

## ***Index to Stephen Harper Quotation Database***

- Aboriginal Issues
- Abortion
- Advocacy Groups
- Agriculture
- Alberta
- Alberta Agenda
- Alberta Liberal Party
- Atlantic Canada
- Being Elected
- Bigotry
- Bilingualism
- Bill Phipps
- Bloc
- Brian Mulroney
- Broadcasting
- Budget Legislation
- Calgary
- Campaign Donations
- Campaign Finance Reform
- Canada
- Canada Pension Plan
- Canada Post
- Canadian Alliance
- Canadian Millennium
- Partnership Program
- Canadian/U.S. Relations
- Capital Punishment
- CBC
- Charter of Rights and Freedoms
- Child Poverty
- Child-Care Benefits
- CHST
- Conservatism in Canada
- Constitution and Meech Lake
- Constitutional Jurisdiction
- Corporate Welfare
- Culture
- Defence
- Deficit
- Distinct Society
- Dollar
- DRC
- Economy
- Education
- Election Financing
- Election Gag Laws
- Electoral Reform
- Employment Insurance
- Environment
- Equalization Payments
- Ethics
- Ethnic Voting/Liberals

- Extremists
- Ezra Levant
- Family
- Finance
- Foreign Aid
- Foreign Policy
- Free Market
- Free Votes
- Fundraising
- George Bush
- Grassroots
- GST
- Gun Control
- Health
- House of Commons
- Immigration
- Industrial Policy
- Infrastructure
- Interest Groups
- Internal Trade
- Iraq
- Jane Stewart
- Jean Charest
- Jean-Pierre Kingsley
- Joe Clark
- Joe Clark/DRC
- John Ralston Saul
- Junkets
- Kyoto Accord
- Labour
- Leadership Style
- Liberals
- Louis Riel
- Miscellaneous Gaffes
- MP Pay
- MP Pension
- MP Perks
- MPs
- National Citizen Coalition
- National Council
- National Security
- NDP
- NEP
- Ontario
- Opposition Parties
- Parliamentary System
- Party Politics
- Paul Martin
- Pay Equity
- Personnel
- Pierre Trudeau
- Political Aspirations
- Political Correctness
- Political Parties
- Populism
- Preston Manning
- Progressive Conservative Party
- Property Rights
- Provinces
- Provincial Wings of the Party
- Quebec
- Quebec Separatism
- Question Period

**ABORTION (page 3):**

Overall, the comments are consistent with the idea that abortion is not and will not be an election issue. Also, that the CA would not be sponsoring any anti-abortion legislation.

**ALBERTA/ ALBERTA AGENDA (page 8-29) :**

December 18/00 (page 11): "I too am one of these angry westerners...let's make the province (Alberta) strong enough that the rest of the country is afraid to threaten us."

No date: (page 17): NCC Online article:

"The CA will be under considerable pressure to rid itself of any tinge of a Western agenda or Alberta control. This we must fight."

March 12/00 (page 22): "Let us do what Quebec has done – create for which the rest of Canada, out of sheer fear, will do anything to keep in the country."

These comments perpetuate the belief of some that the CA is a regional, western-based party that has little ability (or even desire) to break into the rest of the country; that the party's agenda will be centred on western interests.

The issue of the "firewall around Alberta" plan will be an issue. There is need to have concise answers for those questions. In an article from January 2002, SH states clearly that the firewall argument is about the federal government refocusing on "its own responsibilities as much as it is about giving provinces greater control over their responsibilities." -- which is a message that should resonate in other provinces, as well.

**ATLANTIC CANADA (page 32-38):**

November 19/87 (page 35): "...reduced it to a state of permanent dependency."

January 10/97 (page 34): "Now their only prospects are of more government handouts and people who now believe that they can only survive on other people's money."

May 29/02 (page 33): "...there is a culture of defeat that we have to overcome."

The point to these comments is that the federal government has stunted possible growth in Atlantic Canada. That is not the message that has been received, however.

**BILINGUALISM (page 41-43):**

October 02/98 (page 42): "I know other bilingual politicians and I understand the I-am-better-than-you attitude they have toward other Canadians."

May 06/01 (page 42): "...bilingualism is the god that failed. It has led to no fairness, produces no unity, and cost Canadian taxpayers untold millions."

Other quotes on bilingualism are consistent – that the majority of Canadians are not bilingual (especially in western Canada) which is leading toward unfairness (ie: government hiring).

**BILL PHIPPS/UNITED CHURCH (page 44/346):**

June 01/99 (page 346): "After all, the Moderator of the United Church has nothing to do with religion."

May 07/02 (page 44): Globe & Mail article that quotes SH as saying he "despises" Phipps.

**CAMPAIGN DONATIONS (page 48):**

November 05/00: "Frankly, making donors names available is an unethical practice and it should be forbidden."

Reason for inclusion: non-Alliance lists were used for solicitation purposes during SH's leadership race.

November 16/87: should be an end to tax credits for contributions to political parties. No longer party policy.

**CANADA PENSION PLAN (page 54):**

February 23/97: says that Canadians should have the opportunity to invest in their own pension plans, instead of the federal system.

**CANADIAN ALLIANCE (page 58-76):**

September 20/00 (page 60): says that the Liberals and Alliance have more in common than the Alliance and Tories; including a promise to increase social spending.

Same article (page 62): the Alliance is driven by "the religious right" and is pursuing a "hidden agenda". Both are terms that the Liberals use against the CA.

There were other statements by SH on the previous state of the CA – that as a party, it promoted process over policy; how to win political power instead of deciding how that power should be used. No harm in these statements – shows that SH is aware of past problems and is also aware of what is needed for future success.

February 05/01 (page 358): "...the Alliance might have...some odd views on religion." Just an odd comment.

**CANADIAN/US RELATIONS (page 78-81):**

January 30/03 (page 79): SH referred to Canada as being a client of the US; research thought this might be problematic. I disagree – the definition of client is customer/consumer/purchaser – which Canada is.

SH's message on Canada's relationship with the US has been consistent. I have no quotes from prior to summer of 2002.

**CAPITAL PUNISHMENT (page 81):**

Only one quote available – same message as abortion: not an issue the CA will be campaigning on.

**CHILD POVERTY (page 85-86):**

January 06/97: "...in other cases, there are cases of simple parental neglect or irresponsibility."

Taken on its own, could be interpreted as blaming parents. In context, it's prefaced with other reasons for poverty, including the government's inability to establish adequate economic growth that would ensure employment and stability for families.

**CULTURE (page 96-99):**

Comments are consistent – that the definition of culture in Canada has become the “protection of narrow arts and media interest groups based in Toronto” and does not reflect the general public. Money given to culture should reflect public interest and any groups receiving should be held accountable.

**DEFENCE (page 99-105):**

February 02/02 (page 101): calls for the re-evaluation of Canada's role (cost and benefits) as peacekeepers in a post-9/11 world; conflict and violence are more prevalent.

Other comments are consistent – Canada's military is underfunded and neglected; coupled with Canada's lack of a clear foreign policy makes Canada irrelevant on the national stage.

**DISTINCT SOCIETY (page 106-111):**

Comments are consistent – that Quebec should not receive special status; that special status is not necessary for the retention of the French language; Quebec's economy depends on Canada (not the other way around); it is not a Quebec issue, it is a Canadian issue.

**ECONOMY (page 116-120) and FINANCE (page 141-142):**

June 27/01 (page 141) and July 07/01 (page 118): “...the federal government continues to insist upon the maintenance of its own distinctive currency and monetary policy.”

Could be interpreted as calling for an integrated system with other countries (possibly the US). In context, it refers to Liberal policies being self-promoting while damaging the Canadian economy.

March 15/99 (page 120): “...we need these changes (ie: lower taxes, a stronger dollar) fast. Otherwise, Hockey Night in Canada might soon become Hockey Night in Dixie.” Could be read as calling for special breaks for hockey teams when it really calls for a stronger economy that would make these teams viable.

**EDUCATION (page 120-121):**

September 15/00 (page 121): “I think we've vastly over-invested in universities....the vast majority of young people should be going through non-university, post-secondary training.” Both Martin and Manley have come out saying education is a priority (which really falls under provincial jurisdiction). However, SH's comments don't seem to view a university education as a priority (he calls for smaller, more specialized institutions).

**ELECTION FINANCING (page 121-122):**

February 26/02: “...all solutions contain problems.”

**ELECTION GAG LAWS (page 123-128):**

Comments consistent – obviously, Liberals have tried to use the NCC court challenge against SH.

**EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS (page 132-136):**

Comments are consistent. SH sees the need for reducing provincial reliance on Ottawa in order to ensure long-term growth.

February 17/94 (page 136): possibly an incentive program that would tie payments to provincial fiscal performance.

**ETHNIC VOTING/LIBERALS (page 138):**

January 22/01: the majority of Liberal voters west of Winnipeg are "recent Asian immigrants or recent migrants from eastern Canada: people who live in ghettos and who are not integrated into western Canadian society."

SH is showing that the Liberals have no real voter base in western Canada, but could be seen as anti-ethnic (that they live in ghettos: ghettos in the negative, slum-like, traditional sense rather than similar people living in a specific area).

**GUN CONTROL (page 150-151):**

SH voted in favour of the gun bill at second reading but ultimately voted against the bill.

On voting SH said: October 27/93 (page 148): "If there is a conflict between my party's view, my personal view and the wishes of a clear majority of my constituents, it is the latter that ultimately must prevail." – which is what he did on the gun bill (consistent with Party policy).

**HEALTH (page 151-160):**

August 17/97 (page 153): In response to the question of a parallel private health care system in Canada, SH said that it is a good idea.

Same interview: "The best system means having a system where you have as many tiers as possible."

Same interview: "...when you have a private second tier alternative...you have a strong incentive for the public system to be maintained at a higher quality of service..."

Not consistent with recent position of alternative delivery within a publicly funded health system.

**HOUSE OF COMMONS (page 160-164):**

January 18/94 (page 162): call for a more polite, civilized H of C; but has recently called McCallum a "clown" and an "idiot".

**IMMIGRATION (page 164-166):**

June 24/01 (page 165): Immigration standards are not based on economics; federal immigration policy has "drifted from economic criteria to a racial element...it's a vote-buying scheme."

This might not sit well with ethnic groups. Seems to dismiss their potential economic contributions to Canada.

**IRAQ (page 172-174):**

Comments consistent. One concern research had was SH's use of "clash of civilizations" in one of his questions. This term was originally used by French president, Chirac; French foreign minister, De Villipen; and Prime Minister Chretien: any unilateral action against Iraq by the US would be seen as nothing more than a "clash of civilizations". (V Sun, March 28/03; C Herald, March 01/03; Sunday Herald, March 16/03). SH was throwing that back at the government.

**KYOTO (page 179-183):**

September 06/02: only concern is SH calling into question the science on Kyoto (saying it's fuzzy). Not a strong argument for us.

**MP PAY/PENSIONS/PERKS (page 195-209):**

October 25/99 (page 201): Reform MPs prepared to "abuse the public trough" and to "abuse the public trust."

July 02/00 (page 202): "So how can voters now believe Alliance MPs? By what evidence are they to trust that the Alliance has a higher moral standard than the Liberals when it comes to using public money?"

June 04/00 (page 203): "Alliance MPs may have to decide whether they are friends of the taxpayers, or friends of the Liberals."

June 16/00 (page 204): Alliance MPs did "something stupid like flip-flop on the MP pension issue ...Alliance has surrendered its principles and credibility...that's not the kind of Alliance Canadian taxpayers are looking for."

June 29/97 (page 208): "With a mansion, servants and a chauffeur, it will be interesting to see whether Reform can continue to be the fiscal conscience of Parliament."

Not exactly a glowing review of the Party, its members and principles.

**OPPOSITION PARTIES (page 217):**

April 16/01: they represent mere "alternative dictatorial choices".

**PAUL MARTIN (page 221-223):**

June 24/02 (page 221): "Paul Martin at least displayed some achievement, some degree of capability, some degree of ability to articulate ideas, and now he's gone."

January 07/00 (page 222): "...Arguing quite sensibly that the surplus really belongs to taxpayers, Martin wants to put huge spending programs on the backburner so he can give Canadians a tax cut...Unlike Martin, the prime minister has little sympathy for overburdened taxpayers."

July 24/05 (page 223): "Paul Martin is obviously on top of his area...he's just a very good performer as well."

All quotes praise Martin and his performance.

**POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS (page 226-227):**

April 01/98: "I have zero interest in leading this new entity or any existing party...While I don't regret that (participation in partisan politics) at all, I have no desire to do it over again. In fact, there is almost nothing I would rather do less."

October 05/96 (page 227): "It has never been my intention to seek a second term or to become a career politician."

October 05/96 (page 227): "I can state categorically that I would not be a candidate in any future leadership contest."

Reason for inclusion: some might question his sincerity or commitment now.

**QUEBEC SEPARATISM (page 241-268):**

There are numerous quotes on this issue as SH was the unity critic for the Reform. Comments are consistent – that Quebec cannot unilaterally decide its own fate; that it is tied to Canada; Quebec should be under no illusions – a vote for independence doesn't mean they can negotiate "sovereignty-association" with Canada.

One that may be problematic: April 15/91 (page 264): In light of Quebec's demand for more power – that if that's the case, SH might prefer a Canada without Quebec altogether (not verbatim – excerpt from a Maclean's article).

**REFORM/ WESTERN POLITICS (page 272-282):**

November 16/87 (page 272): "...we require a political party to put pursuit of the West's agenda at the top of the list."

March 21/95 (page 280): "The truth is that Reform serves its core constituents quite well. You can define them as narrowly as you want, perhaps as little more than the "g-issues" – guns, gays and government grants – but those people are happy with Reform."

June 07/97 (page 281): "If Reform knew how to break into Ontario, it would have done so by now...Reform is permanent – and yet has no obvious pathway to power, at least in normal times."

Reason for inclusion: although the quotes are attributed to Reform, people may try to carry these over and apply them to the CA (as many don't see the difference between the two).

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION (page 293-299):**

Comments are consistent : not something that will be part of party policy; own view on marriage is based on traditional definition; political parties should be open to all (tolerance for diversity of opinions); should be afforded protection under Canadian Human Rights Act.

Problem: October 23/02 (page 295): Comments in the House re: Svend Robinson's pictures up in nicer places than police stations.

**STORNOWAY (page 308-309):**

June 07/97 (page 308): Talks about not using Stornoway as a functioning residence. "Unless someone has a better idea that will not cost the taxpayers more money, they should sell it."

August 27/97 (page 309): "I don't think it's necessary for him (Manning) to live there."

August 31/97 (page 309): On Manning's decision (flip-flop) to move into Stornoway: "what does that say about what you may do on other issues?"

But: May 18/02 (page 308): On SH and family moving into Stornoway: "it's certainly a perk of the job."

Media and politicians made use of the "call for the bingo hall" by Manning. SH did a similar flip-flop on view of Stornoway.

**UNITE THE RIGHT (page 316-346):**

The main thrust behind comments on uniting the right is that while it is probably necessary to unite into one strong national conservative party, the Alliance will not appease the Tories (and Joe Clark in particular) in order to accomplish that; questions Clark's sincerity and support for a true coalition/union (unity efforts are stuck in a "one-sided mating ritual in the vain hope of finally getting Mr. Clark's attention.")

January 01/98 (page 316): SH suggests the formation of a separate Ontario conservative party that would then cooperate with the western Reform movement.

May 31/98 (page 317): praises the PC's ability to build coalitions.

**Contradictions:**

April 09/98 (page 340): "...those documents (election platforms) reflected some remarkable similarities both in their (Reform and Tory) priorities and in their substance... very real dangers for the Reform and Progressive Conservative parties if they fail to recognize the opportunities available to them...without an explicit attempt to build a broader coalition, neither Reform nor the PCs will launch a credible, national challenge to the Liberals in the next federal election."

January 24/02 (page 325): "Joe Clark and his red Tories don't agree with a single thing this party stands for."

July 12/95 (page 329): SH doesn't see that Reform needs the Tories in order to succeed federally.

January 01/98 (page 331): "...merger seems to us to be simply out of the question."

June 29/97 (page 332): "...there will be no merger between these two parties...even if a merger were possible, would that necessarily be a good thing for Canadian conservatives? The answer is no."

June 25/01 (page 334): "...the eradication of all Reform-oriented values is the price of a merger."

April 18/98 (page 335): "...only if the Reform and Progressive Conservative parties are able to make the accommodations necessary to work together will they demonstrate to the public the ability to make the accommodations necessary to govern."

March 25/03 (page 342): "...it is very unusual for parties to unite."

There seems to be two sides to SH on this issue – the need to unite on one hand and the impossibility of that happening on the other.

**WESTERN ALIENATION (page 353-358):**

November 16/87 (page 356): "If the partners are not willing to live up to the requirements of a partnership, fairness requires that they pursue an equitable dissolution of the partnership." This comment could be misconstrued as the "west wanting out".

MISCELLANEOUS .

# Harper Quotes 1

<b>Key Issue</b>	Aboriginal Issues
<b>Date</b>	18/02/2003
<b>Quote</b>	"Well we have and I think if you look at the kind of things they're spending on, you can say these are noble objectives. But lots of money is spent in these areas already and I think, by and large, the consensus is that we're not getting good value for money there. And are more programs and more spending really the answer, particularly on, you know, separate, distinct programs? We're pretty skeptical about that spending."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader responding to a question about the \$2 billion to be spent on aboriginal initiatives over the next five years contained in the budget.
<b>Source</b>	CBC Newsworld -- Politics Don Newman
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	19/03/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"I'm not ashamed to say that, in caucus, I have more pro-life MPs supporting me than supporting Stockwell Day."
<b>Context</b>	
<b>Source</b>	CPAC -- Talk Politics

<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Well my...position, Mary Lou, is that I don't think...the leader should be focusing on his abortion views. I think that if...I've said that if...I were prime minister, I don't think the government should table abortion legislation. I don't think we should have an abortion referendum. That's up to the voters across party lines. So I'm not...I'm you know, I'm basically not focusing on my views on abortion or those sorts of issues, because I don't think it's party position, and it should not be the leader's position that's at issue."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader responds to a question about where he stands on the abortion issue.
<b>Source</b>	CBC Radio News -- "Harper to Run for Alliance Party"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Harper, who plans to file his official candidacy papers within days, made clear in an interview he will make no effort to court social conservatives who might expect him to lead a campaign to outlaw abortion. "I do not believe this party as a party can be focused on the abortion issue," Harper said, shrugging off news a Christian-based political network has again decided to vigorously back the anti-abortion Day. "He said he was willing to make the commitment that as head of the Alliance party, and possibly some future Alliance government, he would not sponsor legislation on the abortion issue." [I think it's important that when you get to these narrowly defined moral and religious issues that I would make a commitment that I don't think an Alliance government would sponsor legislation in those areas," Harper said. "Harper, who says he leans toward a pro-life stance, said he supports the Alliance's policy of allowing citizen-driven referendums on such sensitive issues as capital punishment and abortion. But the Albertan pointedly stressed he wants the referendum policy clarified before the party fights another election.</p>
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: Harper fired up for Alliance Race
<b>Source</b>	Star Phoenix
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	02/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I see lots of evidence on the ground that what he is actually pushing is essentially the same thing as his last election --that this has to be a pro-life party," Harper said in an interview. "Obviously, the pro-life organizations are campaigning for him."</p>
<b>Context</b>	As the race for the March 8 leadership vote takes on a more personal edge, Harper said Friday the former Alliance leader is relying on the same anti-abortion vote that helped him win the leadership 18 months ago.
<b>Source</b>	Edmonton Journal

<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	04/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"Obviously, I think it's important that the party's position is that we don't have a party position on abortion – that it's not a litmus test and that we're open to people with a wide range of views on that issue."
<b>Context</b>	Mr. Harper argued the party should be neutral on abortion if it is going to attract voters in an election.
<b>Source</b>	National Post
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"I, as leader, am not going to focus this party on the abortion issue or on the leader's personal moral and religious views. That's a fundamental decision the party is going to have to make."
<b>Context</b>	Harper distances himself from Day on the charged abortion issue.
<b>Source</b>	Edmonton Journal
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	20/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"My own view Charles, I guess I'm one of those Canadians on this issue in the middle middle, I'm you know, neither interest group would embrace me. I describe myself as moderately pro-life but I'm not sure as I say that the pro-life groups will necessarily share that view."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader explains his personal position on abortion.
<b>Source</b>	Global Sunday -- "Rivals on the Right"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	05/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"I, as leader, am not going to have an agenda on abortion. I don't want this party focused on abortion. If I were Prime Minister, we would not table government legislation on abortion. We would not sponsor a government referendum on abortion."
<b>Context</b>	The discusses his opinion on abortion.
<b>Source</b>	CBC News -- "Profile of Stephen Harper"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	07/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"My own views on abortion, I'm not on either pole of that and neither of the interest groups on either end of this issue would probably be comfortable with my views. I just leave it there."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader responds to the question of what his personal views on abortion are.
<b>Source</b>	Report Newsmagazine -- "Stephen Harper: The Report Interview"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"I do not believe this party, as a party, can be focused on the abortion issue. I think it's important that when you get to these narrowly defined moral and religious issues that I would make a commitment that I don't think an Alliance government would sponsor legislation in those areas."
<b>Context</b>	Harper distances himself from Day on the charged abortion issue.
<b>Source</b>	Victoria Times Colonist

<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	04/03/2002
<b>Quote</b>	The Leader, declares himself to be "moderately pro-life"
<b>Context</b>	The Leader explains his personal stand on abortion. The article notes that he once openly declared himself to be pro-choice.
<b>Source</b>	Report Newsmagazine -- "Leadership by mutually bad example"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	14/09/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"What they are really trying to do is outlaw opposition to abortion. That's where it leads."
<b>Context</b>	In the aftermath of the July 11, 2000 stabbing of a Vancouver abortion provider, pro-choice advocates demand extreme action be taken to deal with the "anti-choice" climate in which pro-life rhetoric results. The Leader argues that this would constitute an attack on basic freedoms.
<b>Source</b>	Report Newsmagazine -- "Criminal convictions"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Abortion
<b>Date</b>	14/09/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"What they are really saying, if you extend their logic, is that an extra penalty is needed because they believe that being opposed to abortion is, in and of itself, a crime."
<b>Context</b>	In the aftermath of the July 11, 2000 stabbing of a Vancouver abortion provider, pro-choice advocates, including Alexa McDonough, called for Ottawa to amend the Criminal Code so that those convicted of attacking abortion providers could receive harsher sentences. The Leader comments on this possibility, noting that these advocates won't likely rest until they further limit dissent through toughened human-rights regulation – i.e. more restrictive bubble zones.
<b>Source</b>	[Report Newsmagazine -- "Criminal convictions"]
<b>Key Issue</b>	Advocacy Groups
<b>Date</b>	13/02/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"Getting elected" is so important to them that they will invent and reinvent every aspect of their policies and principles. Staffed increasingly by life-long professionals who must gain power to stay employed, their constant switching of ideas and ideals leaves voters angry, confused and alienated."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader argues that those in the public who are politically inclined are turning away from parties in favour of advocacy groups.
<b>Source</b>	[The Calgary Sun -- "Parties Losing Their Appeal: Voters Turn

<b>Key Issue</b>	Agriculture
<b>Date</b>	07/10/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"I must be honest in saying that I did not quite find the same thing everywhere I went [despair because of drought]. I had a strange summer in that wherever I spoke this summer on the Prairies, it rained, including in the drought-stricken areas. I was actually caught in a torrential downpour."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader cracks a joke during his speech on the need to provide more funding for the country's farmers.
<b>Source</b>	Hansard -- Emergency debate (S.O. 52) on agriculture
<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Quote</b>	In one policy area after another, the province of Quebec, with much less financial independence than Alberta, has taken initiatives to ensure it is controlled by its own culture and its own majority. Such a strategy across a range of policy areas will quickly put Alberta on the cutting edge of a world where the region, the continent and the bloc are becoming more important than a nation-state.
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: It's time for Alberta to seek a new relationship with Canada.
<b>Source</b>	NCC Online

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta
<b>Date</b>	12/03/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"Westemers, but especially Albertans, founded Reform/Alliance to get 'in' to Canada. The rest of the country responded by telling us in no uncertain terms that we do not share their 'Canadian values.'
<b>Context</b>	In the article, the Leader advocates strengthening Alberta through provincial channels.
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun -- "Time to Rethink Our Role. Easterners Rejected"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta
<b>Date</b>	19/08/1996
<b>Quote</b>	"Albertans have been part of the national majority far less often than Quebec. Alberta's minority position has often resulted in punitive treatment. The response of Albertans has not been demands for special, separate or distinct status. Rather, Albertans have demanded equality and sought changes that speak not only for themselves but to others."
<b>Context</b>	This quotation stems from a refutation of an argument made by Stephane Dion -- namely, the fact that Quebec is a French-speaking province qualifies it for special recognition embodied by some form of distinct society clause.
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Herald -- "Quebec MP's arguments are hit and my

> CA a "western" party

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Agenda
<b>Date</b>	19/02/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"The proof that Alberta contributes more is proof that Alberta has money that it shouldn't have in the first place. Every benefit that Alberta has is attributed to the fact that Alberta has oil ... Alberta has the wealth it has because of what it has done with its resources. Saskatchewan has an abundant resource base and has managed to take that and turn itself into not just a have-not province but one with no long-term prospects of growth whatsoever through a long-term series of government policies that drove industry after industry out and replaced them with incompetent crown corporations. ... The reaction to our letter validates everything in it; I think to some degree the central Canadian Liberal establishment is frightened by what we're saying. They must try and denounce the debate itself because they have no reply ... Confederation is not about sharing with this part of the country; Confederation is about taking. If it was necessary for the flow to go the other way, the system would break down."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Leader comments on the economic injustices that exist in the federation, and discusses the reaction the "Alberta Agenda" has elicited from the central Canadian elites.</p>
<b>Source</b>	<p>Report Newsmagazine -- "Alberta first: Six prominent citizens</p>

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Agenda
<b>Date</b>	19/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>In his first major policy speech of the campaign, Harper says the federal government has proven since Sept. 11 that it has failed in matters such as national defence, airline policy, the dollar and immigration. □ "Given Ottawa's gross failures in its own jurisdictions, does it really make sense for it to try to do things that the Constitution assigns to provincial governments (like health and education)?," says a portion of his speech made available to the Vancouver Sun. □ "The call for firewalls is about refocusing the federal government on its own responsibilities as much as it is about giving provinces greater control over their responsibilities."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: Harper defends 'firewall' vision of Canada
<b>Source</b>	Edmonton Journal

  

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Agenda
<b>Date</b>	18/12/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I too am one of those angry westerners." The Liberals demonized the West and Alberta, in particular ... we may love Canada, but Canada does not love us ... We have to build a stronger Alberta to become masters in our own house, like Quebecers ... I'm not suggesting a debate about separation, but let's make the province strong enough that the rest of the country is afraid to threaten us."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader expresses his disappointment with the outcome of the 2000 election, and suggests that in order to protect its interests, Alberta should take advantage of its constitutionally awarded areas of jurisdiction.
<b>Source</b>	Report Newsmagazine -- "The Ontario curse"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Agenda
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Quote</b>	<p>[Since the 2000 federal election it is time] to begin building another home - a strong and much more autonomous Alberta. It is time to look at Quebec and to learn. What Albertans should take from this example is to become 'maîtres chez nous'.</p> <p>&gt; Idea may be valid but doesn't promote Stephen Harper's CA as a national party w/ national interests.</p>
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: It's time for Alberta to seek a new relationship with Canada.
<b>Source</b>	NCC Online

<b>Key Issue</b>	<b>Alberta Agenda</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>02/02/2001</b>
<b>Quote</b>	
	<p>Albertans are getting a raw deal from Ottawa and Premier Ralph Klein needs to construct a "firewall" to protect against current and future raids on our treasury. This was the key suggestion that we, along with a number of other Albertans, made in an open letter to the premier last week. But just how raw a deal is Alberta getting?</p> <p>Any examination of Alberta's contribution to Canada must begin with the equalization program. Through equalization, Ottawa tops up the revenues of Canada's less well-off provinces so that all provinces have roughly the same amount of money to spend on each of their citizens. Looking back to 1997 (the latest year for which complete data is available), Ottawa sent Newfoundland \$1,971 in equalization payments for every man woman and child. New Brunswick received \$1,474 per person and \$191 went to Saskatchewan.</p> <p>As a result, every provincial government in Canada had at least \$5,516 in combined federal and provincial revenues to spend on each of their residents.</p> <p>Many analysts have suggested that equalization is flawed because it leads provinces to depend on Ottawa rather than strengthening their own economy. But because equalization is mentioned in the constitution, it could not be changed by Alberta alone.</p> <p>But for many Albertans, equalization itself is not the principal source of angst. Rather, the angst arises, or rises, because Ottawa regularly engages in "super-equalization" – it uses nearly every program at its disposal to tilt the fiscal balance away from Alberta, and toward regions more likely to provide votes for the incumbent party.</p> <p>The biggest offender is the unemployment insurance program. In 1997, according to the C. D. Howe Institute, families in Alberta were net payers to the tune of \$1,000 for unemployment insurance, while families in Newfoundland were net recipients to the tune of \$2,100. Families in the rest of Atlantic Canada were also net recipients of at least \$416. Quebecers were net payers to the tune of \$150.</p>

And it's not just that they have higher unemployment rates. If you remove the impact of differing unemployment rates, Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces received between \$50 and \$405 per person while each Alberta paid \$52. And it is worth noting that since 1997, Ottawa has relaxed the tighter eligibility rules so these disparities have widened.

Ottawa distorts more than just the benefits portion of the program. Unemployment insurance premiums fund a myriad of labour-force programs that not only have a disastrous track record, but infringe on provincial jurisdiction. That they even exist is odd enough, given Jean Chretien's 1995 promise to transfer labour-force programs to the provinces.

The expenditures for these labour-force programs follow a familiar pattern. In 1997, Albertans got an average of \$23 per person while Quebec got \$52 per person and Newfoundland got \$140. (Incidentally, residents in Saskatchewan were net payers for benefits with \$616 and received only \$33 per capita in labour-force programs.)

Ottawa also operates a number of "shared-cost" programs. These are special deals where Ottawa goes to provinces where it "prefers to do business" and agrees to fund a portion of a program in areas such as agriculture, culture, environment, health, housing and transportation -- all are areas of provincial jurisdiction. These programs are buried deep in Ottawa's public accounts, but a vigilant researcher at the C. D. Howe Institute reported that in 1996, Alberta received \$44 per person in such programs, while Saskatchewan received \$133 per person, Quebec \$77 per person and Ontario \$70 per person. P.E.I. and Newfoundland received about \$250 per person.

And where did Ottawa get all this money to slush around the rest of the country? In 1997 Ottawa collected more than \$10,000 per household from Alberta, but only \$6,500 to \$7,500 per household in the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec.

So Alberta paid more and got back less -- much less -- even if you exempt the constitutionally protected equalization program.

Nearly all of the super-equalization detailed here (and we have ignored disparities in farming bailouts, export development grants, Canada Health and Social Transfers and the Canada Pension Plan) arises because Ottawa has found ways to invade provincial jurisdiction. While Quebec grumbles about

Ottawa sticking its hand where it does not belong, the other provinces too often ignore the constitution, grab the cash and run.

This has to end. Alberta must forcefully reject the Orwellian notion that while all Canadians have to share equally, some have to share more equally than others. Alberta may well find allies among other "more equal" provinces as well as in Quebec, though for different reasons. And Ottawa must redirect its efforts at finding ways of buying off politically loyal regions (which is a major source of distortion in these regional economies) into an effort to boost growth in all regions of the country. If it did that, all Canadians would be better off.

One more thing. Wasn't 1997 an election year?

Ken Boessenkool was a policy adviser to provincial treasurer Stockwell Day and has authored a number of commentaries on federal-provincial transfers for the C. D. Howe Institute. Stephen Harper is the president of the National Citizens' Coalition. They are two of six signatories of a recent open letter to Ralph Klein promoting an "Alberta Agenda."

#### Context

#### Source

The Calgary Herald -- "Some provinces are more equal than ot

✓ hand outs ≠ economic growth.

<i>Key Issue</i>	<i>Alberta Agenda</i>
<i>Date</i>	
<i>Quote</i>	
	<p>Stephen Harper [The latest drivelings from the mouth of Canada's Prime Minister suggest Alberta's wealth can be attributed to the federal government. While there is clearly no merit to the claim, we must not ignore the implied threat: If Ottawa giveth, then Ottawa can takeith away.] This is just one more reason why Westerners, but Albertans in particular, need to think hard about their future in this country. After sober reflection, Albertans should decide that it is time to seek a new relationship with Canada. [Obviously, I come to this conclusion after long watching the Reform movement and witnessing its most recent rejection by the very electorate that, in creating the Canadian Alliance, it had twisted itself into a pretzel to please.] I use the term "rejection" rather than "failure" to describe the Canadian Alliance's fate. Many will want to attribute the Alliance's poor showing in Eastern Canada to a badly run campaign. They are not without evidence. [The CA did indeed run a weak campaign by any measure. It lacked any clear strategy, policy focus, or co-ordinated rebuttal to predictable attacks.] In the end, however, this had little if anything to do with the election result. The Alliance was devastated by a shrewd and sinister Liberal attack plan. The strategy -- sometimes subtle, but sometimes blatant -- was to pull up every prejudice about the West and every myth about Alberta that could be dredged. [That such an approach could even be contemplated, let alone successfully executed, shows it has an enormous market in this country. There is no reason to believe the same strategy could not be repeated at any time under any circumstances against any political movement perceived to have a Western, but especially an Alberta, identity.] For many of us, this federal election has stripped away any veneer of openness to reforming Canada. Those who conceived the Reform party, and helped nurture it through its transformation to the Alliance, have not discovered a path to power; they have hit a wall. [This is perhaps not surprising. Alberta and much of the rest of Canada have embarked on divergent and potentially hostile paths to defining their country.] Alberta has opted for the best of Canada's heritage -- a combination of American enterprise and individualism with the British traditions of order and co-operation. We have created an open, dynamic and prosperous society in spite of a continuously hostile federal government.] Canada appears</p>

content to become a second-tier socialistic country, boasting ever more loudly about its economy and social services to mask its second-rate status, led by a second-world strongman appropriately suited for the task. Albertans would be fatally ill-advised to view this situation as amusing or benign. Any country with Canada's insecure smugness and resentment can be dangerous. It can revel in calling its American neighbours names because they are too big and powerful to care. But the attitudes toward Alberta so successfully exploited in this election will have inevitable consequences the next time Canada enters a recession or needs an internal enemy. Having hit a wall, the next logical step is not to bang our heads against it. It is to take the bricks and begin building another home – a stronger and much more autonomous Alberta. It is time to look at Quebec and to learn. What Albertans should take from this example is to become "maîtres chez nous." In one policy area after another, the province of Quebec, with much less financial independence than Alberta, has taken initiatives to ensure it is controlled by its own culture and its own majority. Such a strategy across a range of policy areas will quickly put Alberta on the cutting edge of a world where the region, the continent and the globe are becoming more important than the nation-state. It is true that any achievement by Alberta will only generate more hostility from other quarters of Canada in the short term, but it will just as certainly put them under considerable pressure to evolve and progress. On the other hand, we should not mimic Quebec by lunging from rejection into the arms of an argument about separation. As that province has shown, separation will simply divide our population in a symbolic debate while, still part of the country, it isolates us from any allies. Separation will become a real issue the day the federal government decides to make it one. Neither should Albertans shun federal politics, but we must carefully guard our interests. Much about the Canadian Alliance is worthy of support, and a large number of Canadians do support it. But the CA will be under considerable pressure to rid itself of any tinge of a Western agenda or Alberta control. This we must fight. If the Alliance is ever to become a party that could be lead by a Paul Martin or a Joe Clark, it must do so without us. We don't need a second Liberal party. Westerners, but especially Albertans, founded the Reform/Alliance to get "in" to Canada. The rest of the country has responded by telling us in no uncertain terms that we do not share their "Canadian values." Fine. Let us build a society on Alberta values.

**PROBLEMS:**  
**keeping CA a "western party".**

↳

↳ independent prosperity

<i>Context</i>	Article entitled: It's time for Alberta to seek a new relationship with Canada
<i>Source</i>	NCC Online

Key Issue	Alberta Agenda
Date	
Quote	<p>Open letter to Ralph Klein□ Stephen Harper, Tom Flanagan, Ted Morton, Rainer Knopff, Andrew Crooks and□ Ken Boessenkool□ Hon. Ralph Klein□ Premier of Alberta□ Dear Premier Klein:□ Re: The "Alberta Agenda" □ During and since the recent federal election, we have been among a large□ number of Albertans discussing the future of our province. We were not□ dismayed by the outcome of the election so much as by the strategy employed□ by the federal government to secure its re-election. In our view, the□ Chrétien government undertook a series of attacks not merely designed to□ defeat its partisan opponents, but to marginalize Alberta and Albertans□ within Canada's political system.□□ One well-documented incident was the attack against Alberta's health care□ system. To your credit, you vehemently protested the unprecedented attack□ ads the federal government launched against Alberta's policies -- policies□ the Prime Minister had previously found no fault with.□ However, while your protest was necessary and appreciated by Albertans, we□ believe it is not enough to respond only with protests. If the government in□ Ottawa concludes that Alberta is a soft target, we will be subjected to much□ worse than dishonest television ads. The Prime Minister has already□ signalled as much by announcing his so-called "tough love" campaign for the□ West.□□ We believe the time has come for Albertans to take greater charge of our own□ future. This means resuming control of the powers that we possess under the□ Constitution of Canada but that we have allowed the federal government to□ exercise. Intelligent use of these powers will help Alberta build a□ prosperous future despite a misguided and increasingly hostile government in□ Ottawa.□□ Under the heading of the "Alberta Agenda," we propose our province move□ forward on the following fronts:□□ 1. Withdraw from the Canada Pension Plan to create an Alberta Pension Plan□ offering the same benefits at lower cost while giving Alberta control over□ the investment fund. Pensions are a provincial responsibility under Section□94A of the Constitution Act, 1867, and the legislation setting up the Canada□ Pension Plan permits a province to run its own plan, as Quebec has done from□ the beginning. If Quebec can do it, why not Alberta?□□ 2. Collect our own revenue from personal income tax, as we already do for□ corporate income tax. Now that your government has</p>

made the historic innovation of the single-rate personal income tax, there is no reason to have Ottawa collect our revenue. Any incremental cost of collecting our own personal income tax would be far outweighed by the policy flexibility Alberta would gain, as Quebec's experience has shown. □□3. Start preparing to let the contract with the RCMP run out in 2012 and create an Alberta provincial police force. Alberta is a major province. Like the other major provinces of Ontario and Quebec, we should have our own provincial police force. We have no doubt Alberta can run a more efficient and effective police force than Ottawa can – one that will not be misused as a laboratory for experiments in social engineering. □□4. Resume provincial responsibility for health care policy. If Ottawa objects to provincial policy, fight in the courts. If we lose, we can afford the financial penalties Ottawa might try to impose under the Canada Health Act. Albertans deserve better than the long waiting periods and technological backwardness that are rapidly coming to characterize Canadian medicine. Alberta should also argue that each province should raise its own revenue for health care – i.e., replace Canada Health and Social Transfer with tax points, as Quebec has argued for many years. Poorer provinces would continue to rely on equalization to ensure they have adequate revenues. □□5. Use Section 88 of the Supreme Court's decision in the Quebec Secession Reference to force Senate reform back on to the national agenda. Our reading of that decision is that the federal government and other provinces must seriously consider a proposal for constitutional reform endorsed by "a clear majority on a clear question" in a provincial referendum. You acted decisively once before to hold a senatorial election. Now is the time to drive the issue further. □□All these steps can be taken using the constitutional powers Alberta possesses. In addition, we believe it is imperative for you to take all possible political and legal measures to reduce the financial drain on Alberta caused by Canada's tax and transfer system. The most recent Alberta Treasury estimates are that Albertans transfer \$2,600 per capita annually to other Canadians, for a total outflow from our province approaching \$8-billion a year. The same federal politicians who accuse us of not sharing their "Canadian values" have no compunction about appropriating our Canadian dollars to buy votes elsewhere in the country. □□Mr. Premier, we acknowledge the constructive reforms your government made in the 1990s – balancing the budget, paying down the provincial debt, privatizing government services, getting Albertans off welfare and into jobs, introducing a single-rate

tax, pulling government out of the business of subsidizing business, and many other beneficial changes. But no government can rest on its laurels. As economic slowdown, and perhaps even recession, threatens North America, the government in Ottawa will be tempted to take advantage of Alberta's prosperity, to redistribute income from Alberta to residents of other provinces in order to keep itself in power. It is imperative to take the initiative, to build firewalls around Alberta, to limit the extent to which an aggressive and hostile federal government can encroach upon legitimate provincial jurisdiction. Once Alberta's position is secured, only our imagination will limit the prospects for extending the reform agenda your government undertook eight years ago. To cite only a few examples, lower taxes will unleash the energies of the private sector, easing conditions for charter schools will help individual freedom and initiative improve public education; and greater use of the referendum and initiative will bring Albertans into closer touch with their own government. The precondition for the success of this Alberta Agenda is the exercise of all our legitimate provincial jurisdictions under the Constitution of Canada. Starting to act now will secure the future for all Albertans. Sincerely yours, Stephen Harper, President, National Citizens' Coalition; Tom Flanagan, Professor of Political Science and former Director of Research, Reform party of Canada; Ted Morton, Professor of Political Science and Alberta Senator-Elect; Rainer Knopff, Professor of Political Science; Andrew Crooks, Chairman, Canadian Taxpayers Federation; Ken Boessenkool, Former Policy Adviser to Stockwell Day, former Treasurer of Alberta. DPS: This letter represents our personal views and not those of any organizations with which we are or have been connected.

Article entitled: Open letter to Ralph Klein

NCC Online

Context

Source

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Agenda
<b>Date</b>	12/03/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Westerners, but especially Albertans, founded Reform/Alliance to get 'in' to Canada. The rest of the country responded by telling us in no uncertain terms that we do not share their 'Canadian values.' Fine, let us build a society on Alberta values. Let us do what Quebec has done – create for which the rest of Canada, out of sheer fear, will do anything to keep in the country."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>Discusses the 2000 election result, and how its results necessitate that Alberta focus its energies on becoming stronger and more autonomous. Although the Leader is emphatic in the article that he does not support Alberta separation, taken out of context, the final sentence could be misconstrued as an endorsement of the threat of separatism.</p>
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun - "Time to Rethink Our Role. Easterners Rej



Key Issue	Alberta Agenda
Date	12/09/2001
Quote	<p>OLIVER: Mr. Harper, it seems to me there's a basic contradiction at the heart of your candidacy. You want to be a national leader, and yet everything you're saying is saying provincial power and taking away power from the government which you might one day hope to lead.</p> <p>STEPHEN HARPER (Canadian Alliance Leadership Candidate): Well, I'm not saying that at all. I am saying that the federal government should pay attention to its own areas of jurisdiction, Craig. You know, obviously in areas like health care, I think the federal government should get out of the way and let the provinces deal with their jurisdiction, but, you know, the federal government's got a lot of important jurisdictions and if you look at all of them, whether we're talking about transportation policy, monetary policy, the dollar, national defence and security, immigration and refugees, I could go through the list, but every single federal jurisdiction is an area where successive federal governments have done nothing or so badly mangled the jurisdiction that they might as well have done nothing. So the federal government has a lot to do. It just should spend some time on its own problems, which are pretty large.</p> <p>OLIVER: But by attacking the national government of whatever party, aren't you going into this campaign looking like too much of a regional candidate in a party that used to want to broaden its base?</p> <p>HARPER: I don't put it that way at all. We're looking at national solutions to national problems in the federal jurisdiction. I don't think governments look national when they turn around and attack provinces and interfere in provincial jurisdiction whether it's the federal government attacking Alberta over its resources or attacking over provinces, Ontario, over its running of health care. I don't think this is a national government. I think this is a, you know, this is the problem with the federal Liberals. Their definition of Canada is a combination of anti-province and anti-American, and quite frankly, that doesn't get us anywhere in terms of building a strong federal government or a strong country.</p> <p>GREENSPON: Will you, I mean, in the famous fire wall letter, you advocated Alberta withdraw from the CCP and withdraw</p>

federal govt = federal jurisdiction  
but provinces have full control over areas of  
provincial jurisdiction

from the RCMP. Are you still advocating those positions?

HARPER: Well, those are decisions for the Alberta government to make, but, certainly having, you know, having your own police force is something that is already the case in the big provinces. I say to Alberta, and it's my home province, I say rather than complain about being alienated, if you feel alienated in confederation, which Albertans do, become a first-class province. Deal with your own jurisdictions. I don't think that's a threat to anything else, and frankly, I think the best defence, you want to talk about a fire wall, the best defence for Albertans and for all Canadians against an irresponsible federal government is to change the federal government in Ottawa. So, that's what we're working on doing.

OLIVER: So it sounds to me like you're trying to make the point that it's the Liberals you're against, not the idea of national government. Although, it sounds an awful lot like you're saying any national government is a threat to the provinces.

HARPER: No, no, of course not, Craig. This is, you guys are breathing too much air in Ottawa. The federal government has its own jurisdictions, as I've said, they're pretty important. There are things that can't be done by a foreign country, things that can't be done by provinces. Ottawa should get on with doing them, but it shouldn't spend its time attacking the provinces resources and jurisdictions, and that's, you know, we live in a federal country, not a unitary state. You guys in Ottawa are going to have to learn that.

→ Answer

The Leader defends the Alberta Agenda, and more generally respect for provincial areas of jurisdiction, in an interview that took place during the leadership campaign.

CTC News -- "Interview with Stephen Harper"

*Context*

*Source*

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Agenda
<b>Date</b>	03/12/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"When I moved to Alberta in 1978, I didn't think of myself as ceasing to be Canadian. In thus federal election, I was informed that I was wrong. This is the message I have taken from the 2000 election campaign. Eastern Canadians did not simply reject a Western-based, Alberta-led party on election night. They rejected the West and they voted contempt for Alberta ... political incompetence cannot fully explain what happened to the Alliance. The Liberal Party's strategy in this campaign, though electorally shrewd and successful, was truly sinister. In their assaults on the Canadian Alliance and its leader, Stockwell Day, the Liberals employed an obvious subtext -- sometimes openly stated, sometimes implied -- that the Alliance and Day were from the West, from Alberta, in particular, and 'they are a different type' ... suffice it to say that the Liberals, along with some elements of the central Canadian media, dredged up every fear of the West, and every prejudice about Alberta they could muster. But more importantly, Eastern voters were all too willing to buy it ... as much as we may love Canada, Canada does not particularly like us. It is sad to say this, but perhaps it is a natural development. After all, Alberta and much of the rest of the country have embarked on divergent paths in a world where the region, the continent and the globe are becoming more important than the nation-state. Alberta has become a gem in the Anglo-American world. Our relatively small society has combined the best of American enterprise and individualism with the British traditions of order and co-operation. We have created an open, dynamic and prosperous society in spite of a continuously hostile federal government ... so Albertans must rethink their role in this country, because the attitudes toward Alberta so successfully exploited in this election will have inevitable consequences the next time Canada enters a recession, perhaps even before that ... we must instead turn our energies to building a stronger and much more autonomous Alberta. We must continue to develop a strong economy regardless of bad federal policy. And we must consciously create a society freer and more responsible than the rest of the country. We must indeed become as 'different' as possible ... Westerners, but especially Albertans, founded Reform/Alliance to get 'in' to Canada. The rest of the country responded by telling us in no uncertain terms we do not share their 'Canadian values.' Fine, let us build a society on Alberta</p>

<b>Context</b>	values. Let us do what Quebec has done – create a society for which the rest of Canada, out of sheer fear, will do anything to keep in the country."
<b>Source</b>	Discusses the 2000 election result, and how its results necessitate that Alberta focus its energies on becoming stronger and more autonomous.
<b>Key Issue</b>	The Calgary Sun ~ "Time to Rethink Our Role. Easterners Rej
<b>Date</b>	Alberta Agenda 04/02/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"Alberta has no significant role or voice in the regional spoils system that has become the federal government – other than to fork over the onerous taxation and transfers that finance the Liberal's agenda. ... What we must ask is this: Having not elected the Liberal government, are we going to let it govern us, or are we going to govern ourselves? Will we build an Alberta that is prosperous, strong and free, or just follow the feds down a crooked path of inevitable decline? Will we keep faith with Canada's founders, or allow the Liberals to separate us from them, and from our future?"
<b>Context</b>	This opinion piece discusses the deleterious effect Liberal rule has had on Canada. It then goes on to argue for the "Alberta Agenda."
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun .. "Wake Up to Real Separatists: Group of Al

<b>Key Issue</b>	<b>Alberta Agenda</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>26/01/2001</b>
<b>Quote</b>	
	<p>A group of prominent Alberta conservatives is urging Ralph Klein, the Premier, to fight federal "attacks" on its jurisdiction by introducing sweeping political reforms that include creating a provincial police force, withdrawing from the Canada Pension Plan and openly defying the Canada Health Act.</p> <p>In a letter to Mr. Klein, the six high-profile academics and political activists call on the Premier to build a political "firewall" around Alberta to prevent Jean Chretien, the Prime Minister, from launching a raid on the province's wealth with costly federal programs. □□ The letter also proposes Alberta collect its own income tax and use the Supreme Court's Quebec secession ruling to force Ottawa to accept the province's longstanding demand for a triple-E Senate. □□ "As economic slowdown, and perhaps even recession, threatens North America, the government in Ottawa will be tempted to take advantage of Alberta's prosperity, to redistribute income from Alberta to residents of other provinces in order to keep itself in power," says the letter, whose authors include Stephen Harper, a former Reform MP and now president of the National Citizens' Coalition, and Tom Flanagan, a University of Calgary political scientist and former Reform strategist. □□ "It is imperative to take the initiative, to build firewalls around Alberta, to limit the extent to which an aggressive and hostile federal government can encroach upon legitimate provincial jurisdiction." □□ The letter to Mr. Klein was also signed by Andy Crooks, chairman of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, Ken Boessenkool, former senior advisor to Stockwell Day during his tenure as Alberta's treasurer, Ted Morton, a University of Calgary political scientist and Canadian Alliance "Senator-elect," and Rainer Knopf, a University of Calgary constitutional expert. □□ With an election expected in Alberta in March, the group is hoping to pressure Mr. Klein into a more aggressive stance against an "increasingly hostile" federal government. In their letter to Mr. Klein, the conservatives argue Mr. Chretien and the federal Liberals marginalized and demonized Alberta during last fall's election campaign by running television ads accusing the province of allowing U.S.-style two-tier health care.</p> <p>Those advertisements were a portent of future aggressions to which Alberta -- currently in the midst of an economic boom</p>

**fuelled by high energy prices -- is vulnerable**, the letter says.

"In our view, the Chretien government undertook a series of attacks not merely designed to defeat its partisan opponents, but to marginalize Alberta and Albertans within Canada's political system," it says. "If the government concludes that Alberta is a soft target, we will be subjected to much worse than dishonest television ads." In an interview with the National Post, Mr. Flanagan says he fears Ottawa is eyeing Alberta's oil and gas riches and may seek to redistribute those riches across Canada with a 21st century version of the National Energy Program. "I'm worried about future raids on Alberta's income and wealth. Any time you get a relatively small population that is doing very well, it becomes politically exposed when you have much bigger voting majorities elsewhere in the country," Mr. Flanagan said. "Alberta is kind of riding the crest of a wave right now ... It is going to be extremely tempting for politicians elsewhere to try and cut themselves a slice of that." Adds Mr. Harper: "The message that came out of that election was extremely threatening. The Liberals sent a real strong signal that Alberta is a legitimate whipping boy and will be if the country enters a recession." The letter's authors say they hope to channel post-election feelings of Western anger into "positive" action in Alberta. While the letter-writers propose increased autonomy for the province, they are distancing themselves from other movements such as the fledgling Alberta Independence Party.

Mr. Harper said the NCC hopes to establish a non-partisan Alberta affiliate that will advocate ideas similar to those proposed in the letter to Mr. Klein. Mr. Flanagan and his colleagues say their proposals are both politically achievable and affordable because of the strength of Alberta's economy. The steps can be taken using the province's existing constitutional power, the letter says. The most confrontational proposal suggests Mr. Klein and the Alberta government ignore orders -- or threats of financial punishment -- from Ottawa when considering future health care reforms. Alberta and Ottawa clashed last year over the province's Bill 11, which allows private surgical clinics. Alberta should fight in the courts any federal challenge to its health care policy, the letter says. Mr. Klein is also being urged to ignore federal threats to cut health care transfer payments. "If we lose, we can afford the financial penalties that Ottawa may try to impose," the letter says. The group also urges a more aggressive campaign to "force Senate reform back on to the national agenda" by holding a

<i>Context</i>	referendum asking Albertans whether they favour an elected, equal and effective Senate. The Supreme Court decision setting out rules for secession would require Ottawa to respond because it requires the federal government to "seriously consider a proposal for constitutional reform endorsed by a 'clear majority on a clear question.' " □□ The group proposes Alberta collect its own income taxes and divorce itself from the CPP, replacing it with its own plan offering the same benefits at lower cost. □□ Finally, the group proposes Alberta let its contract with the RCMP expire in 2012 and replace it with a new provincial service, similar to Ontario's and Quebec's. □□ "I frankly think there is nothing that Albertans can't do better in Alberta than can be done for them in Ottawa," said Mr. Harper. □	
<i>Source</i>	<i>Key Issue</i>	National Post
	<i>Date</i>	19/02/2002
<i>Quote</i>	<p>"It was to this arrangement that I, along with five co-authors, referred last year, when we wrote a letter to the premier of Alberta, stressing the need to develop what we called "firewalls" between the federal and provincial levels of government. The clear delineation of powers that we called for is a part of Canada's original design. It is time to recognize the wisdom of that original design in a country as geographically and culturally heterogeneous as Canada."</p>	
<i>Context</i>	Editorial by SH	
<i>Source</i>	National Post	

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Liberal Party
<b>Date</b>	04/03/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"There are other reasons why Albertans don't vote Liberal in particular. Since 1921, Alberta governments have faced powerful opposition. Unlike most provinces, that opposition has not been centred in the legislature where 'official oppositions' have often been small. Instead, the real opponent has usually been a deeply hostile Liberal party based in Ottawa. This type of opposition has not provided democratic accountability in our provincial government, but simply endless confrontation and threats against the vital interests of most Albertans."</p>
<b>Context</b>	In this opinion piece, the Leader defends the NCC's campaign to convince Alberta voters to vote anything but Liberal in the upcoming provincial election.
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun – "Liberals' Strategy Exposed: Albertans See
<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Liberal Party
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"We hoped Albertans who support the government will continue to back Premier Klein. But we also hope Albertans who oppose the government consider supporting non-Liberal alternatives such as the Alberta First Party, the Social Credit party or independent candidates.</p>
<b>Context</b>	NCC campaign add urges Albertans to vote anything but Liberal.
<b>Source</b>	NCC Online

<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Liberal Party
<b>Date</b>	01/05/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"We said 'don't vote Liberal' because of the close relationship between the Alberta and federal Liberal parties, a connection we believe is dangerous for this province."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader explains the NCC's "Vote anything but Liberal in the upcoming provincial election" campaign. At the time, some pundits claimed the campaign was advocating a one-party, undemocratic Alberta.
<b>Source</b>	Alberta Beef Magazine -- "Calling a spade a spade, even when
<b>Key Issue</b>	Alberta Liberal Party
<b>Date</b>	05/03/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"Every vote for the Alberta Liberals foolishly invites the federal Liberals to continue pillaging and wasting western taxpayers' money."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader responding to Nancy MacBeth's, then leader of the Alberta Liberal Party, assertion that the provincial Liberals are a different party than their federal counterparts. During the election campaign, the NCC conducted an anti-Liberal ad campaign.
<b>Source</b>	Report News magazine -- "Ralph goes for a hat trick"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	20/09/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"The Tories are not in a 'fight for the right.'</p> <p>Actually, Joe Clark has long bragged about not being on the right.</p> <p>More troubling, though, is that Clark is now actually in a fight for the left against the NDP. Clark has to beat the NDP in the Atlantic politics of subsidies and hand outs if he wants his party to make gains in that region."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader on the Tories strategy of being pro-handout in order to appeal to Atlantic Canadians.
<b>Source</b>	Nanaimo Daily News -- "Clark can't face the reality"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	29/05/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I think in Atlantic Canada, because of what happened in the decades following Confederation, there is a culture of defeat that we have to overcome," Mr. Harper said in one of his first interviews for an Atlantic audience since he took his seat in the House of Commons last week. □□"It's the idea that we just have to go along, we can't change it, things won't change," he added. "I think that's a sad part, a sad reality the traditional parties have bred in parts of Atlantic Canada."</p> <p>□□ But he vowed that if he were prime minister he would follow through "dramatically and very rapidly" on promises to end regional development programs in favour of tax cuts and investments in infra-structure. □□"Traditional regional development programs are not very successful," he argued. "They grossly distort the market and they not only fail to develop a lot of profitable enterprises, but over a long period of time they have detrimental effects on potential opportunities."</p> <p>□□ Mr. Harper said Atlantic Canada also needs to see its gap in wealth with the rest of the country begin to narrow before the culture of defeat will recede, and he believes a federal government with a "can-do attitude" can also change opinions.</p> <p>□□ "These things feed on each other," he said. □□"Atlantic Canada's culture of defeat will be hard to overcome as long as Atlantic Canada is actually physically trailing the rest of the country," he said. "When that starts to change, the culture will start to change to. □□"I think it's just a matter of setting the rules and setting the mood from the top." Mr. Harper added. "You build on success." □□But he claimed all Canadians are getting "the opposite example" from the federal Liberals and allegations of corruption swamping the federal government.</p> <p>□□ "The culture the Liberal party is breeding in the country - not just in Atlantic Canada or Quebec but everywhere else - is a culture of cronyism. You make your connections with the government . . . and government officials. That's how business gets done. I think that kind of thing over a long period of time is linked to a culture of defeatism."</p> <p>Atlantic Canada's "defeatist" attitude is the biggest stumbling block to a major Canadian Alliance breakthrough with voters in</p>

**Context**

April 11, 2003

the region, says the federal party's new leader. □ Stephen Harper, Leader of the Official Opposition, said in an interview Tuesday that even the region's entrenched voting patterns are not as troublesome for his young party as Atlantic Canada's sense of political impotence.

<b>Source</b>	New Brunswick Telegraph Journal
<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	10/01/1997

**Quote**

"The Atlantic fishery was once run by people who worked hard and thought ahead. This has been obliterated by an economic and social tragedy of epic proportions. Ordinary people of limited means have lost their livelihood. Now their only prospects are of more government handouts and people who now believe that they can only survive on other people's money."

**Context**

In this column, the Leader explains the fundamental disagreement between Chrétien and Manning over the Atlantic Groundfish Strategy (TAGS). Although the program was a colossal failure, Chrétien defended it on "principle" -- "I think giving money to poor fisherman who cannot go at sea, and call it a waste of money, is completely unacceptable." The Leader goes on to argue how programs like TAG, which are detrimental to Canada's economic well being, work to the electoral advantage of the main political parties.

**Source**

The Bulldog – "Other People's Money."

self-sufficiency vs. government reliance.

<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	19/11/1987
<b>Quote</b>	"...the trickle-down of bureaucratic enterprise aids a peripheral region only when, like Atlantic Canada, confederation has reduced it to a state of permanent dependency."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader explains how the modern welfare state works against the interests of the West, but does provide financial benefit to some -- in this case Atlantic Canada.
<b>Source</b>	Excerpts from this speech, which the Leader gave at the 1987
<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	08/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"Perhaps most damaging of all is industrial policy carried out under the guise of 'regional development.' No region shows more evidence of the damage regional development policy can do than the Atlantic provinces. The Atlantic region in the late 1980s was growing faster than the national average. But both growth and external investment began to falter around the time the region started to experience large cash infusions from the federal government for the purpose of so-called regional development."
<b>Context</b>	This article discusses the problem of Liberal state corporatism and the detrimental effect it's had on Canadian industrial policy.
<b>Source</b>	The National Post – "Get the state out of the economy"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	04/07/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"In short, I believe that too many Canadians are simply coming to accept that, as a country, we will continue to fall behind the United States and that areas currently regarded as 'have-not' regions will continue to lag behind the rest of the country. This cynicism and lowering of expectations is what I referred to as 'defeatism.'"
<b>Context</b>	The Leader addresses his controversial comments about the region and attempts to clarify his remarks.
<b>Source</b>	The Journal Pioneer (Summerside) -- "Opposition leader clarifies his controversial comments about the region"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	04/09/1991
<b>Quote</b>	Hoping to keep up its momentum, the Reform party is organizing a late-September tour of the Maritime provinces by Leader Preston Manning. □ "It's still largely virgin territory," chief policy adviser Stephen Harper said Tuesday. □ "Even if there weren't some popular Liberal premiers there . . . it will be tougher than elsewhere in Canada. People are slower to change," Harper said about the prospect of making Reform inroads in the four provinces. □ "This is the only part of the country that has never voted for a third party, ever. It's two-party country and it has been since prior to Confederation."
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: Reform tills new territory with pass through Maritimes
<b>Source</b>	Edmonton Journal

<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	08/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"It is in the interest of all Canadians, as well as those living in Atlantic Canada, to move away from state corporatism and toward an open, unsubsidized and productive economy."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader argues that Liberal state corporatism has had a devastating effect on the economy, and that it's time to consider more pro-free-market solutions.
<b>Source</b>	The National Post - "Get the state out of the economy"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	29/05/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"There is a dependency in the region that breeds a culture of defeatism."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader discusses the economic problems of Atlantic Canada.
<b>Source</b>	CBC News -- "Stephen Harper said some things Atlantic Cana
<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	29/05/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"I think in Atlantic Canada, because of what happened in the decades following Confederation ... there is a culture of defeat that we have to overcome," Harper said. "It's the idea that we just have to go along, we can't change it, things won't change," he added. "I think that's a sad part, a sad reality, the traditional parties have bred in parts of Atlantic Canada."
<b>Context</b>	Atlantic Canada's "defeatist" attitude is the biggest stumbling block to a major Canadian Alliance breakthrough with voters in the region, says the federal party's new leader.
<b>Source</b>	St. John's Telegram

<b>Key Issue</b>	Atlantic Canada
<b>Date</b>	21/09/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"My sense is that people aren't looking for those kind of policies any more. They are looking for policies oriented to growth and success, not policies oriented to the sense that the region is never going to move forward."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader attempts to clarify his earlier remarks during a subsequent trip to Atlantic Canada. The article notes that he did not retract the remarks or apologize for them.
<b>Source</b>	The Globe & Mail -- "Harper comments raises hackles"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Being elected
<b>Date</b>	26/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	In terms of a by-election, I would be very flexible, Harper said, when questioned by an audience member in Barrie on a weekend swing through Ontario. "There's different parts of the country where I've lived and where I have family and where the party has a presence, so I'd consider that. ... There are parts of Ontario where I could do that." But Harper says he and his wife Laureen, who has her own computer graphics business, have discussed what his post-leadership plans should be if he wins, "and she's said 'I could live in Ottawa nine months of the year, but the other three months I'm going to live in Alberta.' So once a general election comes, regardless of where I sit in a by-election, I will seek a riding in southern Alberta in the next general election."
<b>Context</b>	Post -leadership plans if he wins
<b>Source</b>	Toronto Star

Key Issue	Bigotry
Date	
Quote	<p>When Bigots Fight Bigotry [by Stephen Harper] Multiculturalism Minister Hedy Fry's recent rant on imaginary cross burnings in British Columbia reminds me of George Costanza, the character from the TV show Seinfeld. Costanza declared "It's not a lie, if you believe." To me that sums up the real story behind the whole Hedy Fry fiasco. It's not so much that she was lying when she stood up in the House of Commons and accused Prince George residents of setting crosses afame; it's that she so deeply believed it. After all, Fry made her statements with literally no evidence that anything of the sort was happening. Not a police report, not a news story, not a letter. Nothing. Caught with no evidence of her UFOs (Unidentified Fascist Objects), Fry made hurried calls to the RCMP and to B.C.'s Human Rights Commissions to get details of at least similar alien happenings. Even these agencies flatly denied anything resembling her tall tales. Finally forced to recant, she stood in Parliament only to acknowledge that rural British Columbians were not guilty of the "specific hate activity" which she had alleged. The implication is, of course, that they are more generally guilty of racism anyway. Unfortunately, such beliefs are far from limited to her. During the last election, for instance, Immigration Minister Elinor Caplan called supporters of the Western-based Canadian Alliance "holocaust deniers." No evidence; no apology. For his part, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien once linked the Alliance with the "dark side of human nature. And let's not forget his infamous statement that he didn't like dealing with Westerners because they were of a "different type." These comments, outrageous as they are, reflect the mind set of the Liberal establishment when it comes to Western Canadians. Frankly, they view the West, especially the areas beyond its urban centres, as a scary, strange land populated with cross-burning, gun-wielding, racist, fanatic, Christian rednecks. You almost get the feeling, in fact, that the Liberals are not so much interested in governing the West as they are in "civilizing" it. Like some sort of secular missionaries Fry, Caplan, Chrétien et al, are determined to impose their so-called Liberal "values" on what they regard as a primitive, backward people. But this phenomenon is not strictly a partisan thing, or even a regional one. Under the name of "political correctness," the labelling of certain people</p> 

and intolerance for their perspectives has taken on the status of a religion. It indeed matters not whether "specific hate activity" has actually occurred. With the concept of "systemic discrimination," prejudice can be declared rampant without proof of any specific incident, even without the conscious knowledge of the discriminators. Such accusations, like those of Hedy Fry, are little more than bigotry on stilts. They have become increasingly disconnected from any actual racism, sexism, phobia or other hatred. All that we are left with is an accuser with "politically correct" race, gender, religion and characteristics - and an accused with different ones. This is the double standard of the Fry story. Had a white, Christian, male, Alliance MP from Prince George made similar slurs against females of Asian origin in Vancouver, we would not even be discussing whether there was evidence for the statements. That person would be simply banned from public life and all acceptable social company. I am not suggesting that Fry should be treated this way (although I do hope her political career has been fatally wounded). Supplementing left-wing political correctness with a right-wing version is not what's needed. What we need is to stop the "hunt for hatred" in every phrase, every action, and every gesture, a hunt which has become more dangerous than the disease. It corrodes public life - in politics, in academia, in entertainment and in society generally. And this point is being missed in most condemnations of Fry's comments on Prince George. Even if there had been a cross-burning, this does not make anyone other than the participants guilty of anything. Incidents committed by some, no matter how distasteful, are not a basis for casting aspersions on whole groups or communities. Political correctness types like Hedy Fry would do well to learn that lesson. And here's something else Fry should learn: some things are lies no matter how strongly you believe them.

of sat  
Heddy

Article entitled: When Bigots Fight Bigotry

NCC Online

Context

Source

<b>Key Issue</b>	Bigotry
<b>Date</b>	04/05/1996
<b>Quote</b>	"... he discovers what traditional bigotry and political correctness refuse to accept -- racism may be about colour, but racists come in all colours."
<b>Context</b>	This quotation comes from a book review the Leader did on Christopher Darden's, co-prosecutor of O.J. Simpson, memoir of the trial.
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Herald -- "Darden tells his story ..."
<b>Key Issue</b>	Bilingualism
<b>Date</b>	16/11/1987
<b>Quote</b>	"As well, it is probably much more difficult for a Westerner to fit into the bureaucracy. Federal bilingualism policies work unevenly in a region where the majority language is English and the minority language is only rarely French. Fully 94% of Westemers are not 'officially' bilingual and this must disadvantage hiring and promoting in the federal public service which is already centrally oriented."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader discusses the unfairness towards the West that exists in the structure of the federal government.
<b>Source</b>	Excerpts from this speech, which the Leader gave at the 1987

<b>Key Issue</b>	Bilingualism
<b>Date</b>	06/05/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"In those days [late 1960s] the promise was that bilingualism would lead to a new country - more united, more fair, truly bilingual. It didn't work ... there's nothing wrong with this. A unwilling anglophone or unwilling francophone is as much a 'real Canadian' as a bilingual one. And Quebec City or Calgary 'define Canada' as much as Ottawa or Montreal. The difficulty only comes when the federal Liberals insist Canada become a bilingual country it is not. But the ugly truth is that even the Liberals are losing faith in their own creed. They are not practicing what they preach. While there have been ongoing and unsuccessful attempts to promote French outside of Quebec, the federal government has increasingly surrendered to Quebec's activist policies of official unilingualism. The discrimination against English and English institutions by Quebec language laws is well documented ... So there you have it. As a religion, bilingualism is the god that failed. It has led to no fairness, produces no unity, and cost Canadian taxpayers untold millions."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader discusses the failure of Canada's policy of bilingualism.
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun - "Official Bilingualism: The God that Failed"

  

<b>Key Issue</b>	Bilingualism
<b>Date</b>	02/10/1995
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I know other bilingual politicians and I understand the I-am-better-than-you attitude they have toward other Canadians."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader commenting on the fact that Manning is unwilling, and the bigotry that has ensued when he brings up the Quebec issue because of the fact.
<b>Source</b>	The Montreal Gazette -- "Attacks on Manning are bigotry. Refer

<b>Key Issue</b>	Bilingualism
<b>Date</b>	01/11/1994
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"One set of complaints I've heard in my part of the country, and I'm just wondering if you've had this too, has been that at some postal outlets at income tax time there are large quantities of French-language income tax booklets lying around where there'll be almost no demand. I wonder if there is some control on the numbers of language publications that are sent out to the various parts of the country."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>This quotation, which is a question directed to David Anderson, then Minister of National Revenue, stems from a review of Official Language policies and programs of the Department of National Revenue. It could be misconstrued to be seen as petty anti-bilingualism.</p>
<b>Source</b>	Hansard -- Standing Joint Committee of the Senate and House
<b>Key Issue</b>	Bilingualism
<b>Date</b>	20/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"It's that special status is needed to protect the French language in Quebec is simply false."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>For decades Stephen Harper has ridden and campaigned against distinct society in Quebec</p>
<b>Source</b>	CBC World Report

<b>Key Issue</b>	Bill Phipps
<b>Date</b>	14/05/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"Only my campaign actually attempted to negotiate a fair, impartial, open debate format. It is unfortunate that there was no interest in this sort of forum."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader reacts to Rev. Phipps' accusation that he was too arrogant to take part in a debate for the Calgary SW by-election.
<b>Source</b>	The Globe & Mail - "Calgary win makes offical for Harper"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Bill Phipps
<b>Date</b>	07/05/2002
<b>Quote</b>	In this article, the Leader is quoted as saying he "despises" Rev. Phipps.
<b>Context</b>	This article, written by Jeffrey Simpson, focuses on Phipps. The above quotation is the only one of any relevance attributed to the Leader.
<b>Source</b>	The Globe & Mail -- "He makes Harper think uncharitable though

<b>Key Issue</b>	Bloc
<b>Date</b>	25/03/1994
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Apparently, the Bloc is opposed to this [budget] bill, as it is opposed to any major changes proposed by the Reform Party which concern major government programs, and I find this disturbing, because I see a party that is in favour of the greatest change of all, the break-up of this country. When we talk about federal programs, programs created under the federal system, our party is proposing major changes, while the Liberals are proposing changes that are as significant as ours, but when the government starts to discuss issues that are vital to the future of our country, we see that the Bloc is always opposed to these changes. I find it hard to explain to my constituents why a party that cannot abide the Canadian federal system still supports federal programs and in fact supports the status quo. The Bloc Québécois is always prepared to recognize the benefits of federal programs and it does so clearly and incisively, but when it talks about what is wrong with the federal system and especially about the programs we are discussing here, they tend to lack that incisiveness. I must say that I find it hard to understand why they are opposed to the system, to the program in general, while they are not to specific cases.</p>
<b>Context</b>	Response to Budget Bill - this speech also points out good things the Liberals were doing
<b>Source</b>	Hansard

<b>Key Issue</b>	Brian Mulroney
<b>Date</b>	04/05/1992
<b>Quote</b>	"For any Canadian politician to try to score political points from racial violence, particularly in another country, is really disgusting. These people are so out of touch that they ignore legitimate concerns while just dismissing the Reform party as being socially abhorrent."
<b>Context</b>	Mulroney calls Reform Party racists and compares to LA race riots
<b>Source</b>	Vancouver Sun
<b>Key Issue</b>	Broadcasting
<b>Date</b>	16/01/1995
<b>Quote</b>	Calgary West Reform MP Stephen Harper said: "I don't like being told what can be on my TV set. As a party, we should focus more attention on the tremendous power the CRTC has over Canadian broadcasting. Canadian programming will be watched by Canadians if it's good quality."
<b>Context</b>	The fate of Canadian television programming should be decided by the people and not by government regulators, said Calgary TV viewers interviewed Sunday.
<b>Source</b>	Calgary Herald
<b>Key Issue</b>	Budget legislation
<b>Date</b>	25/03/1994
<b>Quote</b>	Our party would be opposed to this kind of measure, to an omnibus approach to government legislation.
<b>Context</b>	Response to Budget Bill - this speech also points out good things the Liberals were doing
<b>Source</b>	Hansard

<b>Key Issue</b>	Budget legislation
<b>Date</b>	24/02/1994
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Reform finance critic Stephen Harper said the party's election platform of chopping \$19 billion in government spending in three years to balance the budget was a preferable alternative to the nearly \$40-billion deficit outlined by Finance Minister Paul Martin. □ In the Commons, Harper said the Liberal campaign promise to reach a \$25-billion deficit after three years was a pipe dream unless more drastic measures were taken. □ While Martin forecasts a \$32.7-billion deficit in 1995-96 fuelled by rosy revenue increases, the budget documents are deliberately empty of deficit projections for the crucial third year of the Liberal mandate, Harper charged. □ It won't be anywhere close to \$25 billion, the Liberal commitment of three per cent of Canada's gross domestic product, he said.</p> <p>□ Instead, the deficit will still be well above \$30 billion or four per cent of gross domestic product, said the Calgary MP.</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>Article entitled: Put up or shut up, Reform budget critics told. Instead of simply urging savage slicing to program spending, Reform and their supporters have a duty to spell out in detail exactly how their severe proposals would affect the economy and Canadians, McLellan said Wednesday in an interview.</p>
<b>Source</b>	Edmonton Journal

<b>Key Issue</b>	Calgary
<b>Date</b>	02/11/1994
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"In this day and age, people expect projects like this to be completely self-financed," Harper said from his Ottawa office. "Taxpayers in Canada are already having to deal with 15- to 20-per-cent reductions in federal spending. Groups that want large amounts of new money will be in a very difficult position."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>Government officials are sceptical about handing over \$800,000 in taxpayer money to finance Calgary's bid for the 2005 World's Fair.</p>
<b>Source</b>	Calgary Herald
<b>Key Issue</b>	Campaign Donations
<b>Date</b>	05/11/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"People don't like getting pestered for money by every group with a cause just because they donated to one. That's why groups which don't guarantee confidentiality increasingly don't get donations. Frankly, making donors names available is an unethical practice and it should be forbidden."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>In this piece, the Leader argues against Bill C-2 (election gag law). The reason for the inclusion of this quotation is that during the Leader's leadership campaign several non-Alliance mailing lists were used to solicit donations.</p>
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun – "Who's Accountable to Whom? Free Socie

↗ Are we for  
releasing of donor's  
(or just for accountability  
purposes? i.e.: Leadership candidates).

<b>Key Issue</b>	Campaign Donations
<b>Date</b>	16/11/1987
<b>Quote</b>	"We must develop ways of gathering taxpayer input on government expenditure to offset the spending demands of pressure groups with their insider connections. As a start, the subsidization of lobbying and other political activities with public funds should be stopped. This would include ending tax credits for contributions to political parties." <i>&gt;Stand on C-2A?</i>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader discusses ways to combat the influence of interest groups have over the Welfare State.
<b>Source</b>	Excerpts from this speech, which the Leader gave at the 1987
<b>Key Issue</b>	Campaign Finance Reform
<b>Date</b>	29/01/2003
<b>Quote</b>	"There are some good ideas in here however even those are flawed. Disclosure ideas are good for leadership races, I have said we support that."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader speaks on the Liberal's campaign finance reform bill. The reason for the inclusion of this quotation is that it could be argued the Leader was initially reluctant to disclose the names of donors to his leadership campaign.
<b>Source</b>	Hansard -- Routine Proceedings

<b>Key Issue</b>	Campaign Finance Reform
<b>Date</b>	01/10/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"How would we handle campaign finance reform? We would handle it the way we generally run this party and the way I ran my leadership campaign. We would try to finance our campaigns from modest contributions from a broad range of voters, not a few contributions from people who receive government contracts. I would personally prefer to see contributions come only from individual voters. I would like to end the union and corporate contributions and let union members, corporate directors and shareholders make their own decisions as to which political parties they contribute to."</p>
<b>Context</b>	
<b>Source</b>	Hansard -- Leader's response to Throne Speech.
<b>Key Issue</b>	
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"As this coalition plays itself out, supporters for a more centralized vision of Canada will increasingly be found only in the elite corridors in Ottawa, among hard-core Liberal centralists in Quebec, in outposts in Atlantic Canada and the eastern half of the Prairies and, last but not least, among 'Old Canada' thinkers who are forever trying to redistribute wealth among provinces rather than export good policies to all parts of the country."</p>
<b>Context</b>	In this piece, co-written by Ken Boessenkool, the Leader argues that a political de-alignment of sorts is taking place. In this global age, regions, including Ontario under Harris, are resisting the centralizing pull towards Ottawa's bosom, and as a result, they will soon challenge the hegemony of Ottawa. This quotation lists the regions that, for whatever reason, will continue to advocate a centralized Canada.
<b>Source</b>	The National Post -- "The provinces will soon have the upper hand"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"I'm starting to wonder what kind of banana republic we're living in up here."
<b>Context</b>	The quotation stems from a discussion of Canada's election gag laws. This article appeared shortly after Bill C-2 was passed.
<b>Source</b>	Report Newsmagazine -- "Banana Canada"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada
<b>Date</b>	01/01/1998
<b>Quote</b>	"Canada is not the same country it was ten years ago. Sound money, balanced budgets, tax reduction, free trade, deregulation, privatization of public enterprise, and targeting of social welfare programs now constitute a broad consensus within the Reform Party, the Progressive Conservatives, and the business Liberals, who currently dominate that party."
<b>Context</b>	Explaining the impact that the conservative movement has had on Canada.
<b>Source</b>	"Conservative Politics in Canada: Past, Present, and Future (c

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada
<b>Date</b>	27/03/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"Canada will continue to be held together by a series of economic and psychological dependencies. The United States could annex us at a whim, but has no interest in doing so."
<b>Context</b>	In this piece, the Leader argues that in order to strengthen the country, Canada must reassess the fundamental of its true nationhood - i.e. the values of individual liberty and personal responsibility. In this quotation, the Leader argues that dissolution of the federation is unlikely as the provinces are held together by mutual economic insecurities.
<b>Source</b>	Report News magazine -- "Back to the future"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Quote</b>	Canada appears content to become a second-tier socialistic country, boasting ever more loudly about its economy and social services to mask its second rate status - led by a second-world strongman appropriately suited for the task.
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: It's time for Alberta to seek a new relationship with Canada.
<b>Source</b>	NCC Online

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada
<b>Date</b>	27/03/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"The challenge is for Canada to reassert the fundamentals of its true nationhood. These are the values of a society based on individual nationhood. These are the values of a society based on individual liberty, personal responsibility and free association that first triumphed in Anglo-American countries. This Canada will no longer be obsessed by a narrow statism at home or an insecure neutralism abroad. Instead, it will equally embrace both the regional nature of its confederation and its international role as a bridge between Britain and America within an advanced global economy."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader offers his advice on what Canada needs to do to maintain its sovereignty, as well as remain relevant.
<b>Source</b>	Report News magazine -- "Back to the future"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada
<b>Date</b>	03/12/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"Canada has largely gone a different way and, as the country's economy and social services slip farther and farther behind the rest of the world, its insecure smugness and its resentment of others' success will only increase." <i>Evident in Liberal remarks toward the U.S.</i>
<b>Context</b>	In this piece, the Leader discusses how the Liberals won the 2000 election on a largely anti-Alberta platform. The context for this quotation is that Alberta has prospered economically and socially while Canada has stagnated.
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun -- "Time to Rethink Our Role. Easterners Rej

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada Pension Plan
<b>Date</b>	23/02/1997
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Well ultimately the low end people. And low and middle income Canadians are the ones who fund the Canada Pension Plan now. They seem to have the money to do it. If they have the money to provide government with pensions, why don't they have the money to invest it themselves. I think there's a fundamental contradiction here."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader responding to Maude Barlow's claim that if people are expected to invest in their own retirement, those with lower incomes will be unable to do so.
<b>Source</b>	CBC News - "Panel Discussion on Canadian Pension Plan"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada Pension Plan
<b>Date</b>	23/02/1997
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Ultimately the record of the government in investing these funds has been absolutely miserable and that's they need the constantly rising premiums. What would have made much more sense in my opinion, would have been to ensure that Canadians can invest those funds themselves in plans that have a demonstrated record of success."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader's response to Mesley's question as to whether the increase in CPP premiums is a tax grab or an investment in the future.
<b>Source</b>	CBC News - "Panel Discussion on Canadian Pension Plan"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada Post
<b>Date</b>	22/10/1996
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Mr. Harper: I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, that I really have any additional questions. The witness has said that he doesn't understand market-based or conservative solutions to economic problems.</p> <p>Mr. Radwanski: No, please let me clarify. I do understand them, I just don't necessarily agree with them.</p> <p>Mr. Harper: I don't know if you do, but what I would say as a general comment - and Mr. Gilmour may have more thoughts on this - is it's very possible that in treating Canada Post as a declining industry, as the report suggests, the best we can do is try to contain its costs as it declines, which may be a better solution than to have it half compete in cross-subsidized services.</p>

#### *Context*

The Leader suggests that a pro-free-market solution should be found for the problems plaguing Canada Post to George Radwanski, who was the chair of the Canada Post Mandate Review.

#### *Source*

Hansard – Standing Committee on Government Operations

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada Post
<b>Date</b>	28/12/1997
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Back-to-work legislation only treats a symptom and not the real problem with postal service in Canada. The real problem is the double monopoly in postal service. The government gives post office management a monopoly over Canadians' mail, and then Canada Post gives CUPW union bosses the labour monopoly power to shut the service down. That threat still hangs over the heads of all Canadian families and businesses. It's time to end the double monopoly and to give Canadian consumers a choice when it comes to mail service. Only ending the monopoly will ensure that Canadians are never held hostage by another postal strike."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader comments on the recent postal strike.
<b>Source</b>	Letter to The Calgary Herald

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada Post
<b>Date</b>	2/10/1996
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"You noted several times that you've been gratified, generally speaking, by the reaction to the report. I assume that probably doesn't include the editorial in <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, which you also made some passing reference to.</p> <p>I'm going to read a section from that editorial, which ends in a question. It's a question I'd like you to address. It says:</p>
	<p>There are two possible reasons for keeping Canada Post as is. The first is the idea that people in rural and isolated areas have some sort of right to subsidized communications. But where, other than in first-class mail, is this the case? The price of an airline ticket is based on cost: Montreal-Toronto flights are cheaper and more frequent than Montreal-Yellowknife. Nobody considers this to be an issue.</p> <p>Nor would anyone question the fact that Montreal-Toronto long-distance telephone rates are cheaper than a long distance call from, say, Halifax, to the far North. It makes economic sense (depending on the mode of transmission). The uniform postal rate may be a long-standing practice, but it is also an anomaly: If it did not already exist, would we want to pass a law inventing it? This is the question.</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Leader quotes a <i>Globe &amp; Mail</i> editorial, which advocates differential postal rates, to George Radwanski, who was chair of the Canada Post Mandate Review.</p>
<b>Source</b>	Hansard – Standing Committee on Government Operations

↗ advocating  
this?

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canada Post
<b>Date</b>	12/01/1997
<b>Quote</b>	"... let's end the first-class mail monopoly so our choices get even better!"
<b>Context</b>	The Leader agreeing with a comment made by then Public Works Minister Alfonso Gagliano, who mused out loud that the postal strike could lead to the privatization of the mail service.
<b>Source</b>	The Bulldog -- "Bread & Circuses."
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	26/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"What has been lost, particularly in the past year or so, has been an emphasis on what this party stands for, what its vision for the country is.-We have descended into the politics of personality and of process, and my strength as a public figure has always been articulating policies and agenda items. That's what I want to see the party get back to. That's the only way it will move forward."
<b>Context</b>	You've said, "We are not closer today to power than when I left Parliament in 1997 and we are a lot further from knowing why we want to be in power." Could you expand on that statement?
<b>Source</b>	Ottawa Citizen

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	29/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"For the last five of years there's been a growing chorus in the party that power is what matters," Harper said. "Don't get me wrong, I'm in this to win .. but this power at all costs has not served us well. We are no closer today to power than when I left Parliament in 1997 and we're a lot farther from knowing why we want to be in power."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Speech in Medicine Hat
<b>Source</b>	CP Wire
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	21/03/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"You have just voted to move our party forward into the future. You have voted to build on our past successes and move beyond our recent difficulties and to become the kind of alternative to the Liberals that this country so badly requires." The new leader said his goal is to rebuild the Alliance and "bring together all who share our values and our visions – reformers, like-minded PCs and others regardless of their previous political affiliation. I have said I would rather go in [to Parliament] sooner rather than later," Mr Harper said, adding Calgary Southwest is "one option."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Comments after first ballot victory
<b>Source</b>	National Post

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	20/09/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Federal Tories tell me they are more 'conservative' than the Liberals, but less "extreme" than the Alliance. Unfortunately, for them, the Liberals and Alliance are really fighting over the centre, where there's not a lot of free space.</p> <p>In economic policy, for instance, the Liberals agree that there should be no return to deficit financing, generous welfare, protectionism or direct government intervention in the economy. The Alliance, for its part, promises to respect the middle-class entitlements of the welfare state -- public health care, pensions and education -- including, by the way, the welfare entitlements of the politicians themselves.</p> <p>Both parties promise to increase their social spending and cut taxes, arguing mainly on how to divvy up the budget surplus."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>In this piece, the Leader argues that the Liberals and the Alliance have more in common policy wise than the Alliance and the Tories do. He is not too cheery when discussing the Alliance's conservative pedigree.</p>
<b>Source</b>	Nanaimo Daily News -- "Clark can't face the reality"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	29/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"This party has a broad vision," he said. "What's caused it to grow was its principles and policies that that vision articulates. Whenever we talk about these things, I believe that as a party we've been successful. We've generated controversy, we've connected with the public. That's how we've made our gains."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Speech in Medicine Hat
<b>Source</b>	CP Wire

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	16/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Harper is aware some complain the direction he wants to take the party will return it to its Reform Party-Western Canada roots and turn it into a rump party. He's perturbed by the belief that if the party returns to its roots it is going backwards. This is all wrong," he said. "What made us successful ... was our vision and our policies. Sitting around talking about power and process and personality (over the past year) has taken us a long way backwards."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Not to return to a "Western party" but a party based on certain values.
<b>Source</b>	<u>Hamilton Spectator</u>
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	16/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Harper says the Alliance also failed to demonstrate to voters it had "a sense of permanency as an organization. Those are the things we need to do," he said yesterday while passing through Hamilton on the start of a five-city tour of Ontario, plus a visit to Montreal. "We need to get more Progressive Conservatives voting for us. We need to get more Liberals voting for us if we're going to win any substantial number of seats in Ontario." □</p>
<b>Context</b>	Exclusive interview.
<b>Source</b>	<u>Hamilton Spectator</u>

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"[My leadership campaign] will not run a deficit. That's one of the biggest complaints about this party's current operation."
<b>Context</b>	Harper announces intentions.
<b>Source</b>	[Edmonton Journal]
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"My immediate objective is to get this party back on track and ready for the next election."
<b>Context</b>	Harper announces intentions.
<b>Source</b>	[Globe and Mail]
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	20/09/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Only on some 'social' values are the Liberals and the Alliance radically different. The Liberals are driven by the world view of the establishment left, and the Alliance by that of the religious right, but both will pursue their agendas as hidden agendas. The Liberals will continue to push theirs through rights commissions and the courts, and the Alliance will attack the power of these institutions."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↙</p>
<b>Context</b>	In this piece, the Leader argues that the Liberals and the Alliance have more in common policy wise than the Alliance and the Tories do. This quotation serves to point out the fundamental differences that separate the two. Note the use of the terms "religious right" and "hidden agenda" in the same sentence.
<b>Source</b>	[Nanaimo Daily News -- "Clark can't face the reality"]

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	20/06/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Coalition, was chief policy officer of the Reform Party of Canada 1988-1992. Tom Flanagan, a professor of political science, was Reform's director of research 1991-92.</p> <p>□□ HEADLINE: Three tips for the CA: policy, policy and policy</p> <p>□□ Every major success enjoyed by conservatives in national politics in the past decade has resulted from the timely and unapologetic advancement of conservative ideals. These ideals catalyzed the Reform party and gave the Canadian Alliance its initial momentum. Conservatives looking for a way forward should get their bearings by taking a look back.</p> <p>□□ Reform was the first national party to oppose the Meech Lake accord, especially the distinct society clause. It made an even bigger impression on the public mind by helping to win the 1992 referendum battle against the Charlottetown accord. The opposition to both accords was essentially grounded on the conservative principle of the equality of all citizens before the law — an ideal that gathered wide support in the referendum battle. □□ The next landmark was Reform's Zero in Three plan for eliminating the federal deficit in three years through spending cuts. □□ Zero in Three became the crucial factor in the 1993 election that enabled the party to win 52 seats in the House of Commons. This time, the conservative ideal of smaller government provided the foundation, a foundation initially derided by all the other parties but soon adopted by the Liberals as their own policy. □□ In 1995, Reform put out a new fiscal blueprint — the Taxpayer's Budget, advocating \$25-billion in spending reductions and the elimination of the federal role in health and education through the transfer of tax points to the provinces. Here was another conservative principle — decentralization. The success of Reform's downsizing and decentralizing proposals came when Finance Minister Paul Martin borrowed heavily from Reform's proposed spending reductions in early 1995. That same budget also combined federal transfers into an annual lump sum, reducing Ottawa's control over provincial social programs. □□ Reform then shifted emphasis when it published its "20/20" paper after the Quebec referendum of October, 1995. That document merged Plan A — decentralization of powers not only to Quebec but all provinces — with Plan B — Canada's pledge to defend its</p>

Yours  
John

national interest against separatist threats. Plan B was grounded in the conservative ideal of the rule of law, which the Liberals borrowed when they introduced the Clarity Act – once again demonstrating how influential an opposition party can be against a rudderless government. In 1998, the leadership of the party launched the United Alternative, shifting the focus from policy to process. Internal strife grew and polling numbers fell as the party put its attention on how to win power, rather than on what political power should be used for. In the meantime, Alberta Treasurer Stockwell Day announced Alberta was moving to a single rate of provincial income tax. Positive reaction in conservative circles emboldened the United Alternative organizers to adopt the single-rate tax as the signature policy of the new Canadian Alliance. Mr. Day's bold tax-reform initiative also made possible his successful campaign for leadership of the Alliance. And while the media paid little attention, his campaign was marked by numerous policy speeches detailing his commitment to tax cuts, smaller government, decentralization, traditional social institutions, and criminal justice reform. Preston Manning, in contrast, spoke relatively little about policy during the campaign, preferring to emphasize his claim that only he could lead the party to victory in a general election. Mr. Day won a resounding victory, and Alliance polling numbers broke through Reform's glass ceiling of 20%. The Liberals responded with cunning – stealing the tax-cut agenda and catching the process-weary Alliance off guard by calling an early election. During the election campaign, the Alliance policy messages got confused. Nonetheless, the party received 25.5% of the popular vote, much better than the 19% Reform got in 1993 and 1997, and Canada got significant tax cuts as a result of the pressure the Alliance put on the Liberals. This survey suggests that if conservatives hope to find a way out of their muddle, they have to refocus on policy. Factional strife and endless talk about who can win, rather than advancing the ideals they would pursue if they did win, will do little but drive the party's supporters away. This is not just a recipe for perpetual opposition. Provincial conservatives have used conservative ideology to win power in Alberta (smaller government), Ontario (tax cuts and welfare reform) and British Columbia (democratic reforms, lower taxes and the equality of all citizens). At the national level, fiscal issues and free trade provided part of the foundations for conservative majorities in the 1980s. Canadians need, and deserve, more than just an alternative, more than just strategic alliances. They need an alternative grounded in conservative ideals such as smaller government, lower taxes, the equality

<b>Context</b>	of citizens, and the rule of law. For if all we want is the exercise of power, we might as well join the Liberals.
<b>Article entitled:</b>	Three tips for the CA; policy, policy and policy
<b>BYLINE:</b>	Stephen Harper and Tom Flanagan

National Post

**Source**  
*April 15, 2003*

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	20/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I'm not under any illusion about how demonized many of you have been," he says. "But I say when all is said and done we've got to give the country hope." □□Mr. Harper, who once advocated Alberta build a "firewall" to insulate itself from the federal government on such matters as policing and health care, used a big chunk of his stump speech to try to squelch the notion he wants to return the party to its western roots.</p> <p>□□ He reminded his audiences here and later in Belleville he was a key architect of the former Reform party's move to expand the western protest party to Ontario after it won no seats in the 1998 election. □□"We couldn't just become a western populist party," he said, heaping praise on Ontario activists who got involved early and who he credited for helping to snag 20 per cent to 25 per cent of the popular vote in the last two federal elections. "Westerners want to be part of a national party."</p> <p>□□ When one questioner asked him to identify three mistakes Mr. Day made that he would not make, Mr. Harper replied: "No. Not because I couldn't identify them. But because I don't think it's a useful exercise." □□Mr. Harper, an economist, vows no letup in the party's efforts to expand its base eastward and reach out to disgruntled Tories, Liberals and other economic and social conservatives who favour provincial equality and limited federal government. □□The reason we should expand across this country is because this party is based on some very sound policies and principles," he said. "And policies and principles are for voters regardless of where they live." □□He argues the party only lost its relevance as a potent political force, which proved itself capable of forcing the Liberals to heel on such issues as debt, deficit, taxes and Quebec separation, when it was overwhelmed by internal turmoil.</p> <p>□□ Mr. Harper says the Alliance under his leadership would not put another ounce of energy into courting the Joe Clark Tories unless the Conservative leader responded to reconciliation offers already on the table. He says his priority will be to get the Alliance, now facing a \$3-million debt, back on solid policy and financial footing before the next election. □□Meanwhile, during a speech in Montreal yesterday, Mr. Harper dismissed two ideals held dear by even the most moderate francophone voters — protection of the French language and Quebec's</p>

<p>status in the Constitution: □□□"The core assertion of its proponents – that special status is needed to protect the French language in Quebec – is simply false," Mr. Harper told about 100 applauding supporters at a downtown restaurant.</p> <p>□□</p> <p>Mr. Harper acknowledged the Alliance has not made strong inroads in Quebec, noting that membership of about 1,000 is not much higher than it was under Mr. Manning.</p>	<p>Article entitled: Harper to woo disgruntled conservatives: Alliance leadership contender Stephen Harper says the party will survive and thrive if it refocuses on policy instead of infighting and personality politics.</p>	<p><b>Context</b></p> <p><b>Source</b></p> <p>Ottawa Citizen</p> <p><b>Key Issue</b></p> <p>Canadian Alliance</p> <p><b>Date</b></p> <p>16/12/2002</p> <p><b>Quote</b></p> <p>"Too often in the past, the voter of Central Canada has looked at this party and judged us not capable of governing the country. I think that voter has been correct. The core reasons are competency, discipline and professionalism, and that's what we have to change."</p> <p><b>Context</b></p> <p>The Leader comments that the Alliance deserved its fate at the time – placing a distant second in the polls -- for the reason outlined in this quotation.</p> <p><b>Source</b></p> <p>Maclean's -- "The Alliance on the rebound"</p>
---	---	--

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	08/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"...the reason this party didn't more substantial gains in the last federal election was not because Joe Clark eked out his survival or eked out his existence. It was because this party didn't run a good campaign. And it wasn't focused on the issues, it wasn't clear what we were saying to the Canadian people. And they hadn't developed the confidence in this organization as an institution that could govern the country."</p> <p style="text-align: right;">↳ <u>What are we saying now?</u></p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader argues that the reason for the 2000 election results was not the existence of the Tories.
<b>Source</b>	CBC Radio New - "Stephen Harper Makes a Bid for the Alliance"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	14/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>The Alliance is recoverable..." provided there are changes. The Alliance has to be showing that its going to be professional and disciplined, its going to believe in itself and its message, its going to be focused on things that matter to people. And if it does that, I think it will get its support back. If it continues to wallow in internal factionalism, if it continues to debate its own existence, if it continues to have senior people in the party say its not viable, not only the public but its own people will lose confidence in it."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Tumult encountered by Party has eroded Alliance identity
<b>Source</b>	Calgary Herald

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	04/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Mr. Harper called the party under Mr. Day's watch "amateurish" and vowed to make headway with voters in central Canada. "It's not our policies that are the barrier -- it's us as an institution that they don't feel comfortable with," he said of Ontario voters. "They've seen a party that has had amateurism too often, too frequently in the past."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>At a town hall debate attended by more than 1,000 party members, former Reform MP Harper lashed out several times at his chief rival, Stockwell Day.</p>
<b>Source</b>	National Post

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	23/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Canadian Alliance leadership candidate Stephen Harper put on an impressive display of strength Tuesday as 15 of 18 supporting MPs posed behind him for a photo opportunity. □ "It isn't just the number who support me," Harper told reporters. "As I've said before, I've got support really from all of the so-called factions of caucus." □ Harper said he has backing from people in the party who worked for former Reform leader Preston Manning, Stockwell Day and Tom Long, leadership hopeful in the race that Day won. □ Harper has made waves criticizing as "short-sighted" efforts to merge the Alliance with the Conservative party supported by other Alliance leadership candidates Diane Ablonczy and Grant Hill, both MPs from Alberta. □ "Even if that were achievable that would get us nowhere near to a national government," said Harper. "We have to be a lot broader in terms of how we widen our tent and look at Liberal voters." □ It could be argued, he said, that the kind of people who vote for (right-of-centre Liberal cabinet ministers) John Manley and Paul Martin "probably belong in this party a lot more than the kind of people who worship (Conservatives) Joe Clark or David Orchard." □ He said if the Tories were willing to consider a serious coalition with the Alliance, as leader he'd be willing to put such a proposal to the party membership. "But I'm not prepared to continually chase Mr. Clark and play telephone tag." □ Harper acknowledged the Alliance, languishing in opinion polls in the wake of the party's internal disputes, needs to be rebuilt. □ But he believes the Alliance can move beyond its support base in Western Canada by attracting votes from Ontario. □ "For three consecutive elections we've got 20 to 25 per cent of the vote in Ontario, which hasn't been enough to win many seats," said Harper. "But you don't have to grow that very much to begin winning a substantial number of seats."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: Alliance MPs line up behind caucus frontrunner Harper.
<b>Source</b>	Times Colonist (Victoria)

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	09/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>In a series of interviews, the outgoing president of the National Citizens' Coalition undermined the credentials of Day, his likely main opponent. Harper highlighted the "poor campaign" by the Day-led party in last year's election, the fact the Alliance has sunk several million dollars in debt, the "upheaval" of the past year and Day's dependence for support on Canada's religious right. But it was Harper's attack on Joe Clark's Progressive Conservatives that caused the most fallout as he set out a clear position on the issue likely to dominate the three-month leadership campaign. □□Harper authored an article four years ago calling for a coalition of small-c conservatives who put principle ahead of pragmatism. His current stance appears intended to solidify his stature as a solid right-winger, especially among true believers in Western Canada who turned the Reform party into a powerful force in the early 1990s on the ashes of the discredited Tories. □□His campaign button harkens back to those heady days when Reform was on the rise and the PCs were on the run. It reads: "Stephen Harper — True Reformer True Conservative." The name Harper is printed in green, the old colour of Reform.</p> <p>□□Harper describes as futile the three-year effort to romance Clark, considered by Canadians to be the most trusted and popular national leader. □□Knocking the drive to unite the right, aimed at creating a single viable alternative to the Liberals, has earned Harper poor reviews from an array of Ontario MPPs and Alberta Conservative MLAs. Alberta Premier Ralph Klein made it clear his vision of the national political landscape is a merger under one banner. □□But going back to the party's ideological roots is not only preferable, it can pay dividends at the ballot box, Harper contends. He believes the Alliance, of the four opposition parties, is best positioned to make gains in the next election. He's gearing up for another five-party battle. □□"Our situation is pretty good if we can just get our focus, discipline and confidence back as a political organization." □□"We've got five times the number of seats as the Tories, we've got 10 times the membership, we've got an electoral base that can actually deliver a substantial-sized caucus. If Joe is unafraid to charge into the next election and says he can move forward, it absolutely mystifies me why this party wouldn't take the same stance. We're in a far better position to do it." □□These are</p>

<i>Context</i>	not comforting words to the seven MPs in the breakaway Democratic Representative Coalition who teamed up in Parliament with the Tories, although they remain separate groups. Edmonton MP Deborah Grey had hoped for a reconciliation with the Alliance in March on the assumption Day would be defeated and a unity promoter elected.			
		Harper didn't mince words in saying that won't happen under him. "She's a member of another party. The actions of the DRC are unacceptable in a disciplined, professional political organization. I don't want it repeated."		
<i>Context</i>	Article entitled: Harper hopes to lead return to Reform's right-wing roots: A return to the past will hurt the party, Alliance official says			
<i>Source</i>	Edmonton Journal			
<i>Key Issue</i>	Canadian Alliance			
<i>Date</i>	04/02/2002			
<i>Quote</i>	"We're going to take this party out of the hands of the spin doctors and the lobbyists and the bigmen who got control of it during the United Alternative process."			
<i>Context</i>	In an apparent attack on the unity candidates -- Grant Hill and Diane Ablonczy -- Mr. Harper also lashed out at the party's past efforts to merge with the Conservatives.			
<i>Source</i>	National Post			

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	24/11/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>The challenge must be to stop talking about an Alliance government, but to focus on winning key ridings and presenting responsible, effective opposition. Only the Alliance can do that.</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Leader argues that the Alliance should stop pretending that they have a chance of winning the election, and instead should run a more targeted campaign.</p>
<b>Source</b>	<p>The Globe &amp; Mail - "Colour Commentary (for 2000 federal election)"</p>
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	01/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I will get rid of the lobbyists, the spin doctors and the bagmen who have come close to wrecking this party," he told about 500 party supporters at a Whitecourt community hall.</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>In a rebuff of past attempts to join with the Conservatives, the Alliance leadership hopeful told a candidates' forum Thursday he will rid the party of some of the elements he says it picked up through the lengthy United Alternative process.</p>
<b>Source</b>	<p>Edmonton Journal</p>

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	14/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I don't think there's anything that's happened that needs to impair the Alliance on any permanent basis. The Alliance has had its own self-inflicted problems in the last year, but the comparison I like to make is, we're not the NDP. The NDP can be having no operational difficulties and it will go nowhere because it has a message right now that no one wants to hear and nobody believes in. The Alliance problems are the opposite. Reform and the Alliance have driven the political agenda in many ways in this country for a decade. Its problems are administrative, operational, leadership, whatever. Those kinds of problems can be fixed if there is a message and an agenda people care about."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Turmoil encountered by Party has eroded Alliance identity
<b>Source</b>	Calgary Herald
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	18/03/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"The problem is that people, particularly in this province [Ontario], are not confident that we are a permanent political party dedicated to professionalism and competence."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader explains the changes needed if the party is to make a breakthrough in Ontario.
<b>Source</b>	Macleans -- "Religion and the Right"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	01/04/1999
<b>Quote</b>	"The new UA will be a centrist party focused on power and popularity, not an ideological party focused on principles and policies."
<b>Context</b>	This quotation stems from an article in which the Leader predicts what the final product of the UA process will be.
<b>Source</b>	The Bulldog -- "Other People's Money"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	12/03/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"... the CA will be under considerable pressure to shed its West-friendly agenda and Alberta leadership to advance, it cannot be counted on to protect Alberta's interests, and it won't have the power anyway."
<b>Context</b>	In this piece, the Leader discusses how the Liberals won the 2000 election on a largely anti-Alberta platform. He goes on to advocate the building of a stronger more autonomous Alberta (i.e. the Alberta Agenda).
<b>Source</b>	The Calgary Sun -- "Time to Rethink Our Role. Easterners Rej

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Alliance
<b>Date</b>	13/02/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"When the new Canadian Alliance was founded two weeks ago, the Calgary Sun picked up on a story most in the media missed – the remarkably small size of the crowd that created this new political entity. After all, to fashion something as dramatic as a 'national coalition to unseat the governing Liberals,' only 1,100 people took part. The subsequent Reform meeting netted only 900 registered delegates, mostly the same people. In my days as a young Progressive Conservative (I do admit it), a national convention of under 3,000 would have been a shocking disappointment."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Leader argues that those in the public who are politically inclined are turning away from parties in favour of advocacy groups. Therefore, the poor turnout at the CA convention is argued to be indicative merely of a phenomenon that is sweeping Canada.</p>
<b>Source</b>	<p>The Calgary Sun - "Parties Losing Their Appeal: Voters Turn</p>

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian Millennium Partnership Program
<b>Date</b>	07/01/2000
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Traditionally, the arrival of a new year is a time for self-improvement resolutions.</p> <p>And now with a new millennium, wouldn't it be nice if our federal Government made a few resolutions of its own, such as 'We will not waste taxpayers' money?'</p> <p>Unfortunately, that's not going to happen. In fact, the federal government is actually using the new millennium as an excuse to spend our tax dollars.</p> <p>They are doing it with something called the Canada Millennium Partnership Program (CMPP). According to government propaganda, this project is supposed to celebrate the new millennium while promoting the environment, youth, arts and culture. Its theme is 'Sharing the Memory, Sharing the Dream.'</p> <p>'Wasting our Time, Wasting your Money' is more like it."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader's not so favourable opinion of the CMPP.
<b>Source</b>	The Windsor Star – "Warning for taxpayers"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	28/11/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I do think there is a deep anti-Americanism in this administration. I think it is reflected in things like Duclos' comments ... I categorize this government as being aggressive toward the United States, and our allies with the United States, when it comes to defence and international relations ... Our argument is that this government has it backwards ... that what they should be doing is being generally humble about our distinct lack of commitment, not just to allied defence but our own defence."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Leader argues that the federal Liberals snipe at Americans on defence and foreign affairs issues but are passive when it comes to defending the country's trade interests.</p>
<b>Source</b>	The Globe & Mail -- "Ottawa anti-American, Harper charges"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	2/08/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"First of all, I'm going to be blunt with you: that's a load of crap. I was on U.S. television defending the interests of this country that had been severely damaged by the Prime Minister and his comment."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>The Leader's response on a radio call-in program to a caller who reprimanded him for going on American television to rebuke the PM's comment that the West must take some responsibility for September 11. The caller said that by going on American TV and undermining the PM, the Leader was acting like "a snotty-nosed kid."</p>
<b>Source</b>	The Globe & Mail -- "Harper comments raises hackles"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	07/10/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"Canadians see the irony of it, even if the Prime Minister does not, in blaming the United States and the west for world terrorism while at the same time starving our forces to such an extent that we have effectively turned over Canada's defence to our allies and to the Americans in particular."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader speaking on the Liberal's negligible funding of the military.
<b>Source</b>	Hansard - Leader's response to Throne Speech.
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	30/01/2003
<b>Quote</b>	"Let's not forget that we are almost wholly dependent on the United States for our own defence and security."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader answering a question about why we should support the United States on defence but then be forceful on trade matters.
<b>Source</b>	CPAC - Primetime Politics
<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	30/01/2003
<b>Quote</b>	"Obviously, we saw the attitude of the American president the other night, I mean, they are, he is extremely determined, he is under a lot of pressure at home. He doesn't need this kind of waffling from its neighbour and customer, or, <u>a client at this time</u> ."
<b>Context</b>	Aaron Gairdner thought that the use of the term "client" to describe Canada's relationship to the U.S. may prove to be problematic.
<b>Source</b>	CPAC - Primetime Politics

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	02/12/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"I think it comes down to our view that we are an American ally and western ally first and foremost."
<b>Context</b>	Answering a question pertaining to the potential war in Iraq, the Leader argues, although our ability to contribute in a meaningful way would be limited, Canada should be working with the U.S., U.K., and other allies to forge a common front on the war on terror.
<b>Source</b>	Ottawa Life Magazine -- "Interview with Stephen Harper"

  

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	28/12/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"We're in an awfully vulnerable position with regards to the United States. They're our customer for some, you know, 85 to 90 percent of our goods, they're our, you know, keeper when it comes to defence and security matters."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader comments on the health of US-Canadian relations.
<b>Source</b>	CBC Radio News -- "Interview with Stephen Harper"

<b>Key Issue</b>	Canadian/U.S. Relations
<b>Date</b>	26/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"One of the things that is so frustrating about this government is that it panders to this anti-American sentiment. I think it's widespread in the government. On many of these issues, they don't assert any real Canadian position at all. We have no plausible military position of our own, because of the long-standing depletion of defence capacity by the government. We go into things like the softwood lumber dispute with no bargaining position decided. This government veers from anti-Americanism to proposals that just simply say let's look at complete harmonization. This is the schizophrenia of this government that is so frustrating. We should recognize what the Americans are - our best friend, ally and customer. We have to understand where our interests vary, and when our interests do vary be very assertive in defending those."</p>
<b>Context</b>	<p>There has been some concern about us standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the United States on any attack on Iraq. How do you feel about criticisms that we are toadying to the U.S.?</p>
<b>Source</b>	Ottawa Citizen
<b>Key Issue</b>	Capital Punishment
<b>Date</b>	20/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"I do believe that there are occasions where capital punishment is appropriate. But once again as I say Charles, I don't believe that this should be a matter of party policy or driven by a leader's agenda."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader explains his position in capital punishment.
<b>Source</b>	Global Sunday – "Rivals on the Right"

<b>Key Issue</b>	CBC
<b>Date</b>	25/03/1994
<p><b>Quote</b></p> <p>The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is being given its own borrowing authority for the first time in its history in the magnitude of \$25 million. This is a thinly veiled attempt to give the CBC more money without increasing its direct grants. In our view there will have to be a thorough examination of whether we support a large or small reduction to the budget of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a significant as evaluation of its role and its mandate. Particularly as technology advances and we see these tremendous changes in the world, we recognize that the CBC will have to be re-examined. Whether or not the government likes it, shortly we will have the choice of hundreds of television stations for ordinary viewers. The CBC will be in a very different position than what it was when this kind of policy was first brought on to the stage. In recent years the CBC with this borrowing authority has been increasingly forced, like it or not, to compete, to go out into the market to raise revenues. With the implied backing directly or indirectly of the Government of Canada, it is crowding out the efforts of private advertisers and private investors to fund their own activities, their own borrowing and expansion requirements, at a time where money is very tight in the markets. The complaint I hear constantly from people in the radio and television business, not only in Calgary but in other cities where I visit, is that the CBC is not on a level playing field. It is a very tight and very competitive business right now. We know that a large percentage of private radio stations, for example, have gone out of business in the past several years. This is not the kind of competition they look upon favourably. We need to decide whether CBC should be strictly a medium to promote and produce Canadian television or whether it is a market player just like other stations. If so, does it compete on a level basis or does it have an unfair advantage? Before we extend this kind of borrowing authority we should be asking what mechanisms are in place to ensure the investments made by borrowing this money are profitable. Ultimately the CBC is fully supported by the Government of Canada and may lack the necessary incentives to invest prudently.</p>	
<p><b>Context</b></p> <p>Response to Budget Bill - this speech also points out good things the Liberals were doing</p>	

<i>Source</i>	Hansard	
<i>Key Issue</i>	CBC	
<i>Date</i>	20/11/1995	
<i>Quote</i>	<p>"I'm not a CBC booster, but the CBC was the best in both English and French," says Stephen Harper, the Calgary West MP who is one of the few Reformers fluent in French. "I thought overall French journalists were more balanced than English."</p>	
<i>Context</i>	<p>The idea that CBC and its French-language service, Radio-Canada, was even-handed in reporting the Quebec referendum campaign has received support from some unusual quarters.</p>	
<i>Source</i>	Edmonton Journal	
<i>Key Issue</i>	Charter of Rights and Freedoms	
<i>Date</i>	29/09/1994	
<i>Quote</i>	<p>"I think there are some benefits with the charter and there are some problems with the charter. If you ask people broadly, 'Do you like the charter this week?' probably a lot would say 'Yes.' But if you start asking about specific elements of the charter, you would probably get very different reactions."</p>	
<i>Context</i>	<p>A grassroots proposal to scrap the Charter of Rights and Freedoms got little support yesterday from Reform MPs.</p>	
<i>Source</i>	Montreal Gazette	

*Did S.H. Support  
Scraping the Charter?*

<b>Key Issue</b>	Charter of Rights and Freedoms
<b>Date</b>	13/06/2000
<b>Quote</b>	"I agree that serious flaws exist in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and that there is no meaningful review or accountability mechanisms for Supreme Court Justices."
<b>Context</b>	This quotation stems from a discussion of the seeming contradiction of somebody on the right using the Charter and the courts to overturn a law. The Leader argues that although he does have concerns about judicial activism, it pales in comparison to the danger embodied in Bill C-2, the Liberal's election gag law.
<b>Source</b>	The Globe & Mail - "Why I hate gag laws"

Key Issue	Child Poverty
Date	06/01/1997
Quote	<p><b>STEPHEN HARPER / NATIONAL CITIZENS' COALITION:</b></p> <p>Well, I think there's certainly a problem with child poverty. There are real cases of child poverty. But I think the numbers are greatly exaggerated. I think if anyone takes a careful analysis of children who are actually living in poverty, it's probably about a quarter of the numbers that are quoted; which is still a significant number, but I don't think we should exaggerate it. In fact, I think we've been on a track in this country where that kind of exaggeration is working against finding solutions. □GARTNER: In what way? □HARPER: Well, I think the 1989 resolution you talk about, probably was the high water mark of political stupidity in this country; that we just felt that somehow the parliament of Canada could just declare child poverty was going to be outlawed and that it was going to throw enough money at it to do it. I think taxpayers feel we're throwing lots of money at social programs. The question is whether they're effective. And I think to do that, you have to start to examine the incentive structure of those social programs. But I think even more broadly, you have to examine economic policy and whether we have policies that create the jobs that allow parents to provide adequately for low-income children. □GARTNER: But even if you quibble about the numbers, you don't argue with the fact that this country has a significant problem, as far as child poverty is concerned. □HARPER: Well, it's not at Third World levels. I admit there's a problem of poverty, but I don't think it's a matter of just quibbling about the numbers. I think in analyzing the problem carefully, we'll get a better understanding of why it exists. It exists, obviously, because some people are unable to get adequate economic support. In some cases, programs don't encourage them to do that and in other cases, there are cases of simply parental neglect or irresponsibility.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">↗ ↘</p> <p>GARTNER: But there also people who are going to say to what degree will this child tax benefit impact on job creation and investment. □HARPER: And on our financial resources. I don't think it's adequate to just dismiss away concerns about the deficit, especially when we're talking about children. Let's remember, that when we're talking about the deficit, we're talking about borrowing against our own children's future income; income they haven't even had an opportunity to earn. And I think it's ridiculous to just dismiss that, when we're talking about something like child poverty. □GARTNER: Well, will</p>

you be comfortable with taxing more Canadians for this? DHARPER: No. We need lower taxes to create economic wealth. And Premier Clark did hit on something very important, when he -- and I think accidentally when he said that, you know, under my program there will be more in this fund, and maybe less is social assistance, so people won't be any better off. The truth of the matter is, those people will be better off, because they'll be getting their money outside of the welfare system that creates dependency. Economic growth and moving away from programs that create dependency, are the way to deal with this problem -- not throwing more money into a social welfare state that has not worked for 20 years.



*Context*

*Source*

Title: Discussion about fighting child poverty

The National Magazine - CBC-TV

<b>Key Issue</b>	Child-Care Benefits
<b>Date</b>	01/10/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>LaFLAMME: Well, one of them certainly is an improvement to the child-care benefits.</p> <p>HARPER: Right.</p> <p>LaFLAMME: And I wonder how your Canadian Alliance government would do things differently. What problem do you have with helping the country's poor children?</p> <p>HARPER: We don't have a problem with that. I guess our approach to that would be a little bit different. Our view has always been that there should be general tax relief for people, that recognizes child care costs, regardless of the type of family or regardless of the type of child care chosen. So we would --</p> <p>LaFLAMME: So a single mother would not get more help than a nuclear family?</p> <p>HARPER: Obviously, you have to take into account circumstances at the lower end of income scale. And we don't disagree with that, but we are more concerned about recognizing in general the costs of raising children for all families.</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader comments on the child-care initiatives contained in the 2002 Throne Speech.
<b>Source</b>	CTV News -- "Throne Speech 2002: The Opposition Reacts"

<b>Key Issue</b>	CHST
<b>Date</b>	26/04/1995
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. Yesterday in response to a question from the leader of the NDP he said that the new Canada social transfer strengthens the federal ability to ensure the responsibility of the provinces to live up to national principles. He went on to say it gives the continuing ability to ensure that leverage is exercised; in other words, blackmailing provincial governments. On March 31 the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said that the budget makes it clear that fewer strings will be attached to the Canada social transfer and went on to say that social transfer strings will be reduced and these requirements will be set by mutual consent. In the eyes of the government, does the Canada social transfer strengthen or weaken the ability of the federal government to apply federal standards in areas of provincial jurisdiction? Hon. Lloyd Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, the new Canadian health and social transfer is the best of all possible worlds. Mr. Stephen Harper: Mr. Speaker, the best of all possible worlds is apparently the ability of the government to talk out of both sides of its mouth. My supplementary question is for the same minister. Is the new Canada social transfer designed to strengthen the government's ability to impose federal standards, as the Liberals say in English, or to reinforce areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, as the Liberals say in French? Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we established five very important health care principles in order to protect the health care network throughout Canada. Of course, these principles will still be protected under the new transfer program. At the same time, we will hold negotiations with all the provinces to discuss the new principles based on a consensus among all partners. The new federalism is based on consensus, partnership and co-operation for the future.</p>
<b>Context</b>	Question Period
<b>Source</b>	Hansard

<b>Key Issue</b>	CHST	
<b>Date</b>	01/12/1995	
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Quebec Minister of Finance made an excellent suggestion regarding social programs. She asked that the federal government transfer tax points to the provinces, instead of money, and give them greater autonomy regarding the management of these programs. The federal government should contemplate such a reform, instead of wasting its time on symbolic measures such as recognition of the distinct society. The irresponsible refusal of the federal Minister of Finance does not mean that federalism cannot be reformed and that Quebecers must separate. On the contrary, Quebecers have allies all over the country, as regards this issue. It is the Liberals that cannot be reformed.</p>	
<b>Context</b>	SO 31	
<b>Source</b>	Hansard	
<b>Key Issue</b>	Conservatism in Canada	
<b>Date</b>	21/04/1997	
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"We cannot think of a single example of a modern conservative party that has disintegrated because of tension between economic and social conservatives. There have been plenty of heated arguments - what else would you expect in politics? - but the coalitions have managed to stick together ... Social conservatives will be permanently excluded from any share of power if they do not come to terms with economic conservatives ... Hence the economic conservatives also need the social conservatives. Since the two sides need each other, elementary prudence suggests focusing discussion on areas of common interest. Constant emphasis on differences is counter-productive."</p>	
<b>Context</b>	The Leader and Dr. Flanagan argue that economic and social conservatives need to cooperate if they hope to pose a real challenge to the Liberals.	
<b>Source</b>	Ottawa Citizen - "Neo-cons and theo-cons"	

<b>Key Issue</b>	Conservatism in Canada
<b>Date</b>	01/01/1998
<b>Quote</b>	"The danger for the Liberals is not defeat by an alternative government, for the opposition is too divided for that to occur."
<b>Context</b>	A pessimistic assessment of the chance for true political change in Canada.
<b>Source</b>	"Conservative Politics in Canada: Past, Present, and Future (c
<b>Key Issue</b>	Conservatism in Canada
<b>Date</b>	01/01/1998
<b>Quote</b>	"The purpose of the conservative movement is to change public opinion and public policy, not solely to elect to office a party with a particular name. Much has already been achieved and can be advanced further by working on public opinion and pressuring the governing Liberal party. Not a perfect solution, perhaps, but then conservatives are not supposed to chase after perfect solutions."
<b>Context</b>	The concluding paragraph of the essay.
<b>Source</b>	"Conservative Politics in Canada: Past, Present, and Future (c



<b>Key Issue</b>	Conservatism in Canada
<b>Date</b>	01/01/1998
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Since experience suggests that a monolithic conservative party's unworkable, what might make more sense is the gradual construction of an explicit alliance of opposition elements, or 'sister parties.' An alliance would face many difficulties, to be sure, but it would also have two great advantages. It would reflect the regional and cultural character of Canadian society, and it would give the character an institutional expression without necessitating constitutional change. Also, it would allow leaders of regional parties to defend necessary compromises as precisely that -- necessary compromises. Within the framework of a single national party, compromises have to be defended as hegemonic party policy, which tends to drive dissenters out of the fold."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader and Dr. Flanagan argue a monolithic conservative party in Canada is unlikely.
<b>Source</b>	"Conservative Politics in Canada: Past, Present, and Future (c
<b>Key Issue</b>	Conservatism in Canada
<b>Date</b>	01/01/1998
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"In this essay, we examine the conservative political disarray ... Our conclusion is that, because of the differences revealed by these debates, a working alliance of separate regional parties, rather than a unitary national party, is the most desirable and attainable goal ... There is unlikely to be any genuine resolution of conservative political divisions until the conclusion of the debate over Quebec sovereignty. For the time being, conservatives will make progress towards their goals by working to influence public opinion and a pliable Liberal party then by expecting to take direct control of the federal government."</p>
<b>Context</b>	The thesis of the essay.
<b>Source</b>	"Conservative Politics in Canada: Past, Present, and Future (c

<b>Key Issue</b>	Constitution and Meech Lake
<b>Date</b>	28/11/1991
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"We're not happy at all, but we're not exactly surprised. One of our criticisms of the government from day one has been that it is not prepared to discuss matters with the public, particularly on the Constitution. They have blocked the ability of other Canadians to have a say on the constitutional development of their country when they (Quebec MPs) know full well their own province is going to have a referendum on its own constitutional future."</p>
<b>Context</b>	Joe Clark said no to legislation for a national referendum on the Constitution after meeting with the party's Quebec caucus.
<b>Source</b>	Calgary Herald
<b>Key Issue</b>	Constitution and Meech Lake
<b>Date</b>	03/11/1989
<b>Quote</b>	<p>The western-rights Reform party is ignoring in telling Quebec to either drop its desire to be a distinct society or separate, the federal government's chief whip says. □□ The Reform Party called at its weekend convention for Quebec to commit to being an equal partner in Canada or take steps to separate. Leader Preston Manning said its time for the rest of Canada to stop making political, constitutional, linguistic and economic concessions to Quebec. □□ The party says it opposes the accord because it could give Quebec more power than other provinces. □ Reform Party researcher Stephen Harper denied the party's position on Quebec is extreme. □□ "It's very common sense," he said. "We're up against a mind set that we have to (prevent) Quebec separation at all costs. Now someone is coming up and saying to Quebec, 'You've got to make up your mind.'" □□ Parti Québécois leader Jacques Parizeau "said the same thing," Harper added.</p>
<b>Context</b>	Article entitled: Reform Party fails Tory's history test
<b>Source</b>	Montreal Gazette

<b>Key Issue</b>	Constitutional Jurisdiction
<b>Date</b>	19/02/1998
<b>Quote</b>	"If the federal government has priorities, even spending priorities, it should focus on those on its own area of jurisdiction. Examine what's going right or wrong in those things. But duplicating health research programmes isn't, ultimately, going to do anything to improve either the quality of our economy or the quality of social services overall."
<b>Context</b>	The Leader outlining the case against federal intrusion into provincial areas of jurisdiction.
<b>Source</b>	CBC News – 'Out of the Red, into the Black, Splitting the Differ
<b>Key Issue</b>	Constitutional Jurisdiction
<b>Date</b>	19/02/2002
<b>Quote</b>	"While much of my attention on federalism has focused on giving provinces greater autonomy, I fully recognize the important role that Ottawa ought to play in the Canadian federation. Our constitution assigns certain responsibilities to the federal government; on many of these, there is no alternative for Canadians other than for the federal government to do its job."
<b>Context</b>	Editorial by SH
<b>Source</b>	National Post

<b>Key Issue</b>	Constitutional Jurisdiction
<b>Date</b>	04/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	"I am a strong believer that the federal government should not raid provincial resources and should butt out of provincial jurisdictions."
<b>Context</b>	Harper announces intentions.
<b>Source</b>	Edmonton Journal
<b>Key Issue</b>	Constitutional Jurisdiction
<b>Date</b>	07/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	That kind of reaction generally comes from centralist extremists. Look, my record is clear—I'm not a centralist. I'm a believer in division of powers between the federal and provincial governments and in provincial autonomy in resources and other matters. But I'm an opponent of separation and certainly of unilateral separation. There is an element among liberals—Big L, Liberals and liberal journalists—that believes we should be a unitary state. I reject that notion.
<b>Context</b>	Interview asking about provinces and central Canada
<b>Source</b>	Alberta Report

<b>Key Issue</b>	Corporate Welfare
<b>Date</b>	27/06/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>In broad areas like communications, transportation and banking - even in an area like wheat marketing - federal policy is invariably designed to enhance the position of monopolistic or oligopolistic enterprises. There are many downsides to this approach. The critical one is that Canadian consumers are deprived of the central benefit of a market economy - consumer choice through vigorous competition. In fact, through a myriad of government programs, Canadian consumers actually prop up some of our biggest corporations, providing hundreds of millions of dollars annually in subsidies, grants, guarantees and non-repayable loans.... Why would the federal government do this? Obviously it sees a link between the importance of national-centred industries and its own importance as a national government. But it is also the case that the Liberal party, despite its rhetoric, is the party of the country's big corporate sector. It receives an enormous part of its support from the industries that benefit from its regulatory and subsidization process. □□</p>
<b>Context</b>	Speech to the Canadian Institute of Plumbing and Heating
<b>Source</b>	National Post

<b>Key Issue</b>	Corporate Welfare
<b>Date</b>	05/12/2001
<b>Quote</b>	<p>HARPER: They're now, you know, basically hand in glove and kind of what I call state corporatism. Often that is the model where the government tries to encourage specific industries or specific businesses. This kind of economic policies going one through all kinds of programs and departments. It's the long economic model. It's corrupting. We saw that in the Shawinigate scandal. I mean the real question in the Shawinigate scandal is not when the Prime Minister wrote the letters but what is the government of Canada doing building hotels and golf courses in the first place. Or being involved in the subsidization of that activity. The federal Liberals, you know, they're the worst practitioners of corporate welfare in this country.</p>
<b>Context</b>	The Leader discusses the connection between the Liberals and corporate welfare.
<b>Source</b>	CBC News - "Profile of Stephen Harper"
<b>Key Issue</b>	Culture
<b>Date</b>	16/11/1987
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"The whole concept of 'Canadian culture' no longer means the values and lifestyles of Canadians in a diverse country. Instead it mean the protection of narrow arts and media interest groups based in Toronto."</p>
<b>Context</b>	In this speech, the Leader explains how the federal structure works against the interests of the West, as well as how "Canadarization" has been applied to the advantage of some regions and to the disadvantage of others.
<b>Source</b>	Excerpts from this speech, which the Leader gave at the 1987

<b>Key Issue</b>	Culture
<b>Date</b>	07/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>Yes, there is such a thing as Canadian Culture, in a very loose sense. But I think that Canadians culture is complex. It consists of regional cultures within Canada, regional cultures that cross borders with the U.S. We're part of a worldwide Anglo-American culture—and a worldwide Francophone culture. In the case of Quebec. We're part of a broader Western culture, Christian or post-Christian. And there is a continental culture. There is a Canadian culture that is in some ways unique to Canada, but I don't think Canadian culture coincides neatly with borders.</p>
<b>Context</b>	[Interview]
<b>Source</b>	[Alberta Report]
<b>Key Issue</b>	Culture
<b>Date</b>	07/01/2002
<b>Quote</b>	<p>I'm not against some government support, but open-ended and unaccountable support must stop. There has to be some way of making sure this money reflects public preferences. I do think, by the way, we've gone way too far on some of that: arts and culture funding.</p>
<b>Context</b>	[Would you support the arts?]
<b>Source</b>	[Alberta Report]

Key Issue	Culture
Date	09/02/1997
Quote	<p><b>STEPHEN HARPER / VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CITIZENS' COALITION:</b> Well I think this particular case what it looks like is the World Trade Organization is going to rule that this particular tax that the government has really is strictly protectionism in the old fashion sense. And frankly, I think a lot of what this debate is, it's simply old fashioned industrial protection really disguised as a cultural policy. And I think what the cultural protectionists are increasingly fighting are not Americans. They're fighting other Canadians they're fighting Canadian consumers and tax-payers who don't want to pay the direct and indirect costs of these policies and they're also fighting Canadian exporters including Canadian cultural exporters who are increasingly successful in international markets.</p> <p>MESLEY: So you're not worried about...you don't think the Canadian culture needs to be protected. We do see an awful lot of American magazines, TV programs.</p> <p>HARPER: Well, I think there's a different issue between Canadian culture and simply cultural products made in this country, which in a strict sense is an industrial policy. I think Canadians themselves can decide what they want to watch, what they want to hear, what they want to read and I think they're capable of doing that. And I think these cultural markets are complex. They don't necessarily fit national borders. Some cultural markets are smaller than national borders, other cross them. So I think it's a complex issue and I think the Canadian consumer is capable of making his own judgment.</p> <p>HARPER: If I can make a point here, we're not talking about the Americanization of culture we're talking about the globalization. I don't think it's a coincidence that the Quebec separatists in parliament are the biggest advocates of the protectionist policies. Because essentially what nationalists want to do, what this planet has done for centuries is divide us into little groups and build walls around us. We're moving into an area where we're going to have a global culture, a global economy, free world and an open society. We're an English speaking country, a French speaking country and we should embrace those international markets.</p>

<b>Context</b>	The Leader debates Maude Barlow on the issue of split-run magazines and the position of Canadian culture.		
<b>Source</b>	CBC News - "Panel Discussion on Protecting Canadian Culture		
<b>Key Issue</b>	Defence		
<b>Date</b>	12/02/1995		
<b>Quote</b>	<p>"Our [budget] would eliminate the deficit in the life of this Parliament," said Harper, whereas the Liberals' effort would only be the beginning of the cutting process. Harper said social programs account for two-thirds of the federal spending, so it is impossible to eliminate the deficit and leave all the social programs intact. "We would have to look at everything, you can't spare anything," said Harper, advocating the biggest cuts come in the areas of lowest priority. You have to use judgment, he said, citing health care versus multiculturalism funding as an example and making it quite clear the latter would be much more eligible for the chopping block than the former. Also, departments which hadn't already made some "efficiencies" would feel the brunt of the pruning before others, such as defence, which have already cut back.</p>		
<b>Context</b>	The Reform party will release a budget in the next few weeks in its continuing push to make the Liberal government more fiscally responsible, says Stephen Harper		
<b>Source</b>	Calgary Herald		