

Election Primer for Diplomats

Monday, September 28th, 2016
River Building, Carleton University

Organized by the Carleton Initiative for Parliamentary and Diplomatic Engagement
www.carleton.ca/parldiplo

Notes:

Veronica L. Green, Master's Candidate, Carleton School of Journalism and Communication

Moderator:

- **Tom Clark**, Chief Political Correspondent for Global News, host of *The West Block with Tom Clark*

Panelists:

- **Bruce Anderson**, Principal of Anderson Insight and Chair of Abacus Data
- **Susan Delacourt**, Author, political commentator, columnist for the Toronto Star and iPolitics, and Fellow of Carleton's School of Political Management
- **Christopher Waddell**, Associate Professor and former Director of the Carleton School of Journalism and Communication

Opening Remarks

Maureen Boyd, Director of Carleton University's Initiative for Parliamentary and Diplomatic Engagement

- Welcomed more than 30 Ambassadors and High Commissioners for a total of 90 diplomats representing more than 60 countries
- Acknowledgement of the support of the Ottawa Diplomatic Association.
- Thanks to sponsors listed in programme: Bombardier, Canadian Gas Association, Cenovus, GlaxoSmithKline, Insurance Bureau of Canada, Shaw, Suncor, TD Bank and Toyota

Introductions

Moderator, Tom Clark:

- The next hour will be enlightening, it will delve deep into issues, but it will also be fun.
- I have covered every election since 1974, of all those elections, this election is "one for the ages".

- Canada has had substantive and substantial elections before. *For example*, in 1988, there was the issue of free trade. This was one election that revolved around substance, and would make a difference to Canada. The election we are in now may not have an issue as enormous, but there is a question of tone. There is a foreign policy debate tonight and I think that for the first time - that I can remember - our role on the world stage is a factor in this election. This is an issue for the parties that will drive votes.
- Introduction of Chris Waddell - accomplished journalist and producer. He produces Peter Mansbridge on election night. Waddell is not only respected but trusted. In the realm of academia, when Chris talks, we listen.

Panelist, Chris Waddell:

- My role is to give a guideline of facts & figures about how elections work.
- To address the growing population, in this election, there will be 338 MPs. That is 3 more than there are currently in in Quebec, 15 in Ontario, 6 in Alberta and British Columbia.
 - Therefore, 170 seats is the majority in the new Parliament.
- Current distribution of seats in the House of Commons:
 - 159 Conservatives, 95 NDP, 36 Liberals, 2 Bloc, 2 Green, 8 Independent, 4 vacancies.
- Electoral system: This is a winner-take-all system¹, whoever finishes first in each riding is the winner.
 - Opinion polling suggests four parties are contesting seats, some Members of Parliament will be elected with more than 30 percent of the vote in each riding.
- Turnout: In the election that Tom Clark mentioned in 1988, the election turnout was above 75 percent. Most elections have been around that, or above.
 - Declining voter turnout isn't a Canadian problem, but we have seen a consistent downturn.
 - 2000 and 2004 turnout was 61 percent;
 - 2006 (Liberal to Conservative change of Government), turnout was at 65 percent;
 - 2008 was the lowest turnout in Canadian history; and,
 - 2011 was 61 percent, suggesting that around 60 - 65 percent was to be the norm.
- Change: This election is an election in which many people, polling states 2/3s, want a "change". Therefore, it will be interesting to see if turnout is higher or still at 60 - 61 percent.
 - We will know this late on the night of October 19th. Turnout is a good indication of change.
- Television coverage: Polls close at a staggered period of time [across the country], this is to guarantee that people go to the polls at the same time. Therefore, most people

¹ In reference to Canada's electoral system, First-Past-the-Post

don't know the outcome of the election when they cast their votes. Counting happens very quickly.

- Broadcasters get a feed of results, they get them at the same time as Elections Canada. This is unlike the British system. Therefore, you will see partial results throughout the night. Networks and broadcast maintain the running totals of results.
- The results could be known early.
- Exit Polls: There are no exit polls in Canada. There have been some people who have tried, but there are many reasons that they are not done:
 - No. 1. Results come so quickly that exit polls have no long-term meaning; and,
 - No. 2. Cost of polling is too high, given that results are available so quickly.
- There is competition between media outlets to call results early on. Research that I've done suggests that audience numbers are great until you call the election. It would therefore make sense for broadcasters to delay the results.
 - However, when you produce election night television - as long as the numbers are showing indecision, you don't call it. But once the numbers show that someone is winning, it should be called because you will look silly at some point by not calling it.

Moderator Tom Clark:

- This election, Chris will be at CBC's *The National* and I will be at Global News. At Global, we've already called the election (*laughs*).
- I will now bring in Bruce Anderson - He's a person who "stares in the fire and sees visions" (*laughs*). Bruce is one of the most respected pollsters in the country, Abacus data has a well respected reputation in the country. Bruce Anderson has been involved in the process on the inside and outside.

Panelist Bruce Anderson:

(Slide Show Presentation of Abacus Polling Data – data available at www.abacusdata.ca)

- Asks group: Is this your first federal election in Canada? (*Vast majority raises their hands*).
- I haven't been following politics for as long as Tom Clark (*laughs*).
- Is this the most interesting election I've ever seen? Absolutely it is. I love elections. But this is particularly good. If you find some days that the election is hard to figure out - it is for us too, those of us who've been following them for a long time - it's extremely hard.
- You've probably seen a lot of polls, but I will tell you a few important things.
 - There are two unresolved questions:
 - (1) How many people want change, and how badly?
 - (2) which version of change are they going to choose?
 - The answer will be the party who forms government.

- Slide 1 - National Voting Intention, The polls show the three way tie - there are 5 points separating the parties at this moment. The graph indicates that there have been times in which the parties had a greater gap between one another.
 - Liberals were leading at one point, but after the Oct. 22nd shooting there was an increase in support for the Conservatives. The NDP line jumps up, and this started “around 10 minutes” after the Alberta government went NDP.² People had previously said ‘I hadn’t really been open to the NDP government, or to the NDP as a brand’, but after the formation of the Alberta government, the most Conservative province went NDP.

- Slide 2 - Ontario Vote Intention. Conservatives are competitive - 36 percent currently. They don’t have the same seat count as the last time. Liberals are at 33 percent. There is another poll out today that has only one point separating those two parties. I am a believer of looking at all polls, you should look at more than one.
 - If you're asking the question ‘Is the race anyone’s race right now?’ - Yes. The NDP have fallen behind the opportunity that they had. Can they turn that around? Yes, there is plenty of time.

- Slide 3 - Quebec Vote intention: It was a breakthrough situation [for the NDP] in the last election campaign in Quebec. But the graph indicates a 17 ‘point shearing’ for the NDP in Quebec.
 - Both Conservatives and Bloc are growing in popularity. This could be about the debate on the niqab.
 - Part of what is shaking loose is a larger phenomena - the NDP don’t seem to be the advocates for the kind of change on the left that they have historically been. They have previously been aggressive promoters of serious change. This has put them in a situation where they have lost votes on issues of the niqab and pipeline. For example, they are not very pro-development and they are not as pro-environment as they have been. The Bloc has been competing with them on the left and the Conservatives have been competing with them on the right.

- Slide 4 - Election Winner Prediction: What people think will happen has a high correlation with what will happen. But right now, people don’t know what’s going to happen. Their guesswork is not very valuable. But, if you went back to August \2014, versus today, what people think has changed. I hope that uncertainty about the election will lead to high turnout. That, combined with long campaign, could have people more engaged. People may be more interested because there is a race. I could be a cup-half full kind of person, but I hope you share this enthusiasm.

- Slide 5 - Positive Feelings Towards Leaders: We measure positive, negative and neutral.

² (The Alberta government elected an NDP Premier in May 2015. NDP Rachel Notley defeated incumbent Conservative Jim Prentice.)

- Trudeau: Positive feelings about Trudeau had been high, the numbers sagged quite a bit in Spring/ Summer (35 - 30 percent); but since the election campaign, his positives have gone up. He's performed well in debates, but he's also surrounded himself with economic voices, former Prime Ministers Paul Martin and Jean Chretien, and former Clerk of the Privy Council Kevin Lynch. His campaign has run "tactically error free".
- Mulcair: After the Alberta election, his positives really increased. It was a "rocket trip" for Mulcair. I do think that when the campaign started he did decide to run as a front-runner. He chose to avoid certain debates, and to not have too much interaction with Trudeau. My sense, of the NDP as a party, is they always work better if they're the 'little engine that could' or the 'underdog'. I think people were taken aback because they did not start out that way.
- Harper: He has historically been an asset for his party - but that can't be said in this election campaign. You get a lot of scar tissue being in a leader that long. He's not a natural born politician. Not many people think that Harper wants their vote that badly.
- Slide 6 - Negative Feelings Toward Leaders:
 - Trudeau: There has been a steady stream of negative advertising. This is a quandary for his opponents. Opponents saw Trudeau as a flawed person and they wanted to expose that. Trudeau's negatives did hit a high point, but his negatives are not growing. In fact, his positives are.
 - Mulcair: He is underperforming against the opportunity of NDP and he's not charming people. That could be worrying for them.
 - Harper: He is competitive - his numbers picked up - and his negatives are not growing.
- Slide 7 - Reaction to Election Outcomes: The majority would not like to see Conservatives win. They would be comfortable with an NDP and a Liberal win. If that is true, what will people do about it? How will they conduct themselves as voters?
- Slide 8 - What type of change are voters looking for?: Three out of four voters do want change according to our numbers. When it comes to change, Canadians are like "give us vanilla and chocolate, but we won't go further in the field than that". Among those who want change, Mr. Trudeau has become the leader to choose. If I were in the NDP war room, this is what I would be most concerned about. This is their base, people who want change. They've lost touch with that sentiment and that voter group.
- Slide 9 - Mulcair or Trudeau - Which leader best represents the two types of change? Ambitious change was 60 - 40, for Trudeau.
- Slide 10 - If the NDP Won: - There were questions as to who would 'make things better', 'make things worse', or 'no difference'. Very few people think that the world would come to an end, and that things would be worse in NDP and Liberal governments.

- For incumbent Conservatives, this is sobering news. They believe that what they have been doing is working.
- Slide 11 - What Would Happen if Liberals Won: On taxes, 35% say taxes would be made better. The sense of a risk to change to Liberals is small. These numbers have been improving since July. NDP numbers have been decreasing.
- *Bruce Anderson encourages everyone to use the Abacus data website - www.abacusdata.ca - to access more details, data and information.*

Moderator Tom Clark

- Bruce Anderson, you can see him on *At Issue* on CBC, he will be involved on that broadcast. You can check it out when Global goes commercial (*laughs*).
- Susan Delacourt is a well-respected political journalist, also the author of *Shopping for Votes*. She speaks to the consumerization of politics. Elections are less about who you are attached to. Because this is shifting dramatically, so has how you get votes.
- Today there was a leaked document from [the Ministry of] Foreign Affairs, on the day of the foreign affairs debate; embedded in that is the frustration about how diplomats feel about the Canadian Government. Susan and I had a conversation earlier today, we asked, how much do foreign affairs matter? The old way of thinking is that they don't - and today, we will take down the argument.

Panelist, Susan Delacourt

- This is 'cool' that so many of you are here for your first election. It is very exciting. My first was in 1988. I think this is one of the most exciting elections I've seen.
- Foreign Policy - is coming together nicely. This is the first time I've seen foreign policy play a continuing and important role. The following is why I think that has happened:
 - The first reason foreign policy may be more interesting in this campaign is for the very reason that Bruce has pointed out: this is a race between three parties. That's new in this country - that three parties are interchangeable. This speaks to the small differences between them, at least domestically; however, there are shades of difference. One of the big ways parties distinguish themselves is foreign policy. There's not a lot of money to do things domestically, so this is where we can see value.
 - The second reason is that Harper, the Prime Minister, is a real fundamentalist on powers in the constitution. He came to Ottawa saying that Ottawa was going to confine itself strictly to the powers of constitution. Therefore, that means no meddling in provincial domains. He has focused on military, security and foreign policy. Over the past 10 years, we get used to that debate in Ottawa.
 - The third reason, is the fact that mass marketing is really 20th Century. People don't do mass marketing any more. Parties are micro-targeting, trying to find small pockets of voters. That's how Conservatives have won elections.

- The other big change is the permanent election campaign. There was a sense that elections stopped when they were over. But we have been in an era of the perma-campaign.
- The Conservatives have spoken to “groups” about concerns. When asked by the Wall Street Journal if he had made Canada more conservative, Harper revealed a strength of the party: he said he was courting cultural communities.
- We all know in the era of the perma-campaign, we get used to looking at foreign policy decisions as having a domestic need. For example, when Harper stands up for Ukraine, he’s standing for Ukrainian-Canadian voters.

- Fourth reason is the fact that the permanent campaign has created, in Canada, a political class. There are political pros who go to other countries and take lessons. That has been going on for 15 years. In the headlines you saw “The arrival of Lynton Crosby,” who helped David Cameron in the spring, and helped in Australia. It is inevitable that if you have international advisors and pros going around the world, they will take the same sort of policies. You saw Cameron introduce a tax law in April, and Harper announce it here last week.
- Liberals and NDP have made regular “pilgrimages” to Washington to learn from the Democrats - particularly in the area of turnout. They are trying to find the 40 percent or the new voters. That’s where Obama succeeded. Every month Liberals and NDPs have been working with strategists. That makes turnout an interesting question: how have they [the US] been raising numbers? [By means of] Facebook, social media? If they [Canadians] drive up turnout in this election, then US tactics have bled North.
- There is a particular Canadian trait that is not new - that is, Canadians really only see themselves through the eyes of others. You’re a success in Canada if you’re a success in the US. It’s like the saying, ‘Enough about me, what do you think about me?’ - you’ll hear that in the debate, what is Canada’s reputation in the world? Harper will be talking about international reputation as well.

Moderator Tom Clark:

- What’s an election without good gossip? You will notice that a number of candidates in all parties have resigned or ‘turfed’ because of stuff they wrote on social media. 18 candidates have been “thrown overboard”. Nominations are now closed, so parties can’t replace candidates. We understand that this is the work of two social media groups: one in Boston and one in Montreal who are doing deep divings and finding people and things they’ve written on social media. It’s said that they’ve held back 11 more that will be released over the next hours and days. Parties can’t put a candidate in their place. So they’re hurt.
- We’re coming to the last 3 weeks of the campaign. In a long campaign, traditionally this is the part when heavy lifting starts. You’ll see the Ad-war. There are huge war chests, the Conservatives have a huge war chest. In a way, what we’ve seen is the laying of the table. What we’re into now is the ‘emotion close’ of the campaign.

- The accounting is done, but now we get to the tone of the campaign.

Question, Moderator Tom Clark: It does look as though there's a breakaway of a Liberal - Conservative fight. How do they [the Liberals] close they deal?

Answer, Panelist Bruce Anderson:

- The Liberals know that they couldn't win unless, at some point, the NDP were ahead. It's constructive to be trailing. And it has so far worked to be useful for the Liberals, to be in the underdog position. The NDP took the frontrunner stance and it hasn't worked. The Liberals are looking at Conservatives. They need people to think that a Conservative victory may happen. This will harden the instinct for change. This is code for negative advertising, and to say they have a platform to stimulate economy.

Answer, Panelist Chris Waddell: *He won't answer this question, but instead offers the following:*

- I hope more things come out about candidates. I would like to know how it might affect them if they stay on the ballot.
- Unlike in many countries, we're three weeks away and we haven't seen policy platforms. We've seen some costing, but they're not very accurate. It is funny considering past campaigns - but you can't see numbers on what each government would do on one PDF.

Answer, Panelist Susan Delacourt:

- I don't believe journalists should make predictions, but I think it was probably good for the Liberals to go through this year of being humbled. They became too used to idea that Trudeau was moving back to 24 Sussex. I don't think that any of them are counting on that.
- The inclusion of a holiday in Canadian election campaigns has been pivotal. In 2005 and 2006, there was Christmas, New Year and Passover, where people talked with family and therefore turfed the Liberals. 2008 had Thanksgiving, 2011 had Easter and Passover. Traditionally, that's when people are deciding. Thanksgiving weekend is going to be a big time of chatter. It wouldn't be surprising if things keep moving.

Moderator Tom Clark: *Opens the floor to questions and comment.*

Question from audience:

- (1) Jason Kenney said that Canada is a centre-left country, ruled by the centre-right. Do you agree with this definition? Could this pattern change?;
- (2) Does the panel disbelieve that after the election there could be a Liberal NDP coalition?; and
- (3) Why is a coalition not part of the political DNA in Canada?

Answer, Panelist Bruce Anderson

- I agree with Kenney, I don't know if it will change. We aspire to be progressive "but we don't run with scissors".

- If Harper doesn't win a majority, I don't think he'll be Prime Minister for long at all. Neither of the other two leaders can go back to their parties to support Harper. Tensions are significant and run deep.
- Why is coalition not part of our DNA? We've always fancied ourselves having winners and losers in a political contest. There are no appetites for coalition. Polls say they'll consider it, but parties like to win.

Answer, Panelist Chris Waddell:

- I think it's all a function of what happens on October 19th, you have to look at the share of the vote that each party has. If parties are concentrated geographically but have little representation, that makes any sort of government formation interesting.
- In 1979 Joe Clark had a minority and he met the House six months after the election date. If Harper is close to getting a majority, the House could be delayed for a long period of time.
- One doesn't have to have a coalition, Harper could try to govern on an issue-by-issue basis. But he's not known for being conciliatory. Liberals and NDP need not form a formal coalition. It could be one party supported by another for a specific length of time or issue-by-issue. But it's all numbers. What politicians say prior to October 19 is subject to revision.

Answer, Panelist Susan Delacourt:

- I agree with both of them. I think that I would watch for what happened in 2008. It was very instructive. The Liberal and NDP tried to form a coalition to oust the Conservatives. Their mistake was involving the Bloc. But that was optics.
- The biggest mistake was passing the Throne Speech. Harper got to stay. They won't let him have another opportunity. When the House comes back, Harper will delay it but he won't get a Throne Speech. I would guess that quiet talks about being made right now. It happened with Broadbent and Chretien. I wrote on the weekend that the campaign managers for the Liberals and NDP, they sat together in 2008, and wrote a coalition for different leaders.

Question from audience:

How much plurality do you need to govern?

Answer, Panelist, Chris Waddell:

- There's no number. 170 seats, if someone is at 160, they're close. If the polling suggests no one, maybe 130 - 135.
- The thing to watch is that if the Liberals and NDP reach or decide to form government, one thing they would want to do is to look for common policies.
- Two platforms were examined and they pointed out that there were things in common to make an argument - 65 percent of people voted for these issues, so we'll go for it. For example, one [of the issues] is changing the electoral system, and [changing] marijuana laws; but there are many differences [between the parties] with no reduction in animosity.

Answer, Panelist Susan Delacourt:

- Watch for Harper to say 'whoever gets the most seats wins'. Harper is trying to use marketing: what he can't get through negotiation, he will make the case that Canadians should have another election rather than coalition. He will use PR tools and wrong information about how governments are formed. He did it in 2008.

Answer, Moderator Tom Clark,

- Coalitions - The last one we had was in WWI and ever since we've steered clear. Secondly we presume in a minority situation that Conservatives will be embroiled in a leadership contest. There is motivation to push the hold button regardless of outcome.

Question from audience - en français:

1. Position of social democrats
2. What is the place of women in campaigns? What is the prediction of their standing? We haven't heard a lot about that.

Answer, Moderator Tom Clark: The three campaign managers are all women. This is a first in Canada.

Answer, Panelist Bruce Anderson:

- The solution of Mulcair is interesting - you touch on the central challenge, he is not left. He is not centrist enough for those voters he's been trying to win. He started the campaign thinking he just had to beat Harper, so he took positions that were most on the centre, more than his party expected. He's been an awkward fit to NDP culture. They were willing to make a bet with him because they saw the prospect of victory. There are interesting issues to look at - situation of risk with little reward - issues around pipelines. He could be for 'some pipelines, sometimes'. He's limited his potential on the centre of the spectrum. In Quebec he's been taken to task on environmentalists. He's against pipelines everywhere but in Quebec. Mulcair has great results in Quebec.
- On the question of women - if women get into politics, the bias is on the part of voters, the voters believe they would be better. It has a lot to do with belief that women can focus on priorities.

Answer, Panelist Susan Delacourt:

- It's an interesting thing that has occurred to me in the last year. Recall the saying "Bill Clinton was the first black president". Well, I'm starting to think Trudeau is the first women Liberal leader. The way he has been criticized is how women have been faced. The issues he has chosen: he made a mark about sexual harassment, kicked pro-life MPs out of caucus. He has been criticized, like Belinda, about getting power from his father. In 2015 we're talking about a man's hair. This kind of criticism, we stopped doing 20 years ago with women. Trudeau has benefited from being seen in the same way that women have been.

Question from audience:

- (1) The question of foreign policy - it's often said, 'Where is Canada now versus where it used to be?' We'll hear this in the debate, but I'd like the panel to share their views, how real is the proposition that the gilded age of Canada's position in the world can come back?
- (2) I'm having a hard time explaining to my headquarters, why are we talking about niqabs?

Answer, Moderator Tom Clark

- Let me jump ahead on the niqab because we've wrestled with the same question. It doesn't drive votes, but if it does they'll use it. In many respects the niqab is code. It's especially prevalent in Quebec where they had their own *Charter of Values*. It was defeated, but it would have banned anyone wearing religious headgear in the public service. It became heated. It comes down to a question of 'code'. Harper and Bloc on one side and the Liberals and NDP on the other side. Bruce Anderson's analysis was interesting. You can attribute the fall of the NDP in that Quebec debate, Mulcair had a lenient view on niqabs. It's code for an unpleasant part of the campaign.

Answer, Panelist Chris Waddell

- I think in the last debate there was a lot of attention on Prime Minister referring to 'old stock Canadians'. I kind of think he couldn't figure out what he was going to say. He said other parties do want to let thousands of people into the country. Neither of the parties have said that. That was a message to those who fear what is going in Europe, that many people, many Muslims, will be brought into Canada and that they won't be integrated into culture properly. *[Interjects with remark about that not being the case.]* Those are the buttons being pushed by the niqab and the debate around that.
- The second issue on foreign policy and where we're going is a question of money - is any government prepared to put up the money? Britain, US, Germany have kept up percentages of overseas development assistance.
- If Harper loses and his government is replaced by Liberal/ NDP, I think people will look back and think that one of his legacies was to change the tax system to prevent succeeding governments from raising revenue that preceding governments used to do. In 1980 we reformed tax. There were three brackets to individuals, there was controversy. But everyone agreed. Reduction of 7 to 5 GST has made the question of debate around taxes very toxic.

Answer, Panelist Bruce Anderson

- I also tend to think that this is a shameful part of political debate. I don't think it's our finest hour. Some advocates for the position of Prime Minister and advocates for the Quebec *Charter of Values* extol the virtues of secularism. It means something to those who chose to use it. Some people have fear of the other. It's a factor in this campaign because in a campaign that is so tight - if you find an issue that appeals to 5 or 7 percent, it is a constructive thing to do.

- On Canada and the return to golden age - I think especially if I step outside question of development aid, I think there is an aspiration that we are active and enthusiastic participants. There's no question that most Canadians can see us in an active role.
- When it came to debate about Syrian refugee crisis - and I don't mean to imply that it is over - we saw real flashes of values debate in this country. Some people said 'my first preoccupation is safety and security. I don't want people coming in only to put that at risk'. Others said 'I'm concerned but my first concern is empathy and helping those in need'. That debate hasn't been resolved. Depending on outcome we could see a different version of Canada.

Answer, Panelist Susan Delacourt:

- To be fair to Quebec, I'm from an upbringing in small town Ontario that was once very Trudeau, but when I've gone back in the last few years, I've been surprised by intolerance. That is new. There is a whole different thing going on in Milton, Ontario than then there was in my day. This election may be won by appealing to those pockets. It's not limited to Quebec.

Question from audience:

The economy hasn't come up much tonight. This is fundamentally the issue to decide the outcome of this election. It is orthodoxy, if the economy is good or bad, it breaks to Conservatives. I'd like your views. Given the up and down news about Canadian economy, how will that play?

Answer, Moderator, Tom Clark

- It depends on what the ballot question turns out to be. If it's more about change than economy, I'm not sure the economy moves that many votes.

Answer, Panelist Bruce Anderson:

- It's more about change. There is a degree of difference of Liberals on the economy, but it is not a huge difference. The economy hasn't been good enough for Conservatives for to claim credit, but not bad enough to toss them out. NDP have looked scarier than they wanted on corporate tax.

Answer, Panelist Chris Waddell

- The question around economy is like the rest of the election, it's not one economy, there are many. For example, in Toronto you wouldn't know about a recession. In South Western Ontario, it's a different story. I think the economy might play an underlying issue. But I'm not sure anyone has put together a coherent approach to change it substantially. Mr. Harper benefited from fact that problems in the global economy weren't problems in Canada.

Moderator Tom Clark: Thank you and I realize the prospect of being pushed off the stage, I know how Harper feels. (*Laughs*)

Closing Remarks: Maureen Boyd.

- Applause for panelists.
- Acknowledgement that Bruce Anderson's information is available to the public on the Abacus Data website.
- For closing remarks, introduction of Andre Plourde, Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs, Carleton University.

Closing Remarks: Andre Plourde, Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs

- I'm originally from small town New Brunswick that is now even smaller town New Brunswick. However my father was a Liberal and during campaigns he refused to talk to Conservative brother. This is wussy stuff. *(Laughs)*
- Dean Plourde provides an anecdote of an Alberta election where change was the talk of the day, but when people went to the voting booth, no one voted for change.
- He asks, is there a narrative that essentially changes the dynamic at the last minute so that change dies and something else takes over? Is there a different outcome?
- With that in mind, on behalf of Faculty of Public Affairs - I would like to thank Tom Clark and the panelists.

6:30 PM: Refreshments were provided at the reception following the debate.