

# Executive Summary of the FDA Electoral Audit Report on the 2011 Canadian Federal Election



THE FOUNDATION FOR  
DEMOCRATIC ADVANCEMENT

Electoral Audit Completed on April 25, 2011

© 2011, Foundation for Democratic Advancement  
All rights reserved.  
Foundation for Democratic Advancement  
728 Northmount Drive NW  
PO Box 94  
Calgary, Alberta  
Canada, T2K 1P0  
info@democracychange.com

### **About the Foundation for Democratic Advancement:**

The Foundation for Democratic Advancement (“FDA”)’s mission is to help encourage the election of the better political representatives for society as a whole, wherever elections occur. The FDA fulfills its mission by performing detailed electoral background audits on political candidates and parties to inform the public, objectively and impartially, about their electoral choices. Also, the FDA audits electoral legislation in terms of fairness and equity, in order to encourage a more equal level playing field for political candidates and parties. The FDA believes that fairer electoral systems coupled with electoral audits of candidates and parties will help create the conditions for the better political representatives to be elected. (For more information on the FDA visit: [www.democracychange.com](http://www.democracychange.com))

### **Purpose of electoral audit:**

Determine a ranking and grades for the selected twelve registered Canadian federal political parties in the 2011 Canadian federal general election, in terms of the better representative of the citizens of Canada as a whole.

This non-partisan and independent determination aims to give the citizens of Canada an informed, objective perspective of the twelve federal political parties.

The FDA does not endorse any policy, party leader or political party through its electoral audit results.

The views in this electoral audit are the views of the Foundation for Democratic Advancement (FDA). Also, the electoral audit is an example of a way to inform the public in their selection of political representatives. Moreover, the audit is a way to hold political candidates and their parties further accountable, and improve the Canadian democratic system by placing emphasis on issues and ideas.

The twelve registered federal political parties in this audit are as follows:

Bloc Québécois  
Canadian Action Party  
Christian Heritage Party  
Communist Party of Canada

Conservative Party of Canada  
Green Party of Canada  
Liberal Party of Canada  
Libertarian Party of Canada  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada  
New Democratic Party  
Progressive Canadian Party  
United Party of Canada

The following registered political parties were not included in this electoral audit, Animal Alliance/Environment Voters, First Peoples National Party of Canada, Radical Marijuana, Pirate Party, Rhinoceros, and Western Block Party because they are either a special interest party or not national in scope.

The FDA decided that though the Bloc Québécois represents a special interest, its popularity in Quebec (38% of the 2008 federal vote in Quebec; 10% of the 2008 federal vote in Canada) and holding 49 seats in the Canadian Parliament (since 2008) impels the FDA to include the Bloc in the electoral audit.

The FDA withdrew the People's Political Party of Canada from the electoral audit because their leader, Mr. Roger Poisson died recently and the party became de-registered. Moreover, party officials said that they are in transition and will not be participating in the current Federal election.

The FDA withdrew as well the First Peoples National Party of Canada from the electoral audit on grounds of insufficient information on the party and its policies. In fact, the FPNP has a very brief policy platform, and therefore, the FDA could not reasonably include the party in the electoral audit. According its leader, Mr. William Morin, the purpose of the party is to protest political inequality against First Nation's peoples.

The FDA's members and volunteers are in no way affiliated with any of the political parties in this audit.

The electoral audit represents an independent assessment by the FDA of the twelve federal political parties based on objectivity, transparency, and non-partisanship. The FDA's assumes no responsibility or liability for any errors in the calculation of its audit results or inaccuracies in its research of the federal political parties. The citizens of Canada will decide themselves on May 2nd which political party forms a new Canadian federal government.

### **Methodology for the audit of the twelve federal political parties:**

#### Section 1:

Backgrounds of the political parties' leaders. Evaluate the leaders' political, professional, educational, and volunteer/extracurricular backgrounds, and length of residency in Canada based on their relevance to leading the Canadian Parliament and Canada as a whole. The FDA defines

leadership skills as the ability to identify issues and act on them, vision, strength to carry through, independent yet team player, and strong communication with peers and public.

The FDA audit team focuses on each background section and applies the applicable FDA grading scale.

The FDA includes a volunteer/extracurricular sub-section because both volunteer work and elected political representation have a component of public service. Also, an individual's volunteer history is an indication of commitment to public service, especially at a younger age. Further, in conducting its audit, the FDA looks at an individual's volunteer work history: duration and length of volunteer work, level within organizations attained, and type of volunteer work.

The FDA includes length of residency to distinguish individuals who have every little experience of Canada from individuals who have significant experience of Canada, while minimize the penalty on individuals who have chosen to see the world. For example, Mr. Ignatieff of the Liberal Party has lived for over thirty years overseas, but overall he has spent over thirty-four years residing in Canada, so the FDA according to its grading scale gave him a 90% score for length of residency. An individual with only 5 years residing in Canada would receive a failing grade.

In the political experience category and in consideration of significant electoral unfairness in Canada, the FDA minimizes any score reductions on individuals who have not been elected, by awarding them for other political experience such as leader of a small party.

In the professional experience category, the FDA awards individuals with relevant experience such as a lawyer, economist, union executive, and corporate executive, while give less points to individuals with less relevant experience such as a medical doctor, geologist, and laymen.

#### Section 2:

Vision of the political parties. Evaluate the parties' visions based both on their relevance to a stable, prosperous Canada and long-term outlook for the Canada.

The FDA examines the relevancy, comprehensiveness, and soundness of the visions

#### Section 3:

Incumbency record of the Conservative Party of Canada during their last term in office from 2008 to present. Evaluate the party's incumbency record based on performance in terms of policies, responses to citizen's changing needs and circumstances, consistency of the party's actions and non-actions with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, soundness of the party's actions and non-actions with the better interests of Canadians as a whole, and the party's overall leadership.

#### Section 4:

Evaluate the key policies of the political parties based on the following criteria:

Economy: sound, fiscal management of public revenue and expenditure, and fair distribution of government expenditure to all sectors of Canada.

Taxes: tax levels which are sound and in the better interests of Canadians as a whole.

Energy: policies which reflect sustainability of energy resources and forwarding thinking in terms of meeting the future energy needs of Canadians.

Environment: sound, comprehensive management of the environment in consideration of regional, national and global environmental issues.

Education: sound policies which give students from kindergarten to post-secondary the best opportunity for success in the future.

Health: sound policies which are consistent with universal health coverage and financially sustainable.

Arts and culture: sound policies which reflect the diversity of Canada and the importance individual artistic and culture expression.

Domestic security: sound policies which improve the domestic security of Canadian citizens.

Foreign affairs: sound policies which are consistent with the Canadian Constitution, Geneva Convention, and Canada's traditional peacekeeping role.

Democracy reform: sound policies which improve electoral fairness and make elected officials more accountable to the public.

Miscellaneous policies: policies which are relevant to Canadians, comprehensive, and financially sound.

### **Weighting and scoring:**

Overall, the FDA scoring is guided by an inherent valuation of the concepts of progression, innovation, soundness, relevancy, and comprehensiveness.

The categories for backgrounds, visions, incumbency record, and each policy section will have a potential score of 0 out of 10. The miscellaneous policy section will receive an overall potential score of 0 out of 10.

Hence, the policy section will have the greatest weight in the audit.

The background section will be divided in five scores of 0 out of 10 for political, professional, educational, volunteer/extracurricular experience, and length of residency in Canada, but the overall score will be averaged equally to a potential overall score of 0 out of 10.

Electoral auditors will meet and deliberate over the research material until consensus is reached on scores. In the case of disagreement, an average of all scores for a particular section will be used.

The FDA electoral audit team will use FDA scoring scales to guide them in their scoring of the political parties. Also, the electoral audit team will use a FDA grade scale to explain the overall scores.

The scores of members of the audit team have equal weight. All scores must be based on stated and documented reasons and soundness. The Chief Electoral auditor and any other auditors' part of the team have the right to question the soundness of the reasons for scores and raise concerns with the rational for scores by other members of the team. The Chief Electoral auditor may remove scores of a member if the rational of the member is unsound.

**FDA Researchers:**

Mr. Stephen Garvey  
Mr. Aurangzeb Qureshi  
Ms. Suzy Thompson  
Mr. Torben Attrup  
Mr. Vincent Lemieux  
Mr. Ryan Leigh  
Mrs. Liza Valentine  
Mrs. Tina Frimpong  
Mrs. Linda Dassin

**FDA Electoral Audit Team:**

Chief Electoral Auditor:  
Mr. Stephen Garvey, Founder and Executive Director of the FDA (BA, MA)

**Electoral Auditors:**

Mr. Torben Attrup  
Mr. Aurangzeb Qureshi  
Ms. Suzy Thompson  
Mr. Vincent Lemieux  
Mrs. Liza Valentine

**Observer:**

Mr. Jon Lord (Mr. Lord was only present at the electoral audit of the New Democratic Party and Conservative Party of Canada.)

**Information sources:**

Media articles and analysis of the federal political parties.  
Parties' policy and background statements, including policy promises and visions.  
The FDA's direct contact with the political parties, in the form of questions and answers and follow-up questions and answers.

## **Table of Contents:**

Background of Political Parties' Leaders	<b>8</b>
Political Background	<b>8</b>
Professional Background	<b>9</b>
Educational Background	<b>10</b>
Volunteer Background	<b>11</b>
Length of Residency	<b>12</b>
Overall Scores for the Background Section	<b>13</b>
Vision of Political Parties	<b>14</b>
Incumbency Record of the Conservative Party of Canada	<b>16</b>
Overall Scores for the Background, Vision, and Incumbency Record Sections	<b>17</b>
Eleven Policy Areas:	<b>18</b>
1. Economy	<b>18</b>
2. Taxes	<b>19</b>
3. Energy	<b>20</b>
4. Environment	<b>22</b>
5. Education	<b>23</b>
6. Health	<b>24</b>
7. Arts and Culture	<b>25</b>
8. Domestic Security	<b>27</b>
9. Foreign Affairs	<b>28</b>
10. Democracy Reform	<b>29</b>
11. Miscellaneous Policies	<b>31</b>
Overall Ranking for the Policy Section	<b>32</b>
Overall Audit Results	<b>33</b>
Analysis	<b>34</b>
Conclusion	<b>37</b>
Recommendations	<b>38</b>
Comparative Analysis	<b>39</b>

## **Background of Political Parties' Leaders**

### **Political Background:**

#### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe 8/10  
Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter 2/10  
Christian Heritage Party, Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 6/10  
Communist Party of Canada, Mr. Miguel Figueroa 7.5/10  
Conservative Party of Canada: Mr. Stephen Harper 8.5/10  
Green Party of Canada, Ms. Elizabeth May 7/10  
Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff 6/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young 3.5/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo 7/10  
New Democratic Party, Mr. Jack Layton 7/10  
Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens 9/10  
United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan 2/10

#### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

The FDA electoral audit team agreed unanimously that minority political parties should not be penalized for their lack of non-election. To do so, would favor the dominant political parties which have a significant unfair advantage. Consequently, a minority party leader with for example 40 years of political experience without election, will be rewarded for that experience.

Bloc Québécois: Mr. Duceppe has 21 years of elected federal political experience, including leader of the National Party, opposition house leader, and opposition whip.

Canadian Action Party: Mr. Porter has less than a year of direct political experience. Also, he has never been elected.

Christian Heritage Party: Mr. Hnatiuk has 9 years of unelected political experience. Though he ran in three federal elections and one by-election. Also, he has been the leader of CHP for three years.

Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Figueroa though has never been elected, and he has 40 years of political experience including 19 years as party leader, and he has ran for election 7 times.

Conservative Party of Canada: Mr. Harper has been involved in politics for 18 years, and he was first elected in 1993. Moreover, he was the former opposition leader, and he has been the PM from 2006 to 2011.

Green Party of Canada: Ms. May has never been elected. Though she has been involved in politics for 31 years. She is leader of the Green Party. Further, Ms. May has been environmental activist for 41 years.

Liberal Party of Canada: Mr. Ignatieff though leader of the Liberal Party of Canada since 2006, and an elected MP, has limited experience in politics. His political experience is limited to about 7 years.

Libertarian Party of Canada: Mr. Young has been the leader of Libertarian Party since 2008, and he ran in the 2008 federal election. He has never been elected. His political experience is limited to approximately 3 years.

New Democratic Party: Mr. Layton has been in politics for 14 years, and he has been leader of the NDP for 14 years. He held an elected seat since 2004, and has worked on various parliamentary committees.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada: Ms. Carlo has been political active for 33 years. Moreover, she has been the leader of the Marxist-Leninist Party for 3 years.

Progressive Canadian Party: Mr. Stevens has over 30 years of political experience, been elected 6 times as a MP, served two times as cabinet minister, and has been the interim leader of the PC Party for 4 years.

United Party of Canada: Mr. Jedan has never been elected nor has he ran in an election. He has only 2 years of political experience.

## **Professional Background:**

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe 8/10  
Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter 3/10  
Christian Heritage Party, Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 7.5/10  
Communist Party of Canada, Mr. Miguel Figueroa 8/10  
Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper 3/10  
Green Party of Canada, Ms. Elizabeth May 9/10  
Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff 9/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young 4.5/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo 8/10  
New Democratic Party, Mr. Jack Layton 9/10  
Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens 8/10  
United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan 1/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois: Mr. Gilles Duceppe has 22 years of union experience as a manager, negotiator, moderator, and organizer.

Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter 21 years experience in non-management and management non-relevant.

Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 25 years experience in the armed forces, and small business experience.

Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Figueroa has 19 years of executive experience at the Communist Party of Canada.

Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper has limited non-management experience both relevant and non-relevant.

Green Party of Canada: Ms. May has experience as university teacher and 17 years experience as an executive director of a charity, policy adviser, and legal counsel. Moreover, she has legal experience via law societies.

Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff has extensive experience in formal education as a professor and director, and significant experience as an author.

Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young has limited professional experience from 12 years in the Canadian military at non-management levels.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo for 19 years experience on democracy reform in Canada.

New Democratic Party: Mr. Layton has been a professor for 30 years and the founder of Green Catalyst Inc. The FDA awarded him for his executive experience and long tenure as a professor.

Progressive Canadian Party: Mr. Sinclair has over 10 years of high level executive banking and investment experience.

United Party of Canada: Mr. Jedan no relevant experience (directly) and no executive or management experience.

## **Educational Background:**

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe 0/10  
Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter 6/10  
Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 5.5/10  
Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Miguel Figueroa 9/10  
Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper 0/10  
Green Party of Canada: Ms. Elizabeth May 10/10  
Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff 2/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young 2.5/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo 7/10  
New Democratic Party: Mr. Layton 0/10  
Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens 2/10  
United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan 0/10

## **Rational:**

Bloc Québécois: Mr. Gilles Duceppe studied political science at university. He did not complete a degree.

Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter studied business administration. He did not complete a degree or diploma.

Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk was educated by the Canadian military in an engineering background. No formal education.

Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Figueroa attained a MA in Arts.

Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper attained a BA and MA in economics.

Green Party of Canada: Ms. Elizabeth May has a law degree, and she is studying theology. Based on the scoring scale, Ms. May is awarded a 7 based on having one relevant degree.

Liberal Party of Canada: Mr. Michael Ignatieff has a Phd in History, and he is a Research Fellow.

Libertarian Party of Canada: Mr. Dennis Young has no known formal education barring a high school diploma.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada: Ms. Anna Di Carlo earned a BA in linguistics. Based on the scoring scale, Ms. Carlo is awarded a 7 based on having one relevant degree.

New Democratic Party: Mr. Jack Layton has 3 degrees: BA, MA, and PhD. Based on the scoring scale, Mr. Layton is awarded a score of 9 for having three relevant degrees.

Progressive Canadian Party: Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens earned a BA and LLB.

United Party of Canada: Mr. Jedan dropped out of high school and no formal education.

## **Volunteer Background:**

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe 0/10

Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter 6/10

Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 5.5/10

Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Miguel Figueroa 9/10

Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper 0/10

Green Party of Canada: Ms. Elizabeth May 10/10

Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff 2/10

Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young 2.5/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo 7/10

New Democratic Party: Mr. Layton 0/10

Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens 2/10

United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan 0/10

## **Rational:**

Bloc Québécois: Mr. Gilles Duceppe has no volunteer experience that the FDA has been able to identify.

Canadian Action Party: Mr. Christopher Porter has 10 years experience within one activity.

Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk been involved in number of churches since 1995. He has taken on the role of deacon in one church.

Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Figueroa has been activist for 40 years, and he has worked on various committees and in various movements.

Conservative Party of Canada: Mr. Stephen Harper has no volunteer experience that has been identified by the FDA.

Green Party of Canada: Ms. Elizabeth May has been volunteering for 41 years and has attained an executive director position.

Liberal Party of Canada: Mr. Michael Ignatieff has limited volunteer experience. The FDA awarded him a score of 2 on grounds of his volunteer writing. The Liberal Party of Canada failed to confirm his volunteer background, and there is no mention of volunteering in his biography on the Liberal Party of Canada website.

Libertarian Party of Canada: Mr. Dennis Young has no volunteer experience that the FDA has been able to identify.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada: Ms. Anna Di Carlo has volunteered extensively for various non-profit causes.

New Democratic Party: Mr. Jack Layton has no volunteer experience that has been identified by the FDA.

Progressive Canadian Party: Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens has been involved in volunteer work for a better democracy in Canada.

United Party of Canada: Mr. Jedan has no volunteer experience that the FDA has been able to identify.

## **Length of Residency in Canada:**

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe 10/10

Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter 6/10

Christian Heritage Party, Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 10/10

Communist Party of Canada, Mr. Miguel Figueroa 10/10

Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper 10/10

Green Party of Canada, Ms. Elizabeth May 9/10

Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff 9/10

Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young 10/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo 10/10

New Democratic Party, Mr. Jack Layton 10/10

Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens 10/10

United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan 10/10

Rational:

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe lived in Canada his entire life.

Canadian Action Party: Mr. Christopher Porter has lived outside of Canada for 10 plus years.

Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk lived in Canada his entire life.

Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Figueroa has lived in Canada all his life.

Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper lived in Canada his entire life.

Green Party of Canada: Ms. Elizabeth May has been living in Canada for 39 years. Arrived in Canada at the age of 18.

Liberal Party of Canada: Mr. Michael Ignatieff has lived 30 years outside of Canada. However, for 34 years, Mr. Ignatieff has lived in Canada.

Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young has lived in Canada his entire life.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo has lived in Canada her entire life.

New Democratic Party, Mr. Jack Layton has lived in Canada his entire life.

Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens has lived in Canada his entire life.

United Party of Canada: Mr. Jedan has lived in Canada his entire life.

## **Overall Ranking for the Background Section:**

The five categories are averaged out equally for a score out of 10.

### **Ranking for Background:**

1. Green Party of Canada: Ms. Elizabeth May (84%)
2. Communist Party of Canada, Mr. Miguel Figueroa (83%)
3. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo (78%)
4. Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens (74%)
5. Christian Heritage Party, Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk (70%)
6. Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff (70%)
7. New Democratic Party, Mr. Jack Layton (70%)
8. Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe 32/50 6.4/10 (64%)
9. Conservative Party of Canada: Mr. Stephen Harper (59%)
10. Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young (52%)
11. Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter (45%)
12. United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan (28%)

## **Visions of the Political Parties:**

Audit criteria: relevancy to a stable, prosperous Canada and long-term outlook for the Canada.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 2/10  
Canadian Action Party 7/10  
Christian Heritage Party 3/10  
Communist Party of Canada 6/10  
Conservative Party of Canada 4/10  
Green Party of Canada 9/10  
Liberal Party of Canada 6/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada 2/10  
New Democratic Party 6/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 6/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 6/10  
United Party of Canada 5.5/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's vision only correlates to Quebec and about 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the Quebec population supports the Bloc. The FDA score of 2 reflects the support for Bloc.

Canadian Action Party's vision is forward thinking and peaceful. Also, the vision focuses on key issues such as challenging the Canadian establishment, reclaiming Canada, and people power. The vision is protectionist, and thereby counter to globalization, and consequently the score did not surpass 7.

Christian Heritage Party's vision is based on the ethical and moral code of Christianity. The vision is not relevant, sound, or comprehensive. The score of 3 is awarded on grounds of the merits of promoting Canadian ethics and morality.

Communist Party of Canada's vision applies to the lower and middle class Canadians and therefore is narrow. The soundness of alienating the wealthy and corporate class is questionable while maintaining the prosperity of the lower and middle classes is questionable.

Conservative Party of Canada's vision is restricted to the short-term. There is no future vision for Canada. Moreover, the short-term vision is limited economic recovery, elimination of debt, low tax etc., which may be perceived as pandering to for example seniors who are more likely to be interested in their economic security.

Green Party of Canada's vision is very comprehensive, progressive, and innovative. Though in our opinion, it does not strongly correlate with all Canadians such segments of the wealthy and conservative classes.

Liberal Party of Canada's vision, in our view, has no innovation or inspiration. Also, the vision is short-term, and it is limited to idea of equal opportunity.

Libertarian Party of Canada's vision is not for forward thinking, and it is unsound. The vision, in our view, projects the marketplace as perfect, but it is clearly not.

New Democratic Party's vision is limited to working class of Canada, and it has questionable soundness in current Canadian times of recession and mounting debt.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's vision is reactionary and lacks innovation. The vision is based on a colonialist world, and thereby out of date. However, the vision is also comprehensive, concrete, and progressive in focusing on a truly multicultural Canada and a fair democratic society. Yet the vision is likely unsound by having communism as the endpoint (depending on how communism is defined and implemented).

Progressive Canadian Party's vision is innovative such as supporting rapid rail transportation, but it is not forward thinking. There is no innovation.

United Party of Canada's vision applies to the lower and middle class Canadians and lacks the comprehensiveness for example of the Communist Party of Canada's vision, and therefore received a lower score than the CPC.

## **Incumbency Record of the Conservative Party of Canada:**

Audit criteria: performance in terms of policies, responses to citizen's changing needs and circumstances, consistency of the party's actions and non-actions with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, soundness of the party's actions and non-actions with the better interests of Canadians as a whole, and the party's overall leadership.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Conservative Party of Canada 3/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Conservative Party of Canada's incumbency record is unsatisfactory. Though the Conservatives were in power when Canada went through the most recent recession, the Bank of Canada and its policies can be accredited with steering Canada through the recession. In terms of international issues, the Conservative Party has fared very badly, losing the seat on the UN Security Council, failing to protest the polar bear when given an opportunity to do so, failing to recognize the state of Palestine, failing to get Canadian troops out of Afghanistan, and Canada is the only western country to not get its citizens out of Guantanamo Bay. Moreover, the Conservatives quickly entered the Libyan conflict in a volunteer role via the UN, while along with other western countries stepping outside the UN mandate by taking sides in the Libyan civil war. Further, the Conservative Party has increased the Canadian debt (over \$100,000 per household) and failed to balance the Canadian budget, and flip-flopped on the income trust tax. Furthermore, the Conservative Party censored Canadian movies (by withholding funding) during their term, and Mr. Harper was held in contempt by the Canadian Parliament (first time for a PM).

## **Ranking of Background, Vision, and Incumbency Record Sections:**

- 1. Green Party of Canada, Ms. Elizabeth May (87%)**
- 2. Communist Party of Canada: Mr. Miguel Figueroa (71.5%)**
- 3. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada, Ms. Anna Di Carlo (69%)**
- 4. Progressive Canadian Party, Mr. Sinclair M. Stevens (67%)**
- 5. Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Michael Ignatieff (65%)**
- 6. New Democratic Party: Mr. Layton (65%)**
- 7. Canadian Action Party, Mr. Christopher Porter (57.5%)**
- 8. Christian Heritage Party: Mr. James (Jim) Hnatiuk 10/20 (50%)**
- 9. Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Stephen Harper (43%)**
- 10. Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gilles Duceppe (42%)**
- 11. United Party of Canada, Mr. Brian Jedan (40%)**
- 12. Libertarian Party of Canada, Mr. Dennis Young (36%)**

## **Policies of the Political Parties:**

### **1. Economy**

Audit criteria: sound, fiscal management of public revenue and expenditure, and fair distribution of government expenditure to all sectors of Canada.

#### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 3/10  
Canadian Action Party 4/10  
Christian Heritage Party 2/10  
Communist Party of Canada 5/10  
Conservative Party of Canada 8/10  
Green Party of Canada 6/10  
Liberal Party of Canada 9/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10  
New Democratic Party 7/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 7/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 6/10  
United Party of Canada 3/10

#### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are comprehensive, but they only focus on the Quebec economy.

Canadian Action Party's policies are vague, relevant, and borderline relevant. The policies are limited due to being restricted to banking issues.

Christian Heritage Party's policies are vague, unsound, and narrow. The Bank of Canada's money comes from the people, so it is unclear how the Bank of Canada infrastructure initiative will not be passed on to the people.

Communist Party of Canada have sound policies for lower and middle class Canadians, while they are unsound to the wealthy and corporate classes, and it is likely that this one sided economic policy will actually harm the lower and middle classes.

Conservative Party of Canada's economic policies are very sound, comprehensive and relevant. Moreover, the policies apply to the broad spectrum of the Canadian energy sector.

Green Party of Canada's policies are progressive and comprehensive. However, there is no mention of Canada's debt problems, and the policies likely lack practicality in terms of being able to afford them.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are very comprehensive and cover most sectors of the Canadian economy. Also, the policies are innovative in how they address Canada's transportation

and infrastructure issues—use of high speed trains and rapid transit. Further, the policies address high youth unemployment and digital modernization etc.

Libertarian Party of Canada’s policies minimize government and let the free market reign.

However, the marketplace is not perfect, and it is unclear how corruption and civil strife can be avoided in such a deconstructed society.

New Democratic Party’s policies are relevant, sound, and comprehensive. Yet they lack innovation.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada’s policies are comprehensive, very detailed, and progressive in aspects. And there are restrictions on foreign investment through strict rules on investors and reinvestment in Canada. Overall, the policies are power to the people. However, they lack relevancy to all people, because they are biased against the wealthy and corporate classes.

Progressive Canadian Party’s policies are vague and general, and devoid of innovation. Also, it is unclear, for example, how a national infrastructure renewal would be affordable.

United Party of Canada’s policies lack broad perspective of Canadian economy, are vague and narrow by focusing, almost exclusively, on lower and middle classes’ interests.

## **2. Taxes**

Audit criteria: tax levels which are sound and in the better interests of Canadians as a whole.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 7/10

Canadian Action Party 4/10

Christian Heritage Party 6/10

Communist Party of Canada 3.5/10

Conservative Party of Canada 7/10

Green Party of Canada 5/10

Liberal Party of Canada 7/10

Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10

New Democratic Party 7/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 3/10

Progressive Canadian Party 4/10

United Party of Canada 2.5/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois’s policies are progressive and broad. They create more accountability of corporations, including a concerted effort to eliminate tax loop holes. Moreover, the policies are national.

Canadian Action Party’s policies are innovative, vague and not entirely relevant.

Christian Heritage Party's policies are innovative and very detailed on Canada's debt. However, a fair tax may discourage consumerism, and thereby harm the economy. Also, there is no mention of tax credits and other tax stimulus packages.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are progressive, but they only focus on lower and middle class Canadians.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies are based on various tax credits and no tax increase. Moreover, there is tax cut for families. Overall, the policies are comprehensive and relevant, and yet it remains to be seen with a decrease in tax, how the Conservatives can balance the budget in 4 years without slashing government programs.

Green Party of Canada's policies are borderline sound, vague and relevant. The policies lack specifics.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are sound, relevant, and comprehensive. However, the policies lack innovation, and they are not as relevant (broad) as they could be.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies take a pay as you go approach. Also, there is no mention of transition to such a tax structure, and it is highly questionable how efficient such a system would be. The policies waver, for example, on whether or not income tax should be eliminated. It is unclear to the FDA how government could function on a pay as you go approach, because revenue would be unreliable. Such a system would always be in debt, because revenue would only be raised in the moment of need.

New Democratic Party's policies lack innovation. The policies focus on business related taxes and tax credits for other areas such as education tax credit.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are innovative by replacing income tax with tax at the output of production. GST would be eliminated, and there would be no tax on the people. The policies are vague and not entirely relevant because they are biased against corporations. Moreover, it is unclear why the working class should be exempt from paying any tax.

Progressive Canadian Party's are vague and only partially relevant. There is no mention of income tax levels, tax credits etc.

United Party of Canada's policies are only focused lower and middle class Canadians, and they are vague and unsound in terms of their benefit to Canada as a whole.

### **3. Energy**

Audit criteria: energy policies which reflect sustainability of energy resources and forwarding thinking in terms of meeting the future energy needs of Canadians.

#### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 7/10

Canadian Action Party 7/10

Christian Heritage Party 4/10

Communist Party of Canada 1/10

Conservative Party of Canada 2/10

Green Party of Canada 7/10

Liberal Party of Canada 4/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada 0/10  
New Democratic Party 7/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 5/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 3/10  
United Party of Canada 4/10

**Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are progressive. They have concrete measures to reduce Canada's dependence on oil.

Canadian Action Party policies cover a range of energy issues in a forward thinking manner, but the policies lack comprehensiveness.

Christian Heritage Party's policies are relevant and sound, but they are vague. There are almost no specifics to the policies. There is no mention of the oil and gas sectors.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are unsound in terms of the benefit of Canada as a whole, irrelevant, and vague. For example, the block development and close the Alberta tar sands would have severe economics consequences for Alberta and Canada, and yet the Communist Party advocates that policy.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies are extremely vague and narrow. The score of 2 is justified on grounds of a few specifics such as the ecoEnergy Retrofit-Homes Program and development of Quebec's offshore resources.

Green Party of Canada's policies are concrete and deal specifically with energy issues such as nuclear development and corporate subsidies. Also, the policies have targets such as reducing overall energy demand.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are general and very vague, and they lack innovation.

Libertarian Party of Canada has no policy on energy that the FDA has been able to identify.

New Democratic Party's policies, in our view, are too general, and they aim too high. The policies need more balance with heavy industry. Also, the policies address sustainable energies and ways to encourage and support them.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are based on public control of energy resources, and restrictions on monopolies of resources. Moreover, the policies would offset social and environmental impacts of pollution by proportionate penalties/charges against the polluters. Also, there would be public national energy policy which would protect workers, promote sustainable resources, and public ownership. It is questionable how sound these policies are from an economic standpoint, and there is no mention of the transition to public ownership.

Progressive Canadian Party's are vague, and they do not address issues in the oil and gas sectors.

United Party of Canada's policies are sound and relevant to Canadians, but they are vague and lack a broad perspective of the Canadian energy sector. By making polluters pay, the UPC suggests that alternatives energies would be more likely to replace energies more harmful to the environment.

## 4. Environment

Audit criteria: sound, comprehensive management of the environment in consideration of regional, national and global environmental issues.

### Scores:

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 5.5/10  
Canadian Action Party 9/10  
Christian Heritage Party 1/10  
Communist Party of Canada 8/10  
Conservative Party of Canada 2/10  
Green Party of Canada 9/10  
Liberal Party of Canada 7/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10  
New Democratic Party 6/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 5/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 2/10  
United Party of Canada 3.5/10

### Rational:

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are progressive and deal with climate change issues. However, the policies are borderline comprehensive.

Canadian Action Party's policies are very comprehensive, innovative, and progressive.

Christian Heritage Party's policies are vague, irrelevant, and controversial by denying the validity of global warming. Also, the policies only address climate change, and the evidence against climate change is not balanced with all the evidence in support of it.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are very sound, relevant, and comprehensive. Moreover, they have elements of innovation in dealing with Canada's environmental issues, such the usage of high speed trains and integration of metro transportation.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies lack progressive vision, and they are contradictory by promoting more intrusion into the environment via snowmobile trails and increasing landowner rights. The score of 2 is justified by the fact that the Conservatives support 2 new national parks.

Green Party of Canada's policies are very specific and comprehensive.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are general, relevant, and innovative and forward thinking on the issue of oil spills. More detail on other issues than oil spills would lead to a higher score.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies are vague, irrelevant, and unsound such as the privatization of National Parks. There is no specifics on how individuals can be protected from pollution, and there is no mention of industrial pollution.

New Democratic Party's policies are borderline comprehensive and only focus on climate change.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies do not deal with climate change issues, and they are vague. Also, the policies identify a number of other key environmental issues and express a commitment to deal with them. The environmental policies are premised on taking the profit motive out of the economy, and thereby it is both innovative and possibly unsound.

Progressive Canadian Party's policies are very vague and says nothing concrete to protect the environment except for support for the Kyoto Protocol.

United Party of Canada's policies are sound and relevant, and yet extremely vague. Moreover, the policies lacks the broadness, for example, of the Communist Party's policies.

## **5. Education**

Audit criteria: sound policies which give students from kindergarten to post-secondary the best opportunity for success in the future.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 2.5/10

Canadian Action Party 7/10

Christian Heritage Party 3/10

Communist Party of Canada 3/10

Conservative Party of Canada 2/10

Green Party of Canada 1/10

Liberal Party of Canada 7.5

Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10

New Democratic Party 5/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 6/10

Progressive Canadian Party 4/10

United Party of Canada 2/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are irrelevant and vague.

Canadian Action Party's policies are relevant and innovative, and address key educational issues.

Christian Heritage Party's policies only focus on post secondary tuition fees.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are sound, extremely vague and not relevant enough to Canadians. The policies are too narrow in terms of educational issues.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies are irrelevant and severely deficient in specifics. The Conservative Party lacks, in our view, a passion for education, and demonstrate no investment in the future of education. Moreover, there is no mention in the policies of issues surrounding the recruitment of teachers, and elementary, junior high school and high school. Further, the

Conservatives do nothing comprehensive to deal with the issue of increasing post-secondary tuition fees.

Green Party of Canada's policies are irrelevant and vague, and fail to address the increasing costs of post-secondary tuition fees.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are relatively comprehensive, innovative, sound, and covers the whole spectrum of education. More comprehensiveness would lead to a higher score.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies promote free market education and no public education.

Unsound, vague, and irrelevant. Basically, in a Libertarian society, people educate themselves.

New Democratic Party's policies are narrow, borderline relevant and sound. It is a spending platform that may not be financially sound, without cuts in other government programs. Also, the policies are vague on how much post secondary fees will be lowered. No policy on teachers' conditions and K to 12.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are borderline comprehensive, and yet they are sound and progressive, and focus on important educational issues such teachers' working conditions, increased funding for education, and free post-secondary education.

Progressive Canadian Party's policies support free tuition fees for post secondary education.

However, the policies do not address teacher needs, rural areas, and k to 12.

United Party of Canada's policies are relevant; yet they are extremely vague and narrow.

## **6. Health**

Audit criteria: sound policies which are consistent with universal health coverage and financially sustainable.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 4.5/10

Canadian Action Party 6/10

Christian Heritage Party 7.5/10

Communist Party of Canada 4/10

Conservative Party of Canada 2/10

Green Party of Canada 2/10

Liberal Party of Canada 8/10

Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10

New Democratic Party 6/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 8/10

Progressive Canadian Party 2/10

United Party of Canada 4/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies establish the independence of provincial health care, and deal with health issues such as wait times. Overall, the policies are vague and borderline relevant. Canadian Action Party's policies are too limited on financial problems of universal health care, and the policies do not address waiting times, and quality and number of doctors and nurses. Christian Heritage Party's policies support a two tiered health care system, better design of hospitals, and the need for more doctors. However, CHP opposes funding abortion, and says abortions and cosmetic surgeries should be low health priorities, which is not entirely sound. Communist Party of Canada's policies have progressive, sound ideas, but they are vague. Conservative Party of Canada's policies lack vision and relevance. The Conservatives have no drug policy to deal with the raising drug costs. However, the Conservatives support more doctors in rural areas and a commitment to deal with increasing wait times. Green Party of Canada's policies have sound ideas, but the policies are very vague and narrow. Liberal Party of Canada's policies are comprehensive and focus on prevention. Moreover, the policies emphasize the health needs of seniors, rural areas, and quality of health service. Also, the policies do not address the emerging universal health care crisis due to raising health costs. Libertarian Party of Canada's policies are for free market health, whereby people deal with their health issues in a state of nature. Score of 1 for innovation and nothing else. New Democratic Party's policies are borderline relevant and comprehensive. Also, no consideration of how universal health care can be financially sustained. The health policy focuses on families and seniors. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are very detailed, progressive, and focus on a broad spectrum of health issues. Moreover, the policies are innovative in confronting the mounting costs of health care through a strict commitment to public health care centered on the people's interest rather than profit. Though the policies lack details on implementation, and it is unclear how it would be funded and sustainable. Progressive Canadian Party's policies support universal health care and keeping doctors in Canada, but they are very vague and narrow. United Party of Canada's policies are sound, progressive, and relevant, but they are vague.

## **7. Arts and Culture**

Audit criteria: sound policies which reflect the diversity of Canada and the importance individual artistic and culture expression.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 3/10

Canadian Action Party 4/10

Christian Heritage Party 8/10

Communist Party of Canada 2/10

Conservative Party of Canada 1/10

Green Party of Canada 2/10

Liberal Party of Canada 7.5/10

Libertarian Party of Canada 2/10  
New Democratic Party 5/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 4/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 4/10  
United Party of Canada 2/10

**Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies support the official national languages and only focus on culture in Quebec.

Canadian Action Party's policies are relevant and vague.

Christian Heritage Party's policies are very detailed and comprehensive.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are unsound (financially) and very vague. Policies are undeveloped.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies are extremely vague and demonstrate a lack of interest and support for arts and culture. Moreover, the Conservatives fail to mention their interest in cutting funding to the CBC. The Conservatives mention support for the RC of Music national examination system and Canadian Periodical Fund, and for this reason, the Conservatives received a score of 1.

Green Party of Canada's policies have sound ideas, but they are very vague and narrow.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are concrete and with no innovation. Moreover, the policies could be more relevant and broad. Nothing is said in the policies about how to identify Canadian culture and promote and protect it, except through digital, CBC, Radio-Canada, Promart and Trades Routes, Canada Council of Arts, and support for the official languages.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies are for a free market arts and culture, including languages. Relevant, unsound, and vague. People would promote whatever culture and language they wanted. There would be no national culture. Art would flourish on its own.

New Democratic Party's policies are very general.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies support public broadcasters and artists, but are vague on funding. Moreover, the policy of having more than two official languages is likely unsound due to implementation and cost issues.

Progressive Canadian Party's policies are innovative, in that the party believes Canadian tax dollars should be spent on national debt, and that artists will find a way to succeed without government support. Also, there is no mention of culture issues such as the national languages and public broadcasting.

United Party of Canada's policies are unsound (financially), somewhat irrelevant, and extremely vague. Policies are undeveloped.

## 8. Domestic Security

Audit criteria: sound policies which improve the domestic security of Canadian citizens.

### Scores:

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 7/10  
Canadian Action Party 6/10  
Christian Heritage Party 3/10  
Communist Party of Canada 4/10  
Conservative Party of Canada 6/10  
Green Party of Canada 2/10  
Liberal Party of Canada 4/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10  
New Democratic Party 5/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 1/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 2.5/10  
United Party of Canada 1.5/10

### Rational:

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are progressive and pro-active, and focus on the real criminals.

Overall, the policies acknowledge the complexity of crime rather than just using power and punishment to deal with crime.

Canadian Action Party's policies focus on the source of crime (rather than just on punishment like the Conservatives). However, the policies do not address prisons, parole and other issues.

Christian Heritage Party's policies do not get at the source of crime. Instead, CHP takes a hard line approach by supporting capital punishment and tougher immigration rules.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are sound, relevant, and vague.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies are a top down approach and power oriented approach to crime. The Conservatives fail to demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of crime, and they fail to get at the sources of crime. The Conservatives proposed terrorism laws threaten the civil liberty of Canadians. Further, the Conservatives surcharge for victims of crime is comprehensive. Overall, the Conservatives domestic security policies likely appeals to seniors as part of campaign strategy.

Green Party of Canada's policies have sound ideas, but they are vague and narrow. The policies do not deal directly with crime.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are vague in terms of dealing with crime, offenders, and prisons. Moreover, there is no policy to address the mentally ill.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies support a free market security, and a strong police force and judiciary. There would be no passports. A state of nature would exist, which in turn would

encourage violence and crime. There is no mention in the policies of prisons and judiciary process.

New Democratic Party's policies do not get at the source of crime. Though the policies addresses the mentally ill.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are very detailed and focus on people power and rights. However, the policies do not directly address crime.

Progressive Canadian Party's policies are very vague and narrow, and yet focus on crime prevention rather than criminal justice system.

United Party of Canada's policies are highly unsound, party relevant, and extremely vague. The idea of no parole and forcing prisoners to work without compensation amounts, in our view, almost to slavery.

## **9. Foreign Affairs**

Audit criteria: sound policies which are consistent with the Canadian Constitution, Geneva Convention, and Canada's traditional peacekeeping role.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 7/10

Canadian Action Party 6/10

Christian Heritage Party 3/10

Communist Party of Canada 4/10

Conservative Party of Canada 6/10

Green Party of Canada 2/10

Liberal Party of Canada 4/10

Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10

New Democratic Party 5/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 1/10

Progressive Canadian Party 2.5/10

United Party of Canada 1.5/10

### **Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are specific and relevant, and deal directly with difficult issues such as Afghanistan. Moreover, the policies promote peaceful conflict resolution rather than aggression.

Canadian Action Party's policies are vague and do not adequately address the needs of the Canadian military, and vague on the role of the Canadian government in international affairs.

Christian Heritage Party's policies only focus on protecting Canada's sovereignty, and thereby failing to address a host of foreign policy issues such as Canada's role in international aid and crises.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are sound in most aspects, relevant, and slightly vague. Also, the policies are progressive and deal directly with issues which dominant parties typically avoid such as recognizing Cuba and state of Palestine and respecting international law.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies are comprehensive and relevant. They are focused building the strength of the Canadian military, which represents a shift to a more aggressive military role for Canada. However, the policies are narrow by not addressing a number of foreign affair issues such as international aid, Middle East conflicts, and proliferation of nuclear arms.

Green Party of Canada's policies are progressive in recognizing state of Palestine, and yet they are weak regarding Afghanistan (by not saying anything new and or anything that has been done already). Also, the policies promote a more aggressive military role for Canada in NATO and NORAD. Overall, the policies are borderline sound, relevant, and comprehensive.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are vague on the issue of a Palestine State and questionable regarding the continuation of Canada's military involvement in Afghanistan. Moreover, there is no policy on Canadian detainees in Guantanamo Bay and Canada's involvement in the aggression against Libya. Further, there is no policy on nuclear proliferation. Overall, it is a feel good policy which lacks specifics and difficult issues.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies are unsound and comprehensive. The policies take a defensive, isolationist approach.

New Democratic Party's policies are a spending platform. The policies are vague, and there is no mention of Libya, Guantanamo Bay, Middle East crises etc. Though there is a clear policy to bring all troops home from Afghanistan. Further, the policies are vague on the proposed new course for the Canadian military, whether in fact it is a new course.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are very progressive. Though, the soundness of them are questionable such as immediate removal from trade agreements and military pacts. Also, the policies are likely not realistic on reform of the UN decision-making process.

Progressive Canadian Party's policies are vague. The policies are not sound on Afghanistan (India and Pakistan are rivals in Afghanistan), and there is no mention of the Middle East, OPEC, Palestine, Guantanamo Bay etc.

United Party of Canada's policies are contradictory and vague. The policies promote the status quo, and yet at the same time try to be progressive.

## **10. Democratic Reform**

Audit criteria: sound policies which improve electoral fairness and make elected officials more accountable to the public.

### **Scores:**

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 2/10

Canadian Action Party 8/10

Christian Heritage Party 1/10  
Communist Party of Canada 7/10  
Conservative Party of Canada 2/10  
Green Party of Canada 4/10  
Liberal Party of Canada 3/10  
Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10  
New Democratic Party 4/10  
Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 8/10  
Progressive Canadian Party 0/10  
United Party of Canada 2.5/10

**Rational:**

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies promote equality, but at the same time are contradictory, because the policies themselves are ideological and partisan by favoring Quebec.

Canadian Action Party's policies are comprehensive and progressive, and focus on key issues in making Canada more democratic.

Christian Heritage Party's policies are very vague. Defend democracy and constitution with no details on either stance, such as the issue of the majority of MP's determining Canada's federal election rules.

Communist Party of Canada's policies are progressive, timely, relevant and comprehensive.

However, the favoring of unions over corporations is an inconsistent policy, thus the overall score was marked down. Moreover, the FDA thinks that the idea of normal working wages for MPs has questionable soundness, because it may deter citizens from running for political office.

Conservative Party of Canada's policies do not deal with gross electoral unfairness issues facing Canada. Although the Conservatives propose progressive reform of the Senate and the elimination of party subsidies. Yet the policy to end party subsidies is likely motivated to weaken the Canadian opposition parties, rather than make Canadian democracy fair, because the Conservatives propose no other measures for electoral fairness.

Green Party of Canada's policies are borderline sound and relevant by not addressing the severe political inequalities in Canada's electoral system. The Green Party fails to realize that proportional representation is not an answer to all of Canada's democracy problems, and proportional representation cannot overcome structural and legislated inequalities.

Liberal Party of Canada's policies are self-serving, in the sense of trying to make democracy better for itself, rather than Canada as a whole. The policies are vague and irrelevant, and they do not address Canada's significant electoral unfairness. Moreover, there is no mention of the need to reform the Canadian senate.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies are for the supremacy of the free market, and thereby they allow for extreme electoral inequalities.

New Democratic Party's policies are sound in supporting the non-profit sector, but the policies fail to address the severe electoral unfairness in Canada. The policies are self-serving to the needs of the NDP, rather than dealing with fundamental electoral unfairness issues.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada's policies are very detailed, very relevant, and innovative. Overall, the Marxist-Leninist's policies support the equality for political candidates and parties, and democracy centered on the people. Their ideas on selection of candidates would be determined through public discussions. However, the power and accountability of the electoral committees is a potentially unsound area.

Progressive Canadian Party has no policy on democratic reform that the FDA has been able to identify. The PCS's policy platform says nothing on democratic reform as well.

United Party of Canada's policies are not fully relevant and extremely vague. Moreover, the policies fail to address a number of democracy related issues such as the equality between candidates and parties, and the political power of mainstream media. Instead the policies partly focus on the process for selecting the governor general, a relatively inconsequential position in government.

## 11. Miscellaneous Policies

Audit criteria: policies which are relevant to Canadians, comprehensive, and financially sound.

### Scores:

The FDA electoral audit team reached consensus on scores.

Bloc Québécois 2/10

Canadian Action Party 7/10

Christian Heritage Party N/A

Communist Party of Canada 6/10

Conservative Party of Canada 6/10

Green Party of Canada 6/10

Liberal Party of Canada 6/10

Libertarian Party of Canada 1/10

New Democratic Party 4/10

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada N/A

Progressive Canadian Party N/A

United Party of Canada 5/10

### Rational:

The scoring is based on FDA scoring scales and discussion of relevant facts and reasons by the electoral audit team.

Bloc Québécois's policies are very direct, comprehensive, and sound, but they only focus on Quebec, and therefore they are irrelevant to most Canadians.

Canadian Action Party's policies are progressive and relevant, such as supporting electric car production.

Christian Heritage Party has no miscellaneous policies that the FDA has been able to identify, and therefore it was not included in this section.

Communist Party of Canada's policies relevant and comprehensive, but they are not entirely sound. For example, a bill of rights for unions may be counter productive to the well-being of the Canada as a whole, and Quebec self-determination would be counter to the union of Canada, and expansion of social benefits would likely sink Canada into further debt.

Conservative Party of Canada has very sound, progressive policies on first nations transparency and fair representation in the House of Commons, and yet at the same time, they have bizarre, partisan policies on the holocaust and communist memorials. Why not a memorial for the 1 million Iraqis killed by the US occupation of Iraq? Why focus on the Russian communists?

Green Party of Canada's policies are borderline relevant, narrow, and sound.

Liberal Party of Canada's additional policies are overall vague and relevant. The immigration policy addresses important issues facing immigrants to Canada. Overall, the Liberal's additional policies, in our view, appear to be pandering to different voting groups, rather than proposing policies with conviction.

Libertarian Party of Canada's policies are a strict free market approach, without realizing that the marketplace is not perfect. Also, the policies support a state of nature based on survival of the most powerful, which is unsound in terms of society and community. Moreover, the policies lack comprehensiveness, for example, of crime and its complexity.

New Democratic Party's policies are a spending platform, and they are not practical, in our view, in Canada's recession like conditions.

Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada had no miscellaneous policies that the FDA identified, and therefore it was not included in this section.

Progressive Canadian Party had no miscellaneous policies that the FDA identified, and therefore it was not included in this section.

United Party of Canada's policies are borderline sound, relevant, and comprehensive. The policies focus on Northern Ontario excludes other northern areas, and the guaranteed minimal income level and mortgage interest deductability may do more economic harm than good.

Advanced transportation systems for Canada is a relevant idea, but it raises many questions such as how to pay for it.

### Ranking of Policy Scores:

1. Canadian Action Party 68/110 (61.8%)
2. Liberal Party of Canada 67/110 (60.9%)
3. New Democratic Party 61/110 (55.5%)
4. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada 48/100 (48%)
5. Bloc Québécois 50.5/110 (45.9%)
6. Communist Party of Canada 47.5/110 (43.2%)
7. Green Party of Canada 46/110 (41.8%)
8. Conservative Party of Canada 44/110 (40%)
9. Christian Heritage Party 38.5/100 (38.5%)
10. Progressive Canadian Party 30/100 (30%)
11. United Party of Canada 31.5/110 (28.6%)
12. Libertarian Party of Canada 11/110 (10%)

## **Overall Audit Results:**

Overall audit results combine policy scores with scores for background, vision, and incumbency record.

1. Liberal Party of Canada (61.54%)
2. Canadian Action Party (61.2%)
3. New Democratic Party (56.9%)
4. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada (51.5%)
5. Green Party of Canada (48.8%)
6. Communist Party of Canada (47.54%)
7. Bloc Québécois (45.3%)
8. Conservative Party of Canada (43.8%)
9. Christian Heritage Party (40.42%)
10. Progressive Canadian Party (36.7%)
11. United Party of Canada (30.4%)
12. Libertarian Party of Canada 18.2/130 (14%)

## Analysis:

The FDA electoral audit takes a broad view of the twelve Canadian registered political parties. Aside from the background of leaders' section, all other sections including each policy section carry equal weight. The background carries the same weight as the other sections, but the background section itself is divided into five sub-sections, and each sub-section carries 1/5<sup>th</sup> the weight of the other sections in the audit.

Only four parties out of the twelve political parties audited received a passing grade. The grades of the four parties are mediocre and unacceptable.

1. Liberal Party of Canada (61.54%) (C)
2. Canadian Action Party (61.2%) (C)
3. New Democratic Party (56.9%) (D+)
4. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada (51.5%) (D)

According to the FDA electoral grading scale,

C grade means unacceptable candidate and/or party (several deficiencies and/or major deficiencies in some of the following sections: policies, vision, incumbency record (if applicable), and background of leaders)

D+ grade means unacceptable candidate and/or party (a lot of deficiencies and/or major deficiencies in some of the following sections: policies, vision, incumbency record (if applicable), and background of leaders) (Grade greater than 54.99% and less than 60%)

D grades means unacceptable candidate and/or party (many deficiencies and/or major deficiencies in some of the following: policies, vision, incumbency record (if applicable), and background of leaders) (Grade greater than 49.99% and less than 55%)

The rest of the political parties received failing grades.

5. Green Party of Canada (48.8%)
6. Communist Party of Canada (47.54%)
7. Bloc Québécois (45.3%)
8. Conservative Party of Canada (43.8%)
9. Christian Heritage Party (40.42%)
10. Progressive Canadian Party (36.7%)
11. United Party of Canada (30.4%)
12. Libertarian Party of Canada 18.2/130 (14%)

According to the FDA grading scale,

F grades means unacceptable candidate and/or party (numerous major deficiencies in most if not all of the following sections: policies, vision, incumbency record (if applicable), and background of leaders) (Grade less than 50%)

For example, the Conservative Party has major deficiencies in the energy, environment, health, education, arts and culture, democracy reform, and incumbency record sections.

The lower the failing grade, the more severe are the deficiencies in the audited sections.

The Liberal Party of Canada is strong in the economy, taxes, environment, education, and arts and culture policy sections, but is weak in the energy, domestic security, foreign policy, and democracy reform policy sections. Moreover, the Liberal Party received an unacceptable score of 65% for vision and background of leader.

The Canadian Action Party, a small political party, finished second overall, and just .34% behind the Liberal Party. The Canadian Action Party is strong in the energy, environment, health, democracy reform, and miscellaneous policy sections, but is weak in the economy, taxes, and arts and culture policy sections. Moreover, the Canadian Action Party has passing scores for domestic security, foreign affairs, and education.

The Liberal Party received the highest score for economy and taxes at 80%, followed by the Conservative Party at 75%.

The Canadian Action Party and the Green Party received the highest scores for environment at 90%, and in contrast to the Conservative Party which received one of the lowest scores at 20%.

The Liberal Party and the Marxist-Leninist Party received the highest scores for education at 80%.

The Christian Heritage Party received the highest score for arts and cultures at 80%.

The Marxist-Leninist Party and the Canadian Action Party received the highest scores for democracy reform at 80%, and in contrast, for example, to the Liberal Party which received one of the lowest scores at 30%.

The Green Party and their leader Ms. Elizabeth May received the highest scores for vision and background of leader at 87% and 84%.

In the background and vision sections, only two parties received acceptable overall grades: the Green Party at 87% and the Communist Party at 71.5%. The Marxist-Leninist Party is very close to the standard of acceptability with a score of 69% for both sections.

According to the FDA grading scale,

A+ Exceptional candidate and/or party (overall flawless and original vision and exceptional background) (Grade greater than 84.99% and less than 100.1%)

B grade means acceptable candidate and/or party (meets overall satisfactory standard for vision and background) (Grade greater than 69.99% and less than 75%)

As established in a recent FDA Report on Electoral Fairness in Canada, the Canadian electoral system is significantly more unfair than fair, with Canada receiving a failing overall score of 25.75%. The FDA shows in this report that the dominant Canadian political parties (Conservative Party, Liberal Party, NDP, and partly the Green Party) have significant unfair electoral advantages over the fifteen other registered political parties.

The Conservative, Liberal, New Democratic, and Green parties are, in the opinion of the FDA, particularly self-serving in the democracy reform policy section. Instead of addressing the significant electoral unfairness in Canada, these parties address electoral issues that strengthen their party (e.g. the NDP and Green Parties' support of proportional representation, and the Liberal Party and NDP's limit on the PM's ability to prorogue), weaken other parties (e.g. the Conservative Party's elimination of party subsidies), and/or have a neutral effect on their parties' electability (e.g. the Conservative Party's senate reform policy).

## **Conclusion:**

With no registered political party receiving an acceptable passing grade, which means all registered parties have at minimum several deficiencies and/or major deficiencies in their vision, leader's background, and/or policies, the FDA concludes that none of the twelve registered political parties are worthy of a majority government. Consequently, the FDA concludes that the 2011 Canadian federal election should result in a minority government or a coalition government.

The FDA believes that leadership is a serious issue in Canada, with most parties thinking and acting from a self-serving party standpoint, rather than thinking and acting from what is in the better interests of Canada as a whole. Until a party emerges which takes this broad, collective approach to Canada, the FDA believes that the Canadian political parties will continue to be unacceptable.

However, the small Canadian political parties are at a distinct disadvantage to the dominant political parties, due to the significant electoral unfairness in the Canadian system. This disadvantage allows the smaller parties to be more progressive, and yet at the same time, deprives the parties of reasonable hope in forming a government. Consequently, the policies of the smaller parties in a more fair electoral system would likely be more relevant and comprehensive. Therefore, these parties would receive higher electoral audit scores than they did in this electoral audit.

Unfortunately, most Canadians are being deprived of the array of political ideas presented by the nineteen registered political parties, because mostly the ideas of four parties are presented in the mainstream Canadian media. For example, in the first national televised leaders debate (on April 12), only the leaders of four political parties were allowed to participate. This stranglehold on political party access is undermining Canadian democracy, and likely helping to cause the mediocre results for the political parties.

Canada like the rest of the world is facing severe economic, political, environmental, and social challenges. The status quo is no longer a viable direction. Canadians need to adapt to the changing global and national circumstances or face the consequences.

## **Recommendations:**

1. The Liberal Party of Canada should form a minority government, or a coalition government should be formed. A coalition government would allow a greater diversity ideas to be part of government while at the same time through a majority status, be strong enough to get necessary legislation passed.

2. The Canadian Action Party, based on its progressive and innovative policies, should be the leader of the opposition in the Canadian Parliament or at minimum be part of the parliamentary opposition and/or a coalition government if one is formed.

3. The Canadian electoral system needs significant reform so that no registered political party has an unfair advantage over other parties in terms of finance and access to the media and broadcasters. (See the 2011 FDA Electoral Fairness Report on Canada for more details: [http://democracychange.com/ FDA electoral fairness report for Canada.pdf](http://democracychange.com/FDA%20electoral%20fairness%20report%20for%20Canada.pdf) )

4. Until the Canadian electoral system has been made significantly more fair, political parties should not be judged based on their success in previous elections or number of previously elected candidates. To judge based on this criterion like Elections Canada and the mainstream media and broadcasters presently do, favors the dominant parties and supports the cycle of significant electoral unfairness. The FDA recommends that political parties are judged based on what they offer Canadians as a whole: candidates' backgrounds, characteristics, and competencies, and parties' vision for Canada, incumbency record, and key policies.

## **Comparative Analysis of the FDA Electoral Audit Results and Electoral Results:**

### **2011 FDA Canadian Federal Election Audit Results:**

1. Liberal Party of Canada (61.54%) (C)
2. Canadian Action Party (61.2%) (C)
3. New Democratic Party (56.9%) (D+)
4. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada (51.5%) (D)
5. Green Party of Canada (48.8%) (F)
6. Communist Party of Canada (47.54%) (F)
7. Bloc Quebecois (45.3%) (F)
8. Conservative Party of Canada (43.8%) (F)
9. Christian Heritage Party (40.42%) (F)
10. Progressive Canadian Party (36.7%) (F)
11. United Party of Canada (30.4%) (F)
12. Libertarian Party of Canada 18.2/130 (14%) (F)

### **2011 Canadian Federal Election Results:**

1. Conservative Party of Canada (167 seats won)
2. New Democratic Party of Canada (102 seats won)
3. Liberal Party of Canada (34 seats won)
4. Bloc Quebecois (4 seats won)
5. Green Party (1 seat won)
6. Independent (no seats won)
7. CHP Canada (no seats won)
8. Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada (no seats won)
9. No Affiliation (no seats won)
10. Libertarian Party of Canada (no seats won)
11. PC Party (no seats won)
12. Rhinoceros (no seats won)
13. Communist Party of Canada (no seats won)
14. Canadian Action Party (no seats won)
15. Radical Marijuana (no seats won)
16. Western Bloc Party (no seats won)
17. United Party (no seats won)
18. FPNP (no seats won)

Source: Elections Canada

## **Analysis:**

The Conservative Party of Canada received a failing grade by the FDA of 43.8%, and yet with only 24.3% support of the Canadian public received a majority government.

The Conservative Party policy platform focused on the short-term with strong economy and taxation policies, but very weak environment, health, education, democracy reform, and arts and culture policies, and weak vision for Canada. Moreover, Harper has an average background (59% FDA score) for the role of leading the Canadian federal government.

The three top parties in the election results, Conservative Party, NDP, and Liberal Party, had a significant advantage over the other parties in terms of media access, campaign funds, and media coverage.

Considering the unequal media and broadcast coverage of the election, the similarity of the Liberal and Conservative policy approaches, and the NDP's strong case for being the parliamentary opposition over the Liberal Party, the election results are not surprising. The Conservative Party canceled out the Liberal Party, and the NDP took on the role of opposition.

## **Conclusion:**

As established in the FDA electoral fairness report for Canada, the Canadian federal electoral system is very unhealthy, stemming from severe favoritism of parties successful in previous elections and significantly unequal political content by the Canadian mainstream media and broadcasters.

As mentioned, only 24.3% of Canadians overall supported the Conservative Party, and yet the party received a majority government. This situation is problematic, because 75.7% of Canadians do not support the Conservative Party. Further, the Canadian electoral system is significantly unfair, which likely means even more Canadians do not support the Conservative Party (in a more fair system).

Ironically, despite the seriousness of the democracy issue in Canada, the Conservative Party has one of the weakest policies for democracy reform, receiving a FDA policy score of 20%. So it is highly unlikely the Conservative Party will do anything to address electoral unfairness (barring the end of party subsidies).

Canadians will have to live with the Conservative Party and its short-term, status quo outlook, and possible repercussions be they environmental, social, and/or economical.