SPANNING THE SPECTRUM: POLITICAL PARTY ATTITUDES IN MANITOBA

Jared J. Wesley
PhD Candidate
University of Calgary
Department of Political Science

jjwesley@ucalgary.ca
www.ucalgary.ca/~jjwesley

Presented at:
The Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario
June 2005

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the contours of the Manitoba political party system. By surveying Progressive Conservative, New Democratic and Liberal candidates in the 2003 Provincial Election, the study uncovers a distinct left-right pattern in their attitudes, with each party maintaining its own unique 'alloy' of attitudinal elements. New Democratic candidates hold social democratic, reform liberal, 'New Left', and neo-liberal attitudes, for instance. Meanwhile the Tories are divided between their 'progressive' and 'conservative' wings, and the Liberals between their reform- and neo-liberal factions. These internal cleavages help bridge the gaps along the party spectrum, as certain left-wing and right-wing values permeate the attitudes of each party. Specifically, the survey reveals widespread leftist support for social welfare, civil liberties and the environment, as well as cross-party adherence to neo-liberal concepts like affordable government. Nonetheless, despite intra-party divisions and inter-party convergence, the study concludes that there is considerable attitudinal distance between the various parties in Manitoba. This establishes the existence of a conventional political spectrum in the province – with the NDP on the left, the PC's on the right and the Liberals in the centre – and confirms that the Manitoba party system provides its voters with the coherent choices and clear options they require to meaningfully participate in provincial elections.

SPANNING THE SPECTRUM: POLITICAL PARTY ATTITUDES IN MANITOBA*

Many Canadians expect political parties to offer them coherent choices and clear options. Whether at the ballot box or in the legislature, citizens often insist that parties display internal consistency and clarity in their principles, while, at the same time, remaining distinct in their visions for society (Schumpeter 1942). In short, many voters demand that parties be discernable – even adversarial – in their attitudes toward public policy, offering clear-cut alternatives from which to draw political leadership (Clarke et al. 1996, 11-22).

In reality, few party systems meet these expectations. For one, divisions can appear *within* parties, creating friction and factionalization of the party's message. As the attitudes of party followers clash, entire party 'wings' are pitted against one another, fostering tension and uncertainty over the party's ultimate direction (Dyck 1996). Conversely, cohesion can develop *across* party lines, blurring the boundaries between the organizations. In this way, party policies and stances may converge with those of their competitors, creating a 'Tweedledum' and 'Tweedledee' style of politics (Brodie and Jenson, 1996). Given this dual tendency – to develop both intra-party divisions and inter-party similarities – parties often struggle to provide the coherent choices and clear options that their constituents demand.

As a result, some citizens perceive a lack of meaningful choice during elections, a development that may lead to confusion, disillusion, and, ultimately, a decline in political engagement. Analysts like Clarke et al. (1996, 21-22, 180) have used this argument to explain the decline of voter turnout in Western democracies like Canada. Indeed, when Elections Manitoba commissioned a study to explore the source the dramatic, 14-point drop in voter turnout in the last provincial election,[1] one of the diagnoses included a lack of difference between the province's three major parties. According to the survey of 400 non-voters, 13 percent blamed their failure to cast a ballot on the fact that they did not trust the candidates or did not like the choices presented; an additional 12 percent of non-voters claimed they did not care about the outcome, while 8 percent argued it did not matter who won the election, anyway (Prairie Research Associates [PRA] 2004, ii).

Ultimately, these forces present a challenge to the conventional conception of party politics in Canada. In the face of recent developments and voter perceptions, analysts must revisit the question, "Where *do* the various parties fall on the political spectrum?" Is it accurate to depict a 'New Democratic left', 'Liberal centre', and

---

*This paper is an abbreviated version of a Master of Arts thesis, which was successfully defended at the University of Manitoba, August 11, 2004. The author thanks his advisor, Dr. David Stewart, and Dr. Brenda O'Neill for their input and suggestions. While their guidance was essential and very much appreciated, the author accepts full responsibility for the content and substance of this work.

A public version of the study is available from the Manitoba Candidates' Study website: http://www.ucalgary.ca/~jjwesley/mcs2003.htm. A full academic version of the study, including specific details regarding the survey methodology, is available through the University of Manitoba or directly from the author. Support was provided by a SSHRC Master's (CGS) Scholarship, the Duff Roblin Fellowship in Canadian Government, the University of Manitoba Department of Political Studies, and the Faculty of Arts Endowment Fund.

'Conservative right' in twenty-first century Canada? And where does each party stand on the various issues? Finding the answers is no easy task, considering the fluidity and diversity of political attitudes in this country (Nevitte et al. 1989).

Nonetheless, the following paper offers a partial response. As a case study in Canadian politics, it analyzes the contours of the Manitoba party system in the wake of the 2003 Provincial Election. Surveying New Democratic, Liberal and Conservative candidates from that campaign, this represents the first examination of its kind in Manitoba, and one of a very few glimpses into post-deficit provincial party attitudes. The study asks, "What are the attitudinal dynamics among Manitoba party politicians?" Put another way, "What attitudes unite, and which attitudes divide, party politicians in the province?" General conceptions of party positions in Canada are tested, as are sentiments that each party's followers are bound by distinct cores of attitudes; and that, by virtue of these divisions, parties can (and do) offer voters the opportunity to make meaningful decisions during elections.

The findings are numerous and complex, as five chapters of a completed Master's thesis attest. As such, the following paper can provide only an abbreviated glimpse into the world of Manitoba party politics. It begins with a brief description of the methodology employed in the study, before discussing separately the internal dynamics within the Conservative, New Democratic, and Liberal Parties. A fourth section analyzes the overall structure of the Manitoba party system, noting the inter- and intra-party cleavages that characterize it. A conclusion confirms that the Manitoba party system *is* structured on the conventional left/right axis. Divided as they are among their various internal 'wings', the research reveals that each provincial party maintains its own distinct "alloy" of political attitudes, with the New Democrats on the left, the Liberals in the centre, and the Conservatives on the right.

Whether or not these divisions were visible to the electorate is the topic for another debate, yet the low 54 per cent turnout rate in the 2003 Provincial Election cannot be blamed wholly on voters' lack of choice. In this sense, a lack of "desirable" party alternatives does not necessarily entail a lack of "discernable" alternatives; discontent, apathy, inattentiveness, and an overall dearth of political knowledge within the electorate need not be linked to similarities between parties, themselves. In their own minds and through their own attitudes and platforms, the candidates in Manitoba's 2003 Provincial Election did offer the electorate a clear set of alternatives upon which to base its decision.

METHODOLOGY

Archer and Whitehorn (2001, 117) are correct: "There are many ways of measuring the degree to which parties are successful in being both internally coherent and externally distinguishable from one another." Their analysis, like those of many others over the past two decades, focused on the attitudes of party *activists* (i.e., convention delegates or voting party members) as an indication of the structure of party systems. The present study takes a slightly different approach, using office-seekers in the 2003 Manitoba Provincial Election as its primary unit of analysis. As written in the cover letter to all candidates, their "thoughts and opinions are central to our understanding of Manitoba politics," and their "personal influence, interpretation and promotion of [their] party's platform have a large impact on other Manitobans." Yet, more than their role as crucial *players* in the political arena, these politicians are among a select few *experts* in Manitoba parties. They are not only *in* the action, but closest to it, and, in the absence of any recent, substantial academic research into Manitoba politics, their beliefs, opinions and sentiments may be the most vital source of information about the province' party system.

For these reasons, a self-administered questionnaire[2] was mailed to each of the politicians representing the New Democratic, Liberal and Progressive Conservative parties; with candidates in all fifty-seven Manitoba constituencies, and a presence in existing research, the three major parties were deemed best-suited for the research design.[3] Following three mail-backs, the overall return rate was 47.4 percent, with 57.9 percent of Progressive Conservatives, 47.4 percent of New Democrats, and 36.8 percent of Liberals responding. Responses were received from two of the three party leaders, the Conservatives' Stuart Murray and Liberals' Jon Gerrard; seven of the New Democrats' seventeen cabinet ministers; and just under half (49.1 percent) of all non-elected candidates. Moreover, in terms of gender, twenty-two of the province's fifty-five female candidates participated in the study. As a sample of all candidates, the author is confident that respondents to this survey were relatively representative of all major party politicians in Manitoba.

The survey combined a series of previously-established indexes and questions, with supplementary sections of original design. Described in greater detail in Appendix A, the questionnaire analyzed the following attitudinal dimensions as independent variables: populism; individualism; social welfare; moralism; civil liberties; government spending priorities; economic regulation; Manitoba's place in the Canadian federation; the province's role in the continental community; and the environment. In addition to the candidates' survey, an in depth analysis of each party platform was also conducted as part of the broader study. Further methodological information is available from the author (Wesley 2004, 15-27).

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES & THE DIVIDED RIGHT IN MANITOBA

As Rand Dyck notes, Canadian parties on the right often struggle to embody the divergent political principles and values of their followers:

> Being composed of a higher proportion of business liberals, the Conservatives are generally to the right of the Liberals on both the individualism and inequality scales. However, a minority stream within that party, the "progressive" wing, is slightly left of centre on the scales of equality and collectivism. This tension within the Conservative Party also forces it toward the centre… Interesting provincial variations in the extent of individual diversity are therefore to be expected (Dyck 1996, 9).

Indeed, as the two main modes of right-wing thought in Manitoba, progressivism and conservatism provide provincial PC's with very different sets of opinions, incompatible moral standards, and competing policy stances. On the former side, 'progressives' – also referred to in this paper as "red tories" – tend to stray somewhat from classic liberal philosophy.[4] They view society as a collection of *inter-connected* citizens – in other words, as a community – placing the social order ahead of the individual. In turn, red tories tend to value social interests ahead of economic concerns, advocating state intervention to improve the life conditions of the disadvantaged. Their progressiveness often extends to protection of civil liberties and the environment, as well. In these ways, red tories may be considered closer to the centre of the political spectrum than their fellow partisans in the small-c 'conservative' wing (Patten 2001).

Conversely, followers of the so-called 'New Right' philosophy include both neo-liberals and neo-conservatives. Members of the former faction value the individual as the primary unit of society, place economics ahead of politics in many areas, and, as fiscal conservatives, seek to maintain a limited role for the state in society and the marketplace. This translates into a relatively ambivalent attitude toward environmental conservation, particularly in the face of opportunities for economic growth. What is more, neo-liberals are also noted for their populist tendencies, favoring government 'by the people' versus 'by experts' (Sigurdson 1994). Moreover, whereas progressives reserve a role for the government in providing a substantial welfare system, a second element of the New Right views the state's responsibility in different terms. Beyond a very basic social safety net, "neo-conservatives" argue the government's crucial role in society lies in preserving moral standards and social norms. This commitment to moral conservatism separates neo-conservatives from the more left-leaning 'progressive' wing of the party, particularly over issues like civil rights, crime, and family values. While different in their focus, together 'neo-liberals' and 'neo-conservatives' make up the so-called 'New Right' in Canadian politics. Their fiscal and moral conservatism separate them from the more centrist, 'progressive' wing of most Canadian PC parties.

On occasion, rifts do develop along these lines. Steve Patten's discussion of the final years of the federal Progressive Conservative Party, for instance, demonstrates how these wings can battle for control over a party's direction (Patten 2001). Similarly, the attitudinal divisions between the former Alliance and federal PC'S were a major bone of contention during the 'Unite the Right' movement. Leading up to the 2004 federal election, public exchanges between former PC Prime Minister Joe Clark – himself a red tory – and new Conservative Party leader Stephen Harper – a perceived spokesperson for neo-liberalism – also lay bare the potential for division within the Canadian right.

The acknowledgement of this progressive / conservative divide should not be construed as a criticism by any means. Language in this paper avoids use of normative terms like 'rift' or 'fracture' to describe the division between the party's tory and neo-liberal wings. This was done to convey the ambiguous nature of the cleavage, itself. Some PC's may find strength in the diversity of opinions within their party, for instance, while others may find weakness in this division. I find merit in both assessments.

In Manitoba, however, the progressive / conservative divide appears less malignant than in the federal context. Instead, the relationship between the two right wing philosophies is more accurately described in terms of a continuum. One may describe a series of policies, attitudes or candidates as being 'more progressive' or 'less conservative', for instance. Such distinctions extend across several issue dimensions, helping us to better describe the attitudinal profile of the province's Conservative party.

Nonetheless, like other right-wing parties, the ability of the Manitoba Conservatives' to embody the values of their members is largely determined by their capacity to bridge, or erase, a unique gap within their ranks. As the following section illustrates, the provincial PC's have been relatively successful at implementing the latter strategy, through close control over the party programme. Crafted concisely prior to the 2003 provincial election, the Conservatives' campaign themes were unmistakably right-wing, representing the party's neo-liberal vision for the province. In fact, in promoting the primacy of the individual, the importance of limited government, and – to a lesser extent – the value of social order, the PC programme was arguably free of any substantive reference to progressivism, whatsoever (Wesley 2004, 76-82).

Party followers, themselves, were far less equivocal in their support of this "New Right" philosophy, however. A survey of PC candidates revealed, not the unification of Conservatives under a single ideology, but rather the division of the party into two distinct wings: one consisting of progressive tories, the other, fiscal and moral conservatives. While the attitudes of the latter group tend to dominate the public image of the provincial Conservatives, the continued survival of the party's 'red tory' element signals an interesting, often-hidden attitudinal dynamic within the Manitoba party system.

An attitudinal profile of the "average" PC candidate masks the progressive / conservative divide within the party, however. Indeed, at least according to PC respondents' mean index and spectral scores, the party's campaign slate appears as right-wing as their programme suggests. (See Appendices A and C.) For instance, their platform's promotion of "an economic system based as fully as possible on individual enterprise, private ownership and competition" was strongly reflected in the attitudes of the typical PC candidate (PC Manitoba 2004). Conservatives scored an average of 1.85 on the 3.0-point individualism index, and placed themselves strongly on the right side (5.12 out of 7.00) of the 'public services versus tax cuts' debate. Indeed, education and highways were the only spending areas in which a majority of PC candidates recommended increased funding. Furthermore, the party scored 2.30 on the 6.0-point privatization index, with a majority of its respondents supporting full public ownership of only one major crown corporation, Manitoba Hydro.

Reminiscent of the party's pro-free trade position in the early 1990s, the average Conservative candidate also scored a 1.76 on the 3.0 continentalism index. To this end, the Conservatives' moderate stance on environmental protection may offer proof of their party's free market ideology; when asked whether or not to "support protection of the environment, even at the cost of economic growth," the average PC candidate placed him- or herself at 3.77 on the corresponding 7.0-point spectrum.

Likewise, the typical Conservative was decidedly populist and in favour of decentralized federalism, suggesting an affinity toward the neo-liberal principles of grassroots governance. He or she also showed strong signs of moral conservatism, with a mean score of 1.85 on the index, and, at 4.24 on the spectrum, "favoured less progressive policies on matters like homosexuality, abortion and multiculturalism." These neo-conservative impulses were further reflected in the Conservatives' reluctance to support civil liberties; the party earned a 0.91 mean score on the civil rights index and a 4.87 placement on the matching spectrum. Overall, "taking all aspects of policy into account," PC candidates placed themselves considerably to the right of the political centre. Matching the tenor of its 2003 campaign platform, the mean score among Conservative respondents on the general left-right spectrum was 5.00. These figures depict a PC party strongly anchored in the principles of the 'New Right', with little evidence of red tory, progressive influence.

Substantial divisions lurk beneath these averages, however, as consensus on specific issues and policy positions was sporadic. To measure the amount of PC party cohesion across the various indexes, a "consensus score" was calculated based on the percentage of candidates who were on the same side of the given issue. These figures ranged from 0 (no consensus) to 50 (complete consensus). More information regarding the precise formula can be found in Appendix B.

As the figures in Appendix B suggest, there was considerable harmony among Conservatives in certain policy areas. In particular, continentalism, individualism and moralism stood out as the pillars of consensus among PC candidates. On the first issue, over 75 percent of Conservative respondents disagreed with the statement that "Canada must take steps to reduce American influence on its culture and mass media," and an identical proportion felt that NAFTA "has been good for Manitoba." On the topic of individualism, a majority of Conservatives agreed with the party's neo-liberal stance on limited government, opposing state intervention in employment and living standards, and supporting the involvement of the private sector in Canada's health care system. And elements of neo-conservatism also pervaded the PC campaign slate. Over two-thirds of the party's respondents believed "our society has become too permissive" and that the "country would have far fewer problems if there were more emphasis on family values." These moral conservative principles included opposition to both the legalization of marijuana use and same-sex marriage, the latter of which was included in the "civil liberties" index. In these three broad issue areas, there was considerable consensus among Conservative politicians, confirming once again the strength of 'New Right' attitudes within the party.

The same was not true across all policy fields, however. The PC party was considerably divided over other attitudinal themes, the most noticeable of which included populism, social welfare, and the environment. For one, differences of opinion arose over whom to trust more: "ordinary people" or "experts and intellectuals." While a majority (57.6 percent) of Conservative candidates supported the former option, the margin was relatively slim. And although two-thirds recommended returning government "to the people at the grassroots," a majority (54.5 percent) *opposed* mandatory referendums on constitutional amendments. In overall terms, this gave the Conservatives a mean consensus score of only 9.6 on the populism index.

Unity was even scarcer on social welfare issues. In particular, Conservatives were divided over the role of the government in providing all Manitobans with adequate housing, and the overall necessity of welfare and social security programs, in general. The party reached a 1.5 consensus score on each survey item, confirming Dyck's diagnosis of a progressive / conservative divide among PC members.

Conservatives were relatively unequivocal when it came to choosing between the environment and social programs, however. A full 78.8 percent opted to preserve funding levels in areas "like education and health" in the face of ecological concerns. Consensus wavered considerably on other environmental issues, though. Conservatives were split, for instance, over whether or not global warming is "as big a problem as environmentalists would have us believe." And only a slim majority (51.5 percent) agreed that "government should enforce stricter [environmental] standards on private industry."

In sum, on issues of populism, social welfare, and environmentalism, the Conservatives' level of consensus was considerably lower – both compared to other policy areas and, as will be shown shortly, to other parties.

SUMMARY

On the whole, the Manitoba Progressive Conservative 2003 campaign slate was decidedly right-of-centre. Yet, with both progressive and conservative leanings, the survey demonstrates that the province's right-wing "fellowship" is one of considerable diversity. In this sense, the Manitoba Conservatives are by no means unique in their ideological structure. Divided between red tories and followers of the 'New Right', the party's official title is as much a moniker as a map of its internal composition. The Manitoba Progressive Conservatives are precisely as their name suggests: both progressive and conservative – at least as far as their campaign slate.

This represents a somewhat surprising finding. Considering, first, its gradual retreat from progressive policy since Duff Roblin's departure in 1967, and, second, the unmitigated success of the 'New Right' throughout Western Canada in recent decades, evidence of progressivism among PC candidates in Manitoba is certainly noteworthy. The "other brand" of conservatism began its steady withdrawal from the Manitoba PC programme with the party's selection of Walter Weir as Premier, in 1967. Successive Conservative leaders, from Spivak and Lyon to Filmon and Murray, have nurtured this trend by thoroughly 'liberalizing' the party's official message (Wesley 2004, 52-65; Netherton 2001). Over time, the primacy of the individual has replaced the importance of province- and community-building as the Conservatives' central focus. So complete was the transformation that, by 2003, the PC campaign platform was arguably devoid of any reference to red tory principles, whatsoever. In the face of this evolution, the continued survival of progressive Conservatives was a rather unexpected discovery (Wesley 2004, 50-65). Of course, the PC's were not the only provincial party to experience internal division.

THE NEW DEMOCRATS AND THE INTER-LEFT CONTINUUM IN MANITOBA

As illustrated above, analysts often focus on divisions within the right as the sharpest partisan cleavages in Canadian politics. Lost in these discussions are the parallel divisions within the Canadian Left, whose followers have witnessed an ideological transformation of their own (Berlin and Aster 2001). Indeed, if the Right is divided between 'progressives' and 'conservatives', cleavages within the partisan Left are even more complex. Social democrats, reform liberals, and "New Left" activists each find their home on the left side of the political spectrum, producing unique attitudinal challenges for leftist parties like the New Democrats.

At the height of the neo-liberal movement in the 1980s and early 1990s, a solution came in the form of the "Third Way" – an attempt to unite a growing left and provide the electorate with a viable alternative to the 'New Right'. To accomplish each of these goals, the 'Third Way' brought together three modes of left-wing thought – social democracy, reform liberalism and 'New Left' activism – under a single banner.[5]

Followers of the former two ideologies were strangers by no means. Across Canada and throughout much of its history, the New Democratic Party has long been home to both social democracy and reform liberalism (Berlin and Aster 2001). In fact, the two modes of left-wing thinking are often equated with one another, particularly over issues of civil liberty and social programs. Yet, there are distinctions to be drawn. Whereas social democrats view society in collective terms, advocating equality of result, reform liberals take a more individualistic approach. The former take a decidedly negative view toward capitalism and an unrestrained market, and point to the need to mitigate its effects through a substantial welfare state and public ownership. To reform liberals, on the other hand, the market is a force to be harnessed, not constrained. For them, society is a series of inter-connected individuals for whom equality of opportunity is necessary. This would create "opportunity for all" and a pursuit of the "widest possible spread of wealth, power and opportunity" (Blair 1998, 3). The distinction is one of collectivism and cooperation on one hand, and individualism and competition on the other. Thus, while holding similar attitudes on many issues – including universal health care, affordable post-secondary education and the elimination of discrimination – social democrats and reform liberals are often at odds over the underlying objectives and principles of left-wing policy.

As a third element of the 'Third Way', a "New Left" brand of social activism has also found a home on the left side of the political spectrum. Known as the "rainbow coalition" in the United States, the Canadian 'New Left' is defined by the so-called "new social movements" (NSM's), like environmentalism, gay rights advocacy, Aboriginal activism (or "indigenism"), feminism, anti-globalization, and other interests. Through these vehicles, the ‘Third Way’ embraced the concept of “equal worth,” aiming to put an end to prejudice and discrimination (Blair 1998, 3). This included the promotion of multiculturalism, and social inclusion of minorities and disadvantaged groups. In particular, pursuing “equal worth” would involve the extension of positive freedoms, civil liberties and, if necessary, affirmative action.

To these traditionally left-wing values – social democracy, reform liberalism and the ‘New Left’ – the ‘Third Way’ wedded a commitment to certain neo-liberal principles. Witnessing the popularity of right-wing parties throughout the world, followers of the ‘Third Way’ saw merit in adopting four specific elements of neo-liberalism. First, left-wing parties began pledging “affordable government”, weakening their social democratic commitment to a greatly expanded public sector. Second, parties like the NDP began talking of tax relief – a hallmark of the neo-liberal philosophy and grand departure from the tax-and-spend policies of the ‘Old Left’. Third, the ‘Third Way’ involved a re-commitment to populism, already a fixed element of social democracy. And fourth, left-wing parties began promoting economic growth as an end unto itself, noting the intrinsic value of the market and competition. With these four pledges, the Canadian left’s partial conversion to neo-liberalism had a considerable effect on its public image, taking some of the radical edge off its party platforms and welcoming centrist liberals into the left-wing fold (Wesley 2004, 107-114).

Following the selection of Gary Doer as its leader in 1988, the Manitoba NDP began redefining itself in ‘Third Way’ terms, as the province’s most collectivist, yet fiscally responsible, party (Wiseman 2002, 223). In this vain, while making markedly fewer campaign promises than the Conservatives, an examination of the 2003 NDP platform reveals the party’s strong left-wing flavour.[6] From start to finish, the New Democratic campaign offered evidence of the party’s ‘Third Way’ values, striking a balance between reform liberal approaches toward housing, social democratic prescriptions for health care, and neo-liberal approaches to economic development (Wesley 2004, 115-119). The Manitoba NDP’s platform fell noticeably short in one area of ‘Third Way’ thought, however. The party remained relatively silent on issues of “equal worth” – including topics like women’s rights, sexual orientation, multiculturalism, and other civil liberty concerns. This was especially surprising, given the pressure on Canadian governments to take a stand on same-sex marriage in the summer and fall of 2003. Whether a conscious decision to avoid debating divisive issues, or the perceived lack of province-level relevance of such concerns, the NDP programme contained little substance in these ‘New Left’ areas.

Nonetheless, the New Democrats’ “five priorities for the next four years” spoke volumes of the balanced, ‘Third Way’ nature of their programme. Their simplified, pragmatic platform committed the party to: (1) “improve our health care system”; (2) “make it easier for young people to stay in Manitoba”; (3) “strengthen and diversify our economy”; (4) “make our communities safer and more secure”; and (5) “make Manitoba an even more affordable place to live” – all of which signalled a drastic departure from the more programmatic, idealistic agenda of the Old Left. In its place, New Democratic leaders like Gary Doer felt they have drafted a more “realistic and achievable” ‘Third

Way' platform, one that blended the pragmatism and fiscal caution of neo-liberalism with the social objectives of the left. "Our commitment to the electorate," reads the party's Statement of Aims, "is to be forthright about our long-range goals as well as practical about our short-term political activities." Pledges such as these leave little doubt of the New Democrats' connection with the pragmatic doctrine of the 'Third Way'.

A party's programme may not necessarily represent the views of all its members, however. This was evidenced by earlier discussions regarding the 2003 Conservative campaign, during which the party's right-wing platform helped mask significant differences of opinion among its candidates. Ironically, it was the presence of the PC'S progressive wing that helped lower the party's overall level of consensus in key policy areas – a group of politicians whose affinity toward social rights and market mitigation strongly resembled those principles outlined in the New Democrats' own election platform. Were there comparable differences of opinion among NDP candidates? Were there divisions between social democrats, reform liberals, 'New Leftists', and neo-liberals?

Results from the Manitoba Candidates Survey conclude that social democracy and 'New Left' activism – not the more centrist reform- or neo-liberalism – are the two predominant themes among NDP candidates. (See Appendix C.) With a mean score of 1.44 on the 3-point index, and 3.07 on the corresponding 7-point spectrum, for instance, New Democrats proved moderately populist in their beliefs. As expected, this reflects the party's allegiance to the grassroots principles of social democracy, a sentiment that was evidenced earlier in the party's 2000 campaign finance reform legislation.

The average NDP candidate showed strong collectivist sentiments in other areas, as well, scoring a very low 0.30 on the individualism index. Furthermore, New Democrats scored highly on the spending index (6.74), and showed fervent support for: public services over tax cuts; public health care over private medical insurance; public or mixed ownership over privatization; and environmental protection over unmitigated economic growth. These attitudes indicate a penchant for active government intervention in providing key social programs, a prominent element of social democratic thought.

In addition, the average New Democrat respondent proved very socially progressive, with a score of 0.67 on the moralist index and left-of-centre placement (2.59) on the matching spectrum. NDP politicians were also very supportive of civil liberties. Thus, in much the same way that the progressive attitudes of many Tory candidates went unreflected in the PC platform, so, too, were many 'New Left' attitudes uncovered by the survey conspicuously absent from the official NDP programme.

Overall, the average New Democratic respondent placed him- or herself at 2.33 on the general ideological spectrum, offering further confirmation of the NDP's left-wing position in Manitoba. In general, these attitudes appeared strongly rooted in rights-consciousness and collectivism, offering proof that many party candidates align themselves more closely to the 'New Left' and social democracy than reform- or neo-liberalism.

What is more, the NDP campaign slate appeared remarkably united behind these left-wing values. Calculating the party's consensus scores, such cohesion emerges most strongly around four particular issue indexes. (See Appendix B for more information and detailed figures.) At 41.4 out of 50.0, for instance, New Democrats agree most strongly on the necessity and universality of social welfare. Similarly high levels of consensus surround the party's commitment to collectivism. On this topic, over 80 percent of NDP respondents dismissed each of the three tenets of individualism included in the index. Environmentalism also united the party. Over 90 percent of New Democrats viewed global warming as a major challenge facing Manitobans, and nearly the same number advocated enforcing "stricter standards on private industry to improve their environmental practices." With consensus scores of 25.3, 20.4 and 19.8, respectively, the NDP remained considerably cohesive on questions of civil liberties, moralism, and continentalism, as well.

In fact, the only major division – indeed, *contradiction* – among NDP candidates occurred over the issue of populism. Strangely, while 63.0 percent of New Democratic respondents agreed that "we could probably solve most of our big political problems if government could be brought back to people at the grassroots", just one-third agreed that "there should be a referendum on all amendments to the constitution." As the party's divided response to the third item in the populism index suggests, New Democrats seemed torn between placing their "trust in the simple down-to-earth thinking of ordinary people" versus "the theories of experts and intellectuals." This lack of consensus is somewhat puzzling, considering the party's social democratic ethos. Perhaps NDP candidates were reluctant to turn to direct democracy out of fear that mass rule would trump social rights and civil liberties. Whatever the reason, the New Democrats remain most divided – not over policy, per se – but over how to develop and implement their political agenda.

SUMMARY

The persistence of the 'inter-left continuum', and the consistency with which New Democratic candidates placed themselves along it, is evidence of the flexibility of the 'Third Way' programme. Borrowing elements from across the traditional spectrum, the party defined its philosophy in rather inclusive terms. The approach gave electoral credibility to a leftist program by uniting it with aspects of liberalism, thus creating Third Way concepts like 'cooperative individualism', 'equality of freedom', and 'market-harnessing.'

Perhaps it was this principled – yet practical and progressive – approach that appealed to NDP politicians. Gone are the party's programmatic, Old Left links to anti-capitalism, equality of result, deficit spending, and strict management of the provincial economy. So, too, has the party severed its ties to Keynesian social democracy, as applied under Schreyer and Pawley. In their place, New Democrats now follow the 'Third Way' approach to politics, openly pursuing partnerships with the private and voluntary sectors, balancing budgets, and remaining at least somewhat open to the "integration of the North American economies." Indeed, when combined with the New Democratic candidates' united support behind 'New Left' values like environmentalism and social inclusion, few elements of the Old Left programme, beyond protectionism, remain prominent in the party's attitudinal profile.

This ideological shift has coincided with the party's return to power, confirming, perhaps, the Manitoba public's support for the New Left's socially-compassionate, yet fiscally-conservative, brand of politics. As mentioned at the outset of this section, and as witnessed by the NDP'S struggles throughout the 20th century, these two principles can be difficult to reconcile. It would appear, by both the success of the party and the cohesiveness of its members, however, that New Democrats in Manitoba have achieved this balance in recent years.

This success runs contrary to the prognoses of many leading analysts. In 1995, at the height of neo-liberalism, Campbell, Christian and others openly questioned the future of left-wing politics in Canada.

> The various ideological strains that have made up the NDP in recent years – environmentalism, feminism, nationalism, labourism, indigenism…, and social democracy – are still important forces in Canadian politics. The question remains whether the NDP can reconstitute itself so that it speaks effectively for these disparate groups (Campbell and Christian 1996, 150).[7]

Yet, the recent record of the Manitoba NDP suggests victorious left-wing parties need not be from the centre. Whatever the developments in other provinces or nationally, this study reveals that social democracy and the 'New Left' have found a safe and prosperous home alongside reform- and neo-liberalism within the Manitoba New Democratic Party. The NDP's 'Third Way' programme has, in this way, contributed to both the unification and improved electability of the left in the province.

THE LIBERAL PARTY AND THE DIVIDED CENTRE IN MANITOBA

When describing the Manitoba Liberals, most analysts point to the party's recent electoral futility. Unable to form government in any of the fourteen provincial elections since 1958, and exceeding 30 percent of the popular vote only once since 1969, the Manitoba Liberal Party has experienced its share of recent disappointment. Indeed, since 1966, the Liberals have spent only one brief term as the Official Opposition (1988-1990), and have not formed government in almost fifty years.

There are many possible reasons for the Liberals' lack of success. One might easily link the party's fortunes to those of its federal counterpart, for instance (Carty and Stewart 1996, 75). Most notably during the Trudeau and Chrétien governments, the Manitoba Liberals saw their support dwindle alongside that of the governing party in Ottawa. In this light, the unpopularity of federal leaders from "the East" (particularly

Quebec) appears to have tainted the provincial party's image among Manitoban voters for the better part of four decades (Wesley 2004, 136-139).

Some also blame the provincial Grits' electoral futility on the party's divisiveness, whether defined in ideological (Dyck 1996, 8) or regional (Drummond 1995, 9) terms. These 'reform liberal / business liberal' and 'urban / rural' divisions appear to run deeply through the party, compromising its ability to put forth a coherent election platform. This has resulted in a lack of regional base and policy space, both of which are critical to success in an adversarial, geographically-divided political climate like Manitoba.

Whatever the source of their shortcomings, the Liberals have nonetheless remained mired in third party status for much of the last three decades.[8] Naturally, the Liberals' consistently-poor showing at the provincial level may prompt questions as to the precise structure of the Manitoba party system. All of this may point to the existence of a two-party system in Manitoba, with the Conservatives and New Democrats as major players, and the Liberals on the sidelines.

The Liberals' continued presence on the provincial scene suggests otherwise, however. After all but one election, 1981, the Manitoba Legislature has contained Liberal representatives, and the party nominated candidates in all fifty-seven constituencies in 2003. In this latter sense, the Liberal Party provided a third voice in every local contest, helping to contribute to policy debates throughout the province. Its role was thus considerably larger than that of minor parties, like the Greens or Communists. Therefore, despite the lack of Liberal success in recent elections, Manitoba does, indeed, support a multi-party system – one in which the Liberals have an equal place on every ballot, and one in which the party has filled, and has the *potential* to fill, a balance of power role in the legislature. Considering this influence, the attitudes of Liberal candidates are an important factor in Manitoba politics and a necessary element in any analysis of the province's party system.

According to an analysis of the party's 2003 platform[9] and the Manitoba Candidates' Survey, the Liberals conform to Dyck's description:

> …the Liberal party has two main factions – business and reform liberalism. The two are slightly right and left of centre on an ideological scale, with inequality and individualism on the right and equality and collectivism on the left. The two forces may vary in balance from time to time, but they usually interact to put the Liberal party in the centre of the ideological spectrum (Dyck 1996, 8).

Much like PC party's 'progressives' and 'conservatives', reform and neo-liberals differ in their attitudes toward the substance of the Grits' programme. If PC 'conservatives' lean further right than 'progressives', so, too, do neo-liberals lean further right than their reform liberal counterparts. A similar division occurs over the relative emphasis placed on economic versus social policy. 'Small-c conservatives' and neo-liberals grant greater prominence to fiscal issues, like small government, privatization and laissez-faire policies. Conversely, reform liberals, like PC ‘progressives’, place politics ahead of economics in the formation of public policy. Instead of grander tax relief strategies, for instance, reform liberals may advocate improved funding for social programs. Instead of complete private ownership in key industries, they may promote state involvement in the provision of vital public services, like health care and energy. As mentioned earlier, these ‘progressive’ and reform liberal principles strongly resemble those of the ’Third Way’, whose allegiance to affordable social welfare stands in stark contrast to the neo-liberal attitudes of those on the New Right. The nature of this overlap will be addressed in a subsequent section. For now, suffice it to say that the reform / neo-liberal divide within the Manitoba Liberal Party splits its ranks in much the same way the PC’s are divided between their ‘progressive’ and ‘conservative’ wings.

The comments of a Liberal candidate demonstrate the difficulties involved in classifying the members of the party. “I am a fiscal conservative,” he wrote, “but a social liberal…” – a dual identity that makes it challenging to label his attitudes as entirely left or right of centre. His progressive stance toward diversity and civil liberties was limited, moreover, by “the exception of abortion and homosexuality.” This constrains our ability to classify his social attitudes as entirely leftist, despite the fact he “strongly believe[s] in our health care system and multiculturalism.” Attitudinal profiles of several other Liberal respondents yielded similarly ambiguous results.

Nonetheless, analysis of “the average Liberal candidate” does help shed some light on the topic. Calculating the mean scores for all Grit politicians, we can sketch the attitudinal profile for the party, as a whole. And the results depict the Liberals as being closer to the centre-left than the centre-right. (See Appendix C.) For instance, the average Liberal respondent was moderately populist, scoring an average of 1.14 on the 3.00-point index, while positioned at 3.63 on the corresponding 7.00-point spectrum. This also translated into a relatively collectivist attitude toward social policy, including moderate support for public services over tax cuts, and strong support for public health care over private medical insurance. Furthermore, the average Liberal was also considerably progressive, scoring a low 1.05 on the moralism index and a leftist 3.10 on the matching spectrum. He or she assumed a more centrist position on civil liberties, however, displaying a slightly centre-right preference for restricting “some civil liberties to keep criminals off the streets.” This issue area notwithstanding, the average Liberal was distinctly centre-left in all other policy domains. This included his or her support for: environmentalism, protectionism, centralized federalism, increased social spending, and at least partial public ownership in key economic sectors. From this perspective, it appears that the party’s reform liberal tendencies are more prominently reflected in the attitudes of its “average” candidate.

Indeed, there was a high level of consensus over the main tenets of reform liberalism, as illustrated in Appendix B. On the topic of the environment, for instance, the party achieved a consensus score of 35.7 out of a possible 50.0. With 95.2 percent in agreement, the Liberals were extremely united on the fact that “government should enforce stricter standards on private industry to improve their environmental practices,” and only slightly less cohesive over the fact that “global warming *is* as big a problem as environmentalists would have us believe." At the same time, Liberal candidates were also quite unified in their ranking of social programs ahead of environmental concerns. Just under 76.2 percent of the party's respondents disagreed with the idea of cleaning up the environment at the cost of cutbacks to education and health.

What is more, Liberals remained united over other social issues as outlined in the welfare index. Over 70 percent agreed over the necessity and universality of social programs in Manitoba, and 61.9 percent saw a role for the government in providing adequate housing – a key plank in the party's election platform.

While dwindling somewhat, this level of consensus was also evident in Liberal responses under the individualism index. Over two-thirds of the party's respondents agreed that "the government ought to make sure that everyone has a decent standard of living," while over three-quarters disagreed with the idea that "most unemployed people could find a job if they really wanted to."

Division arose over the future of health care in the province, however. Just over half (57.1 percent) of Liberal respondents agreed that "governments should allow privately-owned companies to deliver some health care services in Canada," a position endorsed by the party's platform. The remaining 42.9 percent disagreed, creating a noticeable gap between the reform and neo-liberal elements of the party. This was not the only area in which a difference of opinion arose over a key election issue.

A similar divide emerged on the topic of civil liberties, for instance. Whereas Liberals remained united in their support for "affirmative action" programs and even more unified in their opposition toward police encroachment upon civil rights, there was no consensus over the question of whether "homosexual couples should be allowed to be legally married." While 42.9 percent agreed with the concept of same-sex marriage, 38.1 percent disagreed, and an additional 19.0 percent were either 'neutral' or offered 'no opinion'. Similarly, Liberals were completely divided over the issue of marijuana legalization. When asked whether "the possession of small amounts of marijuana for personal use should be legalized," 47.6 percent agreed and 42.9 percent disagreed. Overall, the Liberals scored just 6.4 on the 50.0-point consensus measure when it came to issues of social moralism. What is more, with a consensus score of just 0.8, the party was almost entirely divided on the topic of continentalism.

Together, these stark divisions over health, same-sex marriage, drug legalization, and American influence suggest significant differences of opinion among Liberals over some of the major issues facing Manitobans today. United on issues of environmentalism, social welfare and collectivism, the Grits' reform liberal consensus seemed to evaporate in other hot-button areas. This, in turn, appears to confirm the existence of a reform / neo-liberal divide within the party.

Summary

Considering the ambiguity of the party's platform, it was somewhat surprising to find that the Liberal campaign slate was as cohesive as it was. What is more, one may have assumed that the party was stretching itself to recruit enough candidates to run in all fifty-seven provincial constituencies in 2003, a feat that could have compromised the Liberals' consensus over many policy issues. This did not appear to be the case, however. With the exception of four main (and crucial) issues – same-sex marriage, marijuana legalization, Americanization, and the direction of health care – the party's pool of candidates was relatively united in their centre-left attitudes toward the environment, social welfare and collectivism. In the final analysis, although offset by the party's centre-right tendencies on civil liberty issues, this helped anchor the party slightly to the left of the political centre.

Yet, placement of the party to the centre-left of the political spectrum is important beyond what it tells us about the Liberals, themselves. Certainly, these findings do suggest that reform liberalism carried greater sway in the minds of most Liberal candidates. But more than this, the Liberals' centre-left placement tells us something about the nature of party politics in the province, as a whole. Taking all three major parties into consideration, Manitoba supports a party system with two parties on the political left – the Third Way New Democrats and the centre-leaning Liberals – and one on the right – the Conservatives. With substantial elements of both New Left and New Right thinking as part of its programme, moreover, this places the Liberal Party squarely in the centre of not only the political spectrum, but the *party spectrum*, as well. As will be shown in the following, concluding section, this position has not been advantageous to the Liberals, considering the adversarial character of Manitoba politics.

SPANNING THE SPECTRUM: THE MANITOBA PARTY SYSTEM

To summarize discussions to this point, the Manitoba Conservatives are decidedly right-wing in nature; while tempered somewhat by its 'progressive' wing, the PC party is, nonetheless, a decidedly liberal-conservative one. By the same token, NDP's continued, 'Third Way' attachment to social democracy – despite the influence of reform liberalism, the 'New Left' and neo-liberalism – is unique among Manitoba parties. And the counter-balancing forces of reform and neo-liberalism have anchored the Liberals to the centre, between the Conservatives and NDP. In broad terms, then, it would appear that the structure of the traditional left-right party spectrum holds true in Manitoba, with the New Democrats on the left, the PC's on the right, and the Liberals between them.

According to the individualism index, for instance, the New Democrats (0.30) and Liberals (0.95) proved more collectivist than the Conservatives.[10] This arrangement was confirmed when examining the parties' attitudes toward healthcare. While all three groups agreed "that government should provide universal free health care," there was considerable attitudinal distance between the more centrist Conservatives (3.74) and the more left-leaning Liberals (2.68) and New Democrats (1.93). On the topic of public services, in general, the divisions were even starker. Whereas NDP candidates took a distinctively leftist stance (2.85) on the 'public services versus tax cuts' spectrum, the Liberals (3.84) placed themselves closest to centre; meanwhile, the neo-liberal

Conservatives (5.13) assumed a right-wing position, placing great attitudinal distance between themselves and the other two parties. What is more, New Democrats (6.74) ranked highest on the spending index, recommending increased funding in more areas than either the Liberals (5.70) or Conservatives (4.27). The same left-right pattern emerged from the privatization index, with PC's (2.30) more supportive of private ownership than the Liberals (1.90) and NDP (0.59). On the topic of individualism, therefore, the traditional left/right spectrum definitely holds true for Manitoba parties. As social democrats, the NDP is furthest to the left, with the reform liberal Grits and neo-liberal Conservatives occupying the centre and right, respectively.

Similar patterns emerged over questions of moralism, progressivism and civil liberties. The 'New Left' New Democrats (0.67) proved the most socially tolerant of all parties, with the reform liberal Grits (1.05) falling between the NDP and the more moralist Conservatives (1.85). Moreover, both the New Democrats (2.59) and Liberals (3.10) favored "more progressive policies on matters like homosexuality, abortion and multiculturalism," whereas the neo-conservative Tories (4.24) placed themselves on the opposite side of the spectrum. The sentiments of the Liberal Party shifted to the right on issues of civil rights, however. Both the Grits (4.16) and Tories (4.87) agreed that "it is better to restrict some civil liberties to keep criminals off the streets," leaving the NDP (3.38) as the only party on the left side of the spectrum.

The conventional party spectrum held true even on non-traditional issues like the environment, continentalism and federalism. The New Democrats (2.04) scored highest on the environmentalism index, for instance, with the Liberals (1.76) and Conservatives (1.03) somewhat lower. According to the corresponding spectrum, all three parties favored environmental protection over all-out economic growth, with the NDP (2.56) leaning further to the left than the Liberals (3.37) and PC'S (3.77). This is perhaps further evidence of the strong 'New Left' presence within the NDP. On the issue of continentalism, moreover, all parties assumed a 'protectionist' position on the spectrum. The New Democrats (4.67) and Liberals (4.42) were most protectionist according to this measure, while Conservatives (4.03) were least likely to "advocate Canada's sovereignty over its own economy." These results were echoed in the parties' respective continentalism index scores, with the social democratic NDP (0.48) and reform liberal Grits (0.95) scoring considerably lower than the neo-liberal PC'S (1.76). And, lastly, although all parties believed in a strong, centralized form of federalism, the New Democrats (2.19) and Liberals (2.84) held a stronger belief than the Conservatives (3.67) that "the federal government should take leadership in establishing national standards in matters like health care." Thus, the conventional NDP-Liberal-PC party spectrum applies in Manitoba even in non-traditional areas like environmentalism, continentalism and federalism.

As follows, the Manitoba Candidates' Survey confirms the traditional party spectrum in all but one issue area. On the topic of populism – itself a difficult concept to define in left-right terms – the Liberals shift from between the two other parties to assume the least-populist position. This suggests the party remains somewhat more elitist than its opponents, a product, perhaps, of what Drummond describes as the party's upper class, business liberal origins (Drummond 1995, 24). According to the index, the Conservatives sit opposite the Liberals as the most grassroots party, while the New Democrats believed most strongly that "government is better run 'by the people'", according to their self-placement on the spectrum. Using either measure, however, the greatest attitudinal distance emerges, not between the New Democrats and Conservatives, but between the Liberals and the two other parties. This, in turn, implies a rare area of common ground between the PC'S and NDP, an indication of some overlap between the grassroots principles of the neo-liberal Conservative programme and the social democratic origins of the New Democratic Party.

Populism was the only issue area in which the results contradicted the conventional party spectrum, however. On all other topics, Liberal attitudes fell between those of the New Democrats and Conservatives (see Appendix B).

INTRA-PARTY CONVERGENCE

The findings in this section bring this paper full circle. The original research question asked if Manitoban parties do, in fact, offer the electorate consistent, distinguishable electoral alternatives. To this point in the discussion, the reply – like those of the respondents – has been a resounding 'yes'. There are sizable gaps between not only the platforms of the various parties, but in the attitudes of their candidates. And, while admittedly relative, the attitudinal distances between the parties – on a wide range of issues – appear large enough to indicate clear differences between the province's New Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives. These distinctions are most marked between the left-leaning NDP and right-leaning PC's, but there also seems to be space between each of the two parties and their more centrist Liberal opponents.[11] In short, then, it appears that Manitoban parties present the electorate with the coherent choices and clear options they desire.

This analysis does require qualification, however. For, although the general position of the parties does suggest separation, a "dual tendency" is still at work: not only are there differences of opinion *within* the various parties, as discussed above, but also attitudinal convergence *across* party lines.

This attitudinal overlap has been discussed on several occasions, noting the similarities between 'progressive', Third Way and reform liberal principles. Within each party, members of these various wings share a set of common beliefs. First, they tend to value politics over economics, a principle that helps set them apart from their neo-liberal counterparts. Second, they tend to be more less individualist, viewing society as a community of interdependent individuals. Third, and in this sense, 'progressives', social democrats and reform liberals see a role for government in the provision of a substantial welfare state, including universal health care and education. Plus, fourth, the left-leaning, collectivist values of these groups often extend to issues of environmental protection, even in the face of opportunities for economic growth. And fifth, members of these wings often take tolerant positions toward issues of inclusion and civil liberties, supporting the rights of people in minority or disadvantaged groups and, perhaps, favoring affirmative action as a means of extending equality. This high level of attitudinal consensus contributes to a wide-ranging policy convergence within the Manitoba party system, helping to blur the lines of partisanship over certain issues.

Accordingly, the survey revealed a majority of candidates from each party agreed over policy positions in three of the major issue indexes: welfare, civil liberties, and the environment. For instance, 92.6 percent of New Democrats, 71.4 percent of Liberals, and 51.5 percent of Conservatives disagreed with the statement that “a lot of the welfare and social security programs that we have now are unnecessary.” Similar proportions of each party also felt that “social programs should remain universal.” Meanwhile, on the topic of civil liberties, a majority of respondents from each party supported the continuation of affirmative action programs, and railed against police encroachment upon civil rights. As Appendix B illustrates, similar, cross-party consensus was also generated over issues of environmental protection. In all these areas, ‘progressives’, social democrats and reform liberals, regardless of their party affiliation, hold similar beliefs on several dimensions.

Analysis also revealed a similar policy convergence around certain right-wing principles, as well. The majority of the evidence for this trend exists not in the findings of the survey, necessarily, but in the analysis of each party’s platform. As noted, the Conservatives, New Democrats and Liberals all demonstrated support for neo-liberal values like government transparency, efficiency, affordability, and moderate tax relief. This included an all-party consensus over balanced budgets. When these institutional attitudes are added to the significant tri-partisan agreement over the principles of populism, it appears each party is anchored on not only the left, but also the right. A majority of both New Democrats and Conservatives – and a plurality of Liberals – believed that “we could probably solve most of our big political problems if government could actually be brought back to the people at the grassroots,” for instance. Considering this, the conservative wing of the PC party, the neo-liberal wing of the Liberal Party, and the more centrist element of the NDP share a considerable bond.

CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

Echoing the conclusions of Archer and Whitehorn, this study produced significant findings regarding political competition in Canada. “In examining the broader question of the role of ideology in structuring choices at Canadian elections,” they wrote, “our observations suggest that… the ideological divisions are clear and straightforward, even if those perceptions might not extend to the general public” (2001, 117). Yet, taking the entire Manitoba Candidates’ Study into account, one finds both common ground and visible cleavages within Manitoba’s three chief political parties. The concept may be somewhat complex to outside observers. How could parties be distinct in their positions along the political continuum, yet share many fundamental ideals with regard to both institutions and social policy? The answer requires analysts to re-examine their perceptions of the party spectrum.

In reality, there is no monolithic right or left any longer – if there ever was – and today’s political issues, values, and parties do not fit readily under the old, unidimensional spectrum model. The simpler days of a capitalist ‘right’ and an anti-capitalist ‘left’ have long since passed; as we enter the so-called ‘post-deficit’ era of Canadian politics, political leaders face new challenges that often lie beyond the traditional left-right spectrum (Nevitte et al. 1989). Concerns ranging from feminism, federalism and the environment, to multiculturalism, populism, and balancing the budget – while by no means unique to twenty-first century politics – have taken on new meaning and importance in today’s political arena (Ball and Dagger 1999). Such issues have compelled parties and their leaders to re-evaluate and revamp their approaches toward politics altogether, producing what some have called a “New Right” and “Third Way” in political debate. As a result, there are no exclusively left-wing or right-wing parties in the province, nor do any parties hold monopolies over either side of the continuum. Understanding the attitudes of today’s parties and politicians can be difficult, considering these changes.

Indeed, the picture is often clouded, with parties occupying vast areas on the continuum, divided from within while overlapping with each other to a substantial degree. In this vain, some analysts may contend that the PC party’s progressive / conservative coalition, the New Democrats’ ‘Third Way’ alliance, or the Liberals’ centrist philosophy is evidence of brokerage politics in Manitoba – that is, that each party placed electoral interests ahead of coherent ideological principles, creating ‘big tents’ to house the largest possible number of voters. The foregoing analysis provides partial support for this argument.

Yet, internal diversity does not necessarily preclude external, inter-party differences. This becomes clearer if, instead of occupying distinct policy-spaces along a political continuum, parties are conceived as “alloys” – as fluid mixtures of different ideological elements, or amalgams of attitudes and beliefs. Indeed, if one considers each party as maintaining its own ideological alloy – which, once formed, becomes more than the sum of its parts – considerable differences are visible between the Conservatives, New Democrats and Liberals.

The PC party is built around a distinctly right-wing core, for instance, with neo-liberalism as its primary element. Meanwhile, social democracy provides the solvent for the New Democrats’ left-wing solution, just as welfare liberalism provides the life-blood for the centrist Manitoba Liberal Party. These distinct cores help distinguish the parties, much the same way that different ingredients help differentiate stainless steel from Teflon and Kevlar. All three metals contain a common element (i.e., carbon), and each has its own, unique, complex, heterogeneous internal structure.[12] Yet, it cannot be argued that manufacturers have “no choice” when it comes to selecting between the three. Despite the similarities between them, and despite the inconsistencies within them, each metal – like each party – has its own distinct properties to which producers – like voters – can match their preferences. In this sense, voters seeking a certain policy position – on the future of health care or same-sex marriage, for instance –need only consult their local candidates or refer to each party’s platform, the same way a manufacturer might consult a product sheet when developing a new knife, frying pan, or police vest.

In the end, this evidence suggests that certain parties are more receptive to different ideological groups. A social democrat would appear more "at home" in the New Democratic Party, for example, where similar values are reflected more strongly in the party's platform, and shared by a larger proportion of the party's office-seekers. By the same token, the PC Party is particularly welcoming to neo-conservatives, and the Grits to welfare liberals. This is not to say that parties were ideologically-exclusive. In fact, the opposite appears true. While small in terms of its relative presence, social democracy has a place within the Conservative alloy, and neo-liberalism found a small niche within the New Democratic alloy. The presence of these elements does not invalidate the alloy model as a tool of analysis; it actually serves to strengthen the theory. By considering the internal composition of each party, the alloy model reveals the extent to which individual politicians – and, by implication, individual voters – find partisan homes across the political spectrum. In this sense, the alloy model draws attention to both the patterns and particularities of party ideology in Manitoba.

Even so, without a comprehensive provincial election study in the province, we do not know whether the Manitoban electorate viewed the three parties as distinctly as the parties saw themselves, or as their platforms portrayed. Nor do we know whether voters felt satisfied with the content and substance of the options they were presented in the 2003 Provincial Election.

This study *does* quiet claims that Manitoba parties are merely 'Tweedledum' and 'Tweedledee' players in the political process, however. Even in the face of various internal divisions and limited overlap, there are clear differences between the visions presented by each of the three parties, a finding that echoes similar, contemporary studies at the federal level (Gidengil et al. 2004, 41-101; Nevitte et al. 2004, 64; Archer and Whitehorn 2001). Ultimately, this challenges the idea that brokerage politics is a necessary or sufficient factor in lowering the level of political engagement in Canada (Brodie and Jenson 1996; Clarke et al. 1996). The fact that one in five voters in the 1999 Manitoba Election chose to stay home four years later was *not* directly attributable to a lack of coherent choices and clear options on the ballot. Rather, a better explanation for low voter turnout in democracies like Manitoba lies in a lack of *political knowledge* of the choices available; this, in turn, may be due to media inattention, ineffective campaigning, overall voter apathy, or any number of other factors – not necessarily a dearth of partisan alternatives.

While admittedly case study in political party systems in Canada, the foregoing analysis is hardly idiosyncratic: the left-centre-right configuration of the New Democratic, Liberal and Conservative parties, and the internal challenges faced by each, are by no means unique to Manitoba. In this vein, having witnessed eight (8) provincial elections in 2003, Canadian political scientists are presented with an excellent opportunity for comparative analysis, and the author's doctoral research programme will test its limits in Western Canada. Similar candidate surveys are being conducted in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia in the hopes of shedding much-needed light on party competition at the provincial level.

This marks an urgent area of research, as, perhaps more than ever, Canadian politics is dominated by debates at the provincial level (Barker, 1998). Over time, many of the nation's major policy issues – including health care, urban affairs, education, energy, and the environment – have evolved largely within provincial jurisdiction, yet, unfortunately, academic focus has not shifted along with this trend. As a result, many crucial decisions are being made in a variety of different political environments, the climates of which remain vastly under-explored (Imbeau and Lachapelle, 1996). Christopher Dunn (2001: 441) is correct: "there has clearly been an ebb from the high tide of comparative provincial studies in the 1970s and early 1980s." Since that time, "the literature in some areas is now so dated that any generalizations are becoming hazardous" – "it is time to ask more of the comparative provincial field" in Canada.

Yet, Dunn's invitation extends beyond just Canadianists, to all comparativists, encouraging them to re-examine the nature and significance of Canada's ten provinces as a laboratory for party systems analysis. I join him in welcoming these students with open arms, and hope they bring with them the much-needed wisdom, skills and energy required to revitalize a once-vibrant sub-field in Canadian political science. If the lessons learned from a case study in Manitoba politics are any indication, the results will be of great benefit to our understanding of party systems and deliberative democracy.

APPENDIX A: ATTITUDINAL MEASURES

The following attitude indexes were derived from a series of Likert-style scales measuring the degree of the respondent's agreement or disagreement with a series of statements: *populism*, *individualism*, *welfare*, *moralism*, *civil liberties*, *environment*, and *continentalism*. Many items were drawn from previous studies, including those of: Archer and Whitehorn (1990); Blake, Carty and Erickson (1991); Archer and Ellis (1994); Stewart and Archer (2000); and the 1997 and 2000 Canadian Election Studies. The specific statements used to construct each index are listed in Appendix B. The directions of each index and each statement are given in parentheses. Respondents were asked to format their responses to each statement on a 1 to 5 scale: (1) 'strongly disagree', (2) disagree', (3) 'neutral', (4) 'agree', or (5) 'strongly agree'. Respondents were also given the option to offer (8) 'no opinion'. A response given in the direction of the index was scored as '1'; all other responses – including 'neutral' or 'no opinion' – were scored as '0'.

A **Spending Index** was created using a formula designed by Blake et al. (1991), who assigned a score from –1 to +1 to respondents depending on whether they believed that government spending in policy areas should be substantially / slightly increased (1), maintained at current levels (0), or slightly / substantially reduced (-1). The scores for each item were then summed to produce an overall index score. The eleven (11) policy areas examined were: welfare rates; Kindergarten to Grade 12 education; post-secondary education and training; health care; job creation grants; tourism; day care; scientific research; business and farm subsidies; environmental protection; and highways. Index scores ranged from –11 to +11.

A **Privatization Index** was also calculated as follows. For each given corporation, respondents were assigned a score of 0 if they favored complete or partial public ownership, 1 if they favored complete private ownership. The scores from each item were then summed to produce a public ownership index score for each respondent. The six (6) corporations examined were: Winnipeg CanadInns Stadium, Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, Manitoba Public Insurance, Manitoba Telecom Services (MTS), and Manitoba Highways. Index scores ranged from 0 to +6.

ATTITUDE SPECTRA

The attitude spectra were adapted from a study conducted by Laver and Hunt (1992). Each spectrum was labelled with numbers ranging from 1 (far left) to 7 (far right), with 4 symbolizing a neutral position. Contrasting statements were placed at opposite ends of each spectrum as indicated below, and each respondent was asked to indicate his or her own position, plus the positions of all three Manitoban parties.

Left	**Right**
Promote raising taxes to increase public services.	Promote cutting public services to cut taxes.
Support protection of the environment, even at the cost of economic growth.	Support economic growth, even at the cost of damage to the environment.
Believe it is better to protect civil rights even if it allows some criminals to go free.	Believe it is better to restrict some civil liberties to keep criminals off the streets.
Advocate that government should provide universal free health care.	Advocate that medical expenses should be paid by individuals and private insurance plans.
Advocate integration of the North American economies.	Advocate Canada's sovereignty over its own economy.
Believe government is better run "by the people", or the "grass roots".	Believe government is better left to politicians and experts.
Favour more progressive policies on matters like homosexuality, abortion and multiculturalism.	Favour less progressive policies on matters like homosexuality, abortion and multiculturalism.
Believe the federal government should take leadership in establishing national standards in matters like health care.	Believe the provinces should determine their own, individual provincial standards in matters like health care.
Left ("taking all aspects of policy into account")	Right ("taking all aspects of policy into account")

Appendix B: Attitudinal Difference & Consensus Scores

While this study did not make use of statistical significance testing (due to the small-N involved), an objective standard was established to define substantive attitudinal division. First, the size of the attitudinal difference between the given groups of candidates was examined. To reach this figure, I subtracted the smaller attitudinal score from the larger. If this difference was greater than 0.25, the standard deviation of each group's attitudes was then examined. If these figures were less than 0.700, I then searched for other, related attitudinal differences between the groups of candidates. If this search provided context and a logical explanation for the difference in attitudes, I assumed that a substantive attitudinal division existed between the two groups. While not statistically-based, I remain confident that this method is reliable, especially considering the small size of the population under study.

In addition, consensus scores were calculated for each index using a formula developed by Blake et al. (1991). The score is actually an index, itself, measuring the amount of internal party cohesion over specific policy issues. The figure is reached by calculating the "absolute value of 50 minus the percentage of respondents agreeing with a given statement" (Blake et al. 1991, 143). As a result, each consensus score has a maximum value of 50, which would be reached only if everyone agreed (or disagreed) in response to the given item. If a majority was not reached in favour of any of the possible statements – i.e. if opinion was split between two or more options such that no single response received over 50 percent support – a score of '0' was recorded, reflecting the lack of consensus on the issue.

		NDP	LIB	PC
▼ POPULISM INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in populist direction) ▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**8.4**	**7.9**	**9.6**
In the long run, I'll put my trust in the simple down-to-earth thinking of ordinary people rather than the theories of experts and intellectuals.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	48.1%	61.9%	42.4%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	48.1%	28.6%	57.6%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	9.5%	0.0%
We could probably solve most of our big political problems if government could actually be brought back to the people at the grassroots.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	37.0%	42.9%	33.3%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	63.0%	47.6%	66.7%
	Neutral / No Opinion	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%
There should be a referendum on all amendments to the constitution.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	66.7%	61.9%	54.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	33.3%	38.1%	45.5%
▼ INDIVIDUALISM INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in individualist direction)▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**32.7**	**16.7**	**19.7**
Let's face it, most unemployed people could find a job if they really wanted to.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	81.5%	76.2%	51.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	14.8%	19.0%	48.5%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	4.8%	0.0%
The government ought to make sure that everyone has a decent standard of living.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	14.8%	33.3%	60.6%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	85.2%	66.7%	39.4%
Governments should allow privately-owned companies to deliver some health care services in Canada.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	81.5%	42.9%	3.0%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	11.1%	57.1%	97.0%
	Neutral / No Opinion	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%
▼ WELFARE INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in direction of support for welfare) ▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**41.4**	**19.8**	**5.5**
A lot of the welfare and social security programs that we have now are unnecessary.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	92.6%	71.4%	51.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	7.4%	23.8%	48.5%
	Neutral / No Opinion	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%
Social programs should remain universal.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	11.1%	23.8%	36.4%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	88.9%	76.2%	63.6%
The government should see that everyone has adequate housing.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	7.4%	38.1%	51.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	92.6%	61.9%	45.5%
	Neutral / No Opinion	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%

		NDP	LIB	PC
▼ MORALISM INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in moralist direction) ▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**20.4**	**6.4**	**17.7**
Our society has become too permissive.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	74.1%	66.7%	27.3%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	22.2%	28.6%	72.7%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	4.8%	0.0%
This country would have far fewer problems if there were more emphasis on family values.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	66.7%	52.4%	36.4%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	33.3%	47.6%	63.6%
The possession of small amounts of marijuana for personal use should be legalized.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	25.9%	42.9%	66.7%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	70.4%	47.6%	33.3%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	9.5%	0.0%
▼ CIVIL LIBERTIES INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in direction of support for civil liberties) ▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**25.3**	**14.3**	**11.6**
For the most part, discrimination in our society has decreased, making most "affirmative action" programs out-of-date.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	81.5%	66.7%	54.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	18.5%	33.3%	42.4%
	Neutral / No Opinion	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Certain restrictions on civil rights would be acceptable if it would help police reduce crime.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	70.4%	76.2%	54.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	29.6%	23.8%	45.5%
Homosexual couples should be allowed to be legally married.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	22.2%	38.1%	75.8%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	74.1%	42.9%	18.2%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	19.0%	6.1%
▼ ENVIRONMENTALISM INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in environmentalist direction) ▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**32.7**	**35.7**	**10.1**
Global warming is not as big a problem as environmentalists would have us believe.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	92.6%	85.7%	48.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	3.7%	14.3%	48.5%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	0.0%	3.0%
The government should make a greater effort to clean-up the environment, even if this means making cut-backs to social programs like education and health.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	66.7%	76.2%	78.8%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	25.9%	14.3%	21.2%
	Neutral / No Opinion	7.4%	9.5%	0.0%
The government should enforce stricter standards on private industry to improve their environmental practices.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	11.1%	4.8%	48.5%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	88.9%	95.2%	51.5%
▼ CONTINENTALISM INDEX (0 to 3) (scored in continentalist direction)▼	**AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE**	**19.8**	**0.8**	**21.7**
We must ensure an independent Canada even if that were to mean a lower standard of living for Canadians.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	44.4%	47.6%	63.6%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	44.4%	42.9%	30.3%
	Neutral / No Opinion	11.1%	9.5%	6.1%
Canada must take steps to reduce American influence on its culture and mass media.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	22.2%	42.9%	75.8%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	77.8%	47.6%	24.2%
	Neutral / No Opinion	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%
The North American Free Trade Agreement has been good for Manitoba.	Disagree / Strongly Disagree	81.5%	52.4%	21.2%
	Agree / Strongly Agree	14.8%	47.6%	75.8%
	Neutral / No Opinion	3.7%	0.0%	3.0%
	OVERALL AVERAGE CONSENSUS SCORE	***25.8***	***14.5***	***13.7***

APPENDIX C

TABLE 1: AVERAGE INDEX SCORES BY PARTY

	NDP	Liberal Party	PC Party	All Respondents
POPULISM Index *(0 to 3 in populist direction)*	1.44	1.14	1.70	1.47
INDIVIDUALISM Index *(0 to 3 in individualist direction)*	0.30	0.95	1.85	1.10
MORALISM Index *(0 to 3 in moralist direction)*	0.67	1.05	1.85	1.25
CIVIL LIBERTIES Index *(0 to 3 in supportive direction)*	2.15	1.52	0.91	1.48
ENVIRONMENT Index *(0 to 3 in environmentalist direction)*	2.04	1.76	1.03	1.56
CONTINENTALISM Index *(0 to 3 in continentalist direction)*	0.48	0.95	1.76	1.12
SPENDING Index *(0 to 11 in pro-spending direction)*	6.74	5.70	4.27	5.46
PRIVATIZATION Index *(0 to 6 in pro-privatization direction)*	0.59	1.90	2.30	1.63
	N=27	N=21	N=33	N=81

TABLE 2: AVERAGE SPECTRUM SCORES BY PARTY*

	NDP	Liberal Party	PC Party	All Respondents
Grass Roots vs. Expert Governance	3.07	3.63	3.17	3.25
Public Services vs. Tax Cuts	2.85	3.84	5.12	4.03
More Socially Progressive vs. Less Socially Progressive	2.59	3.10	4.24	3.36
Civil Rights vs. Criminal Prosecution	3.38	4.16	4.87	4.18
Environmental Protection vs. Economic Growth	2.56	3.37	3.77	3.24
Economic Continentalist vs. Protectionist	4.67	4.42	4.03	4.26
Centralized vs. Decentralized Federalism	2.19	2.84	3.67	2.95
Public vs. Private Provision of Health Care	1.93	2.68	3.74	2.84
Overall Left/Right Spectrum	2.33	3.89	5.00	3.74
	N=26	N=19	N=29	N=74

**all spectrum scores range from 1 (far left; first option) to 7 (far right; latter option)*

ENDNOTES

[1] Voter turnout in the 1999 provincial election was 68 percent; in 2003, this figure dropped by 20 percent (or 14 percentage-points) to 54 percent. This was the lowest voter turnout in the province since 1946 (source: Elections Manitoba).
[2] A copy of the questionnaire is available at: http://www.ucalgary.ca/~jjwesley/mcs2003.htm .
[3]The reason for excluding minor parties is partly a matter of ethics, and partly a matter of comparability. In the first instance, Manitoba's minor parties ran very few candidates in the province's fifty-seven constituencies. The Green Party of Manitoba contested fifteen races, the Libertarians ran in six, and the Communist Party nominated candidates in five constituencies; only two Independents ran for office (source: Elections Manitoba). Creating an attitudinal profile of a party based on so few politicians would involve problems with confidentiality and anonymity. In the second instance, no frame of reference would exist to gauge our findings. Very little research has been conducted on Canada's minor parties, at either the federal or provincial levels. While this lack of data is regrettable, it is not within the scope of the present study to 'blaze this trail'.
[4] Ideological labeling is a delicate exercise. The terminology used in this paper combines definitions from a variety of sources (Adams 2001; Ball and Dagger 1999; Graf 1998; Love 1998; Campbell and Christian 1996; Foley 1994; Eatwell and Wright 1993; Eagleton 1991; Honderich 1990; Hagopian 1985; Sargeant 1981; Gilmour 1977; Plamenatz 1970; Horowitz 1966), and serves to operationally define various concepts for the following analysis.
[5] The so-called 'Third Way' was not an entirely new philosophy. Nor did it burst suddenly onto the scene in the 1990s. Rather, the 'Third Way' was the culmination of a process launched decades earlier. In Canada, the federal New Democratic Party had begun severing its ties with the Old Left in the late 1960s, abandoning the utopian goals of socialism in favor of a more practical (read: "liberal") approach toward politics (Campbell and Christian 1996, 130-141; Wesley 2004, 111-112).
[6] To Premier Doer, this meant altering the entire New Democratic outlook on elections and governance. "In the past," he noted following his election in 1999, "we used to have huge NDP policy weekends and would produce these fat books dedicated to policy. But [in 1999], we took a simpler approach, fearing that if we produced another 600-page document then we would almost certainly lose the election. In its place we produced five pledges and made sure that each one, and this is perhaps a novel idea, could be implemented once we became the government" (Doer 2000, 5).
[7] Also unconvinced, Alan Whitehorn doubted the ability of the NDP to continue as a truly social democratic party in this light. "The NDP as it currently exists may no longer be the best vehicle for social democracy. Like its predecessors, the Progressives and the CCF, the NDP may be coming to the end of its role, and it may be necessary to pass the torch to another and more vibrant standard bearer" (quoted in Campbell and Christian 1996, 150).
[8] Such was not always the case for the Manitoba Liberals. In the first half of the twentieth century, the Liberal-Progressives were a very ideologically succinct party, before continually vacillating between the left and the right, from leader to leader. See Wesley 2004, 47-65; Chorney and Hansen 1985, 13-14.
[9] The 2003 Liberal campaign platform employed a variety of elements from both the left and right. The party's rural and environmental strategies, in particular, showed strong 'reform liberal' influences, a presence that helped temper its neo-liberal approaches toward issues like health care and the economy. Dyck's assertion appears to hold true in this case: these divergent "forces" keep the party wavering on either side of the political centre. For a detailed discussion of the Liberal Party's 2003 platform, see Wesley 2004, 141-148.
[10] Due to the small-N involved, significance testing was not conducted. See Appendix B for reasoning, and a discussion of how attitudinal differences were calculated.
[11] For a detailed discussion of the attitudinal *distance* between the three parties, see Wesley 2004, 166-168. In addition, see Wesley 2004, 168-175 for analysis of the candidates' *perceptions* of the provincial political spectrum.
[12] Stainless steel contains iron, chromium, nickel, and carbon; Teflon consists carbon and fluorine; and Kevlar contains carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, and hydrogen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Ian. *Political Ideology Today.* 2nd Ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 2001.

Archer, Keith and Alan Whitehorn. "Opinion Structure Among Party Activists: A Comparison of New Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives." *Party Politics in Canada.* (8th Ed.) Hugh G. Thorburn and Alan Whitehorn, eds. Toronto: Prentice-Hall. 2001.

Ball, Terence and Richard Dagger. *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal.* 3rd Ed. Don Mills: Longman. 1999.

Barker, Paul. "Disentangling the Federation: Social Policy and Fiscal Federalism." *Challenges to Canadian Federalism*. Martin Westmacott and Hugh Mellon, eds. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada. 1998.

Berlin, David and Howard Aster. *What's Left?: The New Democratic Party in Renewal.* Oakville, ON: Mosaic Press. 2001.

Blair, Tony. *The Third Way: New Politics for the New Century*. London: Fabian Society. 1998.

Blais, Andre. *To Vote or Not to Vote: The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 2000.

Blake, Donald E. "Division and Cohesion: The Major Parties." *Party Democracy in Canada: The Politics of National Party Conventions.* George Perlin, ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall. 1988.

Blake, Donald E., R.K. Carty and Lynda Erickson. *Grassroots Politicians: Party Activists in British Columbia.* Vancouver: UBC Press. 1991.

Brodie, Janine and Jane Jenson. "Piercing the Smokescreen: Stability and Change in Brokerage Politics." in *Canadian Parties in Transition.* 3rd Ed. A. Brian Tanguay and Alain-G. Gagnon, eds. Toronto: Nelson Canada. 1996.

Campbell, Colin and William Christian. *Parties, Leaders and Ideologies in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson. 1996.

Carty, R.K. and David Stewart. "Parties and Party Systems." *Provinces: Canadian Provincial Politics.* Christopher Dunn, ed. Peterborough: Broadview. 1996. p. 75.

Chorney, Harold and Phillip Hansen. "Neo-Conservatism, Social Democracy and 'Province Building': the Experience of Manitoba." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. 22 (1985): 1-29.

Clarke, Harold. "The Ideological Self-Perceptions of Provincial Legislators." *Canadian Journal of Political Science.* 11 (1978): 617-33.

Clarke, Harold D., Jane Jenson, Lawrence LeDuc, and Jon H. Pammett. *Absent Mandate: Canadian Electoral Politics in an Era of Restructuring*. 3rd Ed. Toronto: Gage. 1996.

De Vaus, D.A. *Surveys in Social Research.* 5th Ed. London: Routledge. 2002.

Doer, Gary Hon. "Policy Challenges for the New Century: the Manitoba Perspective." Speech presented at the 2000 Donald Gow Lecture at Queen's University. www.queensu.ca/sps/calendar/gow/00Lecture.pdf (accessed: May 21, 2004).

Drummond, Robert. "Liberal Party Organization and Manitoba's 1995 Provincial Election." Master of Arts Thesis. University of Manitoba. 1995.

Dunn, Christopher. "Comparative Provincial Politics: A Review." *The Provincial State in Canada: Politics in the Provinces and Territories.* Keith Brownsey and Michael Howlett, eds. Peterborough: Broadview Press. 2001.

Dyck, Rand. *Provincial Politics in Canada.* Scarborough: Prentice Hall. 1996.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: an introduction.* London: Verso. 1991.

Eatwell, Roger and Anthony Wright. *Contemporary Political Ideologies*. Boulder: Westview Press. 1993.

Elections Manitoba Website. http://www.electionsmanitoba.ca. Accessed: May 21, 2004.)

Ellis, Faron and Keith Archer. "Ideology and Opinion Within the Reform Party." *Party Politics in Canada.* (8th Ed.) Hugh G. Thorburn and Alan Whitehorn, eds. Toronto: Prentice-Hall. 2001.

Foley, Michael. *Ideas That Shape Politics.* Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1994.

Gidengil, Elisabeth, Andre Blais, Neil Nevitte, and Richard Nadeau. *Citizens*. Vancouver: UBC Press. 2004.

Gilmour, Ian. *Inside Right.* London: Hutchinson. 1977.

Graf, William D. *Political Ideologies: The Enlightenment to the Present.* Toronto: Garamond Press. 1998.

Hagopian, Mark N. *Ideals and Ideologies of Modern Politics.* New York: Longman. 1985.

Honderich, Ted. *Conservatism.* Markham: Penguin Books. 1990.

Horowitz, Gad. "Conservatism, Liberalism and Socialism in Canada: An Interpretation," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* XXXII:2. May 1966.

Imbeau, Louis M. and Guy Lachapelle. "Comparative Provincial Public Policy in Canada." *Provinces: Canadian Provincial Politics*. Christopher Dunn, ed. Peterborough: Broadview Press. 1996.

Laver, Michael and W.B. Hunt. *Policy and Party Competition*. London: Routledge. 1992.

Love, Nancy. *Dogmas and Dreams: a reader in modern political ideologies.* 2nd Ed. Nancy Love, ed. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers. 1998.

Netherton, Alex. "The Shifting Points of Politics: A Neo-Institutional Analysis." *The Provincial State: Politics in Canada's Provinces and Territories.* Keith Brownsey and Michael Howlett, eds. Mississauga: Copp Clark Pitman. 1992. pp. 175-206.

Nevitte, Neil, Herman Bakvis, and Roger Gibbins. "The Ideological Contours of 'New Politics' in Canada: Policy, Mobilization and Partisan Support." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 22:3. 1989. pp. 473-503.

Patten, Steve. "'Toryism' and the Conservative Party in a Neo-Liberal Era." *Party Politics in Canada*. 8th Ed. Thorburn, Hugh G. ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada. 2001.

PC Manitoba. "Party Philosophy." *PC Manitoba Website*. http://www.pcmanitoba.com/PClegacy/legacy_philosophy.asp (accessed: May 21, 2004

Plamenatz, John. *Ideology*. New York: Praeger Publishers. 1970.

Prairie Research Associates. "Low Voter Turnout: A Survey of Voters and Non-voters". 2004. Elections Manitoba Website: http://www.electionsmanitoba.ca/pdf/MB_Voter_Turnout_Survey.pdf [accessed May 9, 2005]).

Sargent, Lyman Tower. *Contemporary Political Ideologies: A Comparative Analysis.* 5th Ed. Georgetown, ON: Irwin Dorsey Limited. 1981.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. *Captalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper. 1975 [1942].

Sigurdson, Richard. "Preston Manning and the Politics of Postmodernism in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science.* 27: 2. 1994. pp. 249-276.

Stewart, David and Keith Archer. *Quasi-Democracy?: Parties and Leadership Selection in Alberta.* Vancouver: UBC Press. 2000.

Wesley, Jared. "Spanning the Spectrum: Political Party Attitudes in Manitoba". Master of Arts Thesis. University of Manitoba. 2004. http://www.ucalgary.ca/~jjwesley/mcs2003.htm.

Wiseman, Nelson. "Social Democracy in a Neo-Conservative Age: The Politics of Manitoba and Saskatchewan." *Canada: The State of the Federation 2001: Canadian Political Culture(s) in Transition*. Hamish Telford and Harvey Lazar, Eds. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations. 2002.