




Award date: 2016-10-31

Contract # 35035-165058/001/CY

POR 061-16

POR@PCO-BCP.gc.ca



Privy Council Office Continuous Qualitative Data Collection of Canadians' Views – Second Round of Focus Groups

FINAL REPORT
March 24, 2017

Ipsos Public Affairs

1 Nicholas Street, Suite 1400

Ottawa ON K1N 7B7

Tel: 613.241.5802

Fax: 613.248.7981

www.ipsos.ca

« Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français »



Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
Background and Objectives	1
Overview of Methodology	2
Key Findings 3	
2. Detailed Findings	9
Themes Addressed.....	9
Government Actions.....	9
Bombardier.....	9
Electoral Reform.....	10
Health Care Transfers.....	10
Canada Savings Bonds	11
Canada – US relations.....	11
The Canadian Armed Forces.....	12
Justice	13
Housing.....	14
Business Program Innovation.....	15
Online - Net Neutrality	16
Themes	16
3. Appendix.....	20
Appendix A. Detailed Research Methodology	20
Appendix B. Recruitment Guide	22
Appendix C. Discussion Guides	28



Political Neutrality Statement

I hereby certify as Senior Officer of Ipsos that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.



Mike Colledge
President
Ipsos Public Affairs

1. Executive Summary

Background and Objectives

The Privy Council Office (PCO) is the hub of non-partisan, public service support to the Prime Minister and Cabinet and its decision-making structures. Led by the Clerk of the Privy Council, PCO helps the Government implement its vision and respond effectively and quickly to issues facing the government and the country.

As an advisor to the Prime Minister, PCO brings together quality, objective policy advice and information to support the Prime Minister and Cabinet, including information on the priorities of Canadians. To this end, the Communications and Consultation Secretariat within PCO supports the Prime Minister’s Office in coordinating government communications and setting broad government communications themes and messages, in accordance with government priorities, as determined by the Prime Minister, Cabinet, Cabinet committees and the Clerk of the Privy Council. The Secretariat also works with PCO policy secretariats to advise and support Cabinet and its committees.

In fulfilling its mandate, PCO required an ongoing cycle of qualitative data collection to ensure that it has up-to-date representations of Canadians’ opinions on macro-level issues that are of interest to the government, such as their views on what should be the priorities of the government. Additionally, such research increases the Government of Canada’s understanding of emerging trends, and measures Canadians’ views on key national issues and policy initiatives.

Through the use of an ongoing cycle of focus groups, PCO is gaining a solid understanding of Canadians’ views as they relate to the most important issues facing the country; their perceptions of how the federal government can best address these issues; expectations of actions related to government priorities; and perspectives on how the government can most effectively convey its efforts in dealing with emerging issues. This research helps inform the development of communications messages, products and dissemination tactics to respond to priority issues. Additionally, the research allows the Government of Canada to develop and refine communications activities to meet the specific needs of Canadians with timely, up-to-date, easily understood information based on the current perceptions of Canadians in the requisite areas.

This second wave of ongoing qualitative research was meant to gather feedback from Canadians on select issues and policy areas that are important to the Government of Canada. The issues discussed during focus groups differed from one location to the next. Topics covered included:

- Awareness of recent Government of Canada actions
- Support for Bombardier
- Awareness of recent announcements related to electoral reform
- Health care funding
- Canada-US relations
- Business Innovation Program
- Affordable Housing initiative

- Net neutrality
- The Canadian Armed Forces
- Justice
- Overall goals for the Government of Canada
- Energy and the environment

Overview of Methodology

This second wave of qualitative research was comprised of a series of twelve focus groups with Canadians aged 20 years old and above, held between February 15th and February 28th, 2017. All group discussions lasted approximately two hours and were conducted in the evening, with the first session in each city starting at 5:30pm and the second starting at 7:30pm. These sessions were held in the following locations:

- Montreal – February 15th
- Fredericton – February 16th
- Toronto – February 22nd
- London – February 23rd
- Winnipeg – February 27th
- Vancouver – February 28th

A total of 12 participants were recruited for each session to ensure that a minimum of eight to ten participants would attend. In total, 107 participants took part in the discussions. All participants received an honorarium of \$75 for attending the sessions at the focus group facilities. The screening questionnaire helped ensure that participants included a good cross-section of the general population, with good mixes of gender, ages, education and income levels, as well as household composition. Additional methodological details can be found in the appendix of this report.

This second wave of research is part of a continuous qualitative research project that will include a total of 144 focus groups to be held in multiple waves over the 2017 calendar year, with the option of renewing the cycle of research for two additional years. The contracted amount for this research project for calendar year 2017 is \$916,865.05, including HST.

Key Findings

Bombardier

Awareness of government support for Bombardier varied greatly by location. Predictably those in Montreal were more aware than their counterparts in Fredericton or Toronto. Few could provide exact details on the nature of Government of Canada support. As a rule, participants had more questions than answers:

- What was the exact nature of the financial commitment?
- Why was this support needed?
- How did it compare to what the Quebec Government had provided? (In Montreal)
- When was the contribution made and what were the modalities in place for repayment?
- Was appropriate for the federal government to be providing financial support to private industry? (raised in Fredericton and Toronto)

Most were reassured when provided with more details on the nature of the contribution and the fact that it was a repayable loan.

Electoral Reform

Awareness of electoral reform can best be characterized and mixed and for the most part superficial. A few participants in groups in Montreal, Fredericton, Toronto and London acknowledged having heard something about this. Comments tended to focus on the governments’ electoral promise to explore to explore electoral reform during the lead up to the last election, and this initiative would not be moving forward due to a lack of consensus on how this should be done. This outcome did not come as much of a surprise given what participants perceived to be a very complex undertaking.

Health Care Transfers

As part of a brief discussion on health care related issues participants in Montreal, Fredericton, London and Winnipeg were asked if they had heard anything related to health care and new funding arrangements between the federal government and their provincial government.

Some participants in Montreal and Fredericton mentioned negotiations on new funding arrangements between the federal government and certain provinces unprompted. Those with some familiarity, particularly those in Fredericton, said they had heard that the federal government wanted some of the funds targeted to mental health and long-term care. There were cursory references in each location related to the federal government having struck bilateral agreements with certain provinces and not with others. A number of participants in Fredericton expressed support for this approach.

Canada Savings Bonds

There was moderate awareness of Canada Savings Bonds (CSB) among participants in Montreal and Fredericton. There was marked indifference and no apparent strong attachment to the program and when queried as to the need for it to be maintained most felt that given the availability of other, more competitive financial products, as well as the likely costs associated with administering the program itself, the time had come for the program to be phased out.

Canada – US relations

Views on Canada – US relations were abundant among participants in Montreal, Fredericton, Toronto and London where this theme was explored. Comments tended to focus on the Prime Minister’s recent visit to Washington to meet with the US President. Most felt that the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada had done a good job of underscoring how Canada would respectfully continue to act in its own best interest while looking for opportunities to collaborate with the United States when it made sense to do so.

Most felt that that US concerns related to NAFTA were mainly focused on an apparent trade imbalance between the United States and Mexico. There were those who felt that Canada should be looking to diversify our trade in order to be less dependent on the US; CETA was cited as an example of this.

When challenged to consider areas for possible collaboration with the United States participants most often mentioned:

- The environment and climate change,
- Trade and Following this initial discussion, and
- Border security cooperation and domestic anti-terrorism security

The Canadian Armed Forces

Montreal participants were presented with a series of three possible broad objectives/mission statements that could potentially be used to define the Canadian Armed Forces and asked to take a few minutes to reflect on each of these objectives and to share their perspectives.

Statements tested were as follows:

- Strong at home (Force au pays)
- Secure in North America (Sécurité en Amérique du Nord), and
- Engaged in the World (Engagement dans le monde)

Of the three statements presented ‘Engaged in the world/Engagement dans le monde’ resonated most strongly. It was seen as in keeping with our long tradition of peacekeeping and of lending assistance to those abroad facing adversity due to natural disasters or otherwise. Furthermore, the use of the word ‘engaged’ was well received, it was likened to being ‘proactive’. This statement could refer to both humanitarian or military action and suggests active participation, rather than passive support.

Cyber Capabilities

Participants in both Montreal sessions were asked what came to mind when they heard the words ‘cyber capabilities’. For the most part, participants offered vague references to ‘data’, ‘technology’ and more generally, ‘the Internet’. When provided with additional context as to what was meant by cyber capabilities (i.e. ‘space-based surveillance and cyber security’) most felt that this should be an area of shared responsibility between CAF, the RCMP, other federal government law enforcement agencies and local law enforcement depending on the nature of the threat – i.e. drugs, fraud, cyber-crime, cyber-terrorism, etc.

Justice

When presented with a list of core objectives and asked which they felt should be the main objective of the Canadian Criminal Justice System (CJS) a number of participants stated that the **CJS should be focused on addressing the root problems behind the criminal activity**. Reasons most often used to justify this choice focused on reducing over-representation of marginalized communities in the criminal justice system. Indeed, much of the initial conversation tended to focus on crime prevention and ensuring fair and equitable treatment regardless of socio-economic attainment. Conversely, few said that the CJS should be focused **on being less hard on criminals**. Many participants expressed the view that the purpose of the criminal justice system was primarily two fold – preventing crime and ensuring reasonable punishment for crimes committed.

Most participants were in favour of mandatory minimum penalties as they are seen as a way of ensuring equal punishment among offenders of the same crime. Those less likely to support mandatory minimum penalties often spoke of the need to ensure judges had some discretionary powers to deal with the particular circumstances of each case presented to them.

Housing

Participants in Fredericton were presented with a short description of a Government of Canada program to provide loans at low cost to municipalities and housing developers who construct new affordable rental housing projects. Most were supportive of this concept, they saw this as an opportunity to promote innovative approaches to the development of affordable housing, a program that encourages the construction of affordable housing. Some concerns were raised however:

- Do developers really in need of this funding?
- Is this type of program somehow going to lead to privatization of government led affordable housing programs?
- Should the government not be spending time and money addressing the root cause that lead to the need for affordable rental housing?

During this exercise, participants were also provided with a list of potential names for the program. Participants generally preferred **Affordable Rental Housing Loan Program**, and **Affordable Rental Housing Construction Program**.

Business Program Innovation

The following exercise was conducted solely in focus groups facilitated in Fredericton. A government program was described to participants in which innovative businesses would be invited by the government to solve complex government problems by proposing their products as solutions. This program is intended to foster and promote the development of innovative business solutions that could benefit both the public and private sectors. Participants tended to be in favour of the program. Reasons most often cited for their support included:

- It would be effective in fostering innovation in Canada.
- It could benefit Canada as a whole and small businesses in Canada in the long run.
- It was better to look to Canadian small businesses for innovation rather than businesses

overseas.

Participants were then provided with a list of possible names for the program and asked to select their favourites, Names most often retained were:

- Innovative Solutions Canada (seen as descriptive, clear and simple yet encompassing the aims of the program)
- Solutions Canada (also simple and broadly speaks to innovation from coast to coast, focused on the ideas behind the problem being addressed – i.e. ‘the solution’)
- Canadian Business Innovation Research (most likely to sound like a government department/program)

Online - Net Neutrality

Focus group participants in Toronto, London, Winnipeg and Vancouver were questioned as to their familiarity with the concept of net neutrality. Awareness of this concept was low. Despite having been provided with this additional information, participants still struggled with the concept, a number of them equating it to internet censorship.

Code of Conduct for digital platforms

There was little appetite for a government regulated code of conduct for digital platforms such as Facebook and Google to ensure content reflected a diversity of views and local content. Many participants also viewed this as censorship stating that it is not governments’ role to filter content.

Fake News

Participants also discussed the role of digital platforms in providing accurate information in the context of ‘fake’ news. While regulation of accurate news is ideal, most felt it was not realistic due to an inconsistent definition of fake news. For most it is the role of citizens to filter their own news, as information accuracy is often based on individual bias.

Themes

Participants in Toronto and London were presented with a list of themes that might describe overarching goals for what the Government of Canada was trying to achieve. These themes were grouped into five broad sections. Participants were then asked to review each section and identify one theme within each that they preferred. They were subsequently asked to consider their five preferred themes and identify which of these resonated most positively with them.

The sections were as follows:

- **Section 1:** Building a strong middle class, Working for the middle class, Standing with the middle class
- **Section 2:** Progress for the middle class, The promise of progress, Building on progress
- **Section 3:** Skills, innovation, and middle class jobs, Middle class jobs in the new economy, tax fairness for the middle class
- **Section 4:** A healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada, A stronger Canada at home and

abroad, A strong and fair Canada at home and in the world

- **Section 5:** Infrastructure investments, Strong and prosperous communities, Building strong communities, Building and connecting communities

Overall Favoured Theme

Participants in Toronto selected “a healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada” as their preferred theme overall. It was seen as aspirational, underscored the need to strive for high standards both in terms of our innovative achievements while highlighting our reputation on the world stage as a caring nation.

Participants in London were less likely to express a strong preference for any one theme however “Building a strong middle class”, “Building on progress”, and “Strong and Prosperous Communities” tended to be retained.

The following discussions took place solely in Vancouver.

Opioids

Many participants were aware of opioid and fentanyl use and had heard of this issue in the news. Participants were in general agreement that producers and dealers of opioid and fentanyl were the root of the problem. Participants were not aware of any federal government assistance of any kind, for this issue.

Energy

Though many participants were aware of pipeline projects, their specific knowledge was limited. Participants were then provided with additional information on the Kinder Morgan Pipeline and asked to list potential benefits and concerns they had. Benefits discussed included jobs, tax revenues, and royalties. Concerns focused on potential spills, tankers and the pipeline being an eyesore.

Very few participants were aware of the Oceans Protection Plan. Once provided a brief description, participant concerns related to oil spills or pipelines remained.

The Port of Vancouver

Few participants were aware of the expansion of the Port of Vancouver. Participants felt they did not have sufficient information/knowledge to engage in a meaningful discussion discuss the expansion of the South Delta Port. When informed of plans to increase storage container capacity participants’ initial reactions were to express concerns about potential increased noise, truck traffic, and street congestion as well as effects on marine life and water access.

Note on Interpretation of Findings

Qualitative research is designed to reveal a rich range of opinions and interpretations rather than to measure what percentage of the target population holds a given opinion. These results must not be used to estimate the numeric proportion or number of individuals in the population who hold a particular opinion because they are not statistically projectable.

Focus group research on government priorities seeks to provide a deeper understanding of participants’ views, often complementing quantitative findings gathered through survey research. Discussions allow for deep probing on key issues that is not possible with quantitative research. This type of information is essential for the Privy Council Office in its role advising and supporting the Cabinet and its committees.

2. Detailed Findings

This section of the report presents the detailed findings from twelve focus group discussions held in six different locations across Canada. The section is organized thematically in order to best reflect the varying discussions held from one location to the next. The moderator’s guide was adapted slightly from one location to the next in order to focus on various question areas. Each iteration of the moderator’s guide can be found in the Appendices.

Themes Addressed

Government Actions

Participants were asked to relate what they had seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada recently. Items spontaneously mentioned covered a broad range of issues and included:

- The Prime Minister’s visit to Washington
- Electoral reform
- NAFTA
- Defence spending and NATO commitments
- Tax credits – loss of Child Tax Benefits
- Pipeline projects
- Marijuana legalization and testing
- Immigration and refugees
- Border control
- Softwood lumber negotiations
- Bill C23
- Housing
- Healthcare/wait times/ privatization/ bilateral funding agreements with certain provinces.

Designated (prompted) topics discussed in the focus groups included:

- Bombardier
- Electoral Reform
- Health Care Transfers
- Canada Savings Bonds
- Canada – US Relations
- The Canadian Armed Forces
- Justice
- Housing
- Business Program Innovation
- Online – Net Neutrality

Bombardier

Participants in Montreal, Fredericton and Toronto were asked whether they had heard anything recently about federal government support for Bombardier. Awareness varied greatly by location with those in Montreal somewhat more aware than their counterparts in Fredericton or Toronto. A few participants in each group spoke of the financial contribution made by the federal government in support of

Bombardier, although few were familiar with the details of the funding arrangement. Initial reactions ranged from questions related to the exact amount of the contribution, reasons for which it was necessary and additional details as to the exact nature of the financial commitment. Some, particularly those in Montreal, compared the federal government’s financial contribution to that of the contribution made by the Quebec provincial government, others wondered whether the contribution was made in a timely manner and yet others wanted additional details on if and how these moneys would be repaid.

Some participants, particularly in Fredericton and Toronto, wondered whether the federal government should be providing financial support to private industry and how this contribution could/would be seen by some of Canada’s trading partners, whereas others felt that such actions were acceptable if it meant ensuring Canadian jobs were maintained. When provided with additional details as to the nature of the federal government’s financial contribution to Bombardier a number of participants were reassured that this was a repayable contribution. Participants also generally agreed that targeting funds to research and development for the Global 7000 business jet and the C-Series aircraft made sense and would likely lead to advancements that would/could benefit other sectors of our economy.

Electoral Reform

Participants in Montreal, Fredericton, Toronto and London were asked if they had heard anything recently about electoral reform. A few participants in each location acknowledged having heard something about this. These participants simply recounted that the government had committed to explore electoral reform during the lead up to the last election, and that after some discussions and consultations, this initiative would not be moving forward as no consensus could be found on how to revise the current first past the post system. Some participants expressed disappointment with this outcome, whereas others were not surprised given the perceived complexity of such an undertaking.

Health Care Transfers

As part of a brief discussion on health care related issues participants in Montreal, Fredericton, London and Winnipeg were asked if they had heard anything related to health care and new funding arrangements between the federal government and their provincial government. Participants in all locations initially tended to speak of local or provincial government related health concerns such as health professional shortages, insufficient funding and lengthy delays in getting treatment due to unreasonable wait times.

A few participants, particularly in Montreal, noted that healthcare was a provincial responsibility and as such questioned the extent to which the federal government should get involved in healthcare related matters beyond ensuring healthcare transfers. Others in both Montreal and Fredericton mentioned negotiations on new funding arrangements between the federal government and certain provinces unprompted. Those with some familiarity, particularly those in Fredericton, said they had heard that the federal government wanted some of the funds targeted to mental health and long-term care.

Furthermore, a few individuals in each location spoke of how certain provinces had come to bilateral agreements on health care funding with the federal government. A number of participants in Fredericton stated that they saw this as a positive outcome for their province given negotiated assurances that

should other provinces strike a more favourable deal, this would also extend to the province of New Brunswick.

Canada Savings Bonds

There was moderate awareness of Canada Savings Bonds (CSB) among participants in Montreal and Fredericton. When participants were asked how they felt about them, most indicated they were indifferent. A number of participants wondered out loud whether they still existed. When further prompted as to the merits of the program and whether it was still relevant, most simply said that there were other financial products available to them that offered better returns. None of the participants expressed any strong attachment to the CSB program and a few questioned whether money spent to maintain and administer it made sense in the current context. When specifically asked whether the program should be maintained or phased out, the consensus was that it could be phased out.

Canada – US relations

Views on Canada – US relations were abundant among participants in Montreal, Fredericton, Toronto and London where this theme was explored. Initial comments tended to focus on the Prime Minister’s recent visit to Washington to meet with the US President. Participants in all locations generally felt that the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada had done a good job of underscoring how Canada would respectfully continue to act in its own best interest while looking for opportunities to collaborate with the United States when it made sense to do so. A number of participants made a point of noting with pride how Canada had differentiated itself from the US in how it was dealing with the recent refugee crisis. This was particularly true of participants in Montreal.

Many participants also referenced the US Presidents’ recent pronouncements on NAFTA and the desire to revisit this trade agreement. This discussion focused on the United States interest in exploring increased bilateral agreements rather than the current trilateral agreement. There was a general consensus in all sessions that US concerns related to NAFTA were mainly focused on an apparent trade imbalance between the United States and Mexico and that Canada would likely escape relatively unscathed. That said, a few participants felt that Canada should be looking at ways to further diversify our trade in order to be less dependent on the US; recent CETA negotiations were mentioned as an example of the types of things Canada should be doing.

Following this initial discussion, participants were encouraged to come up with examples of areas where opportunities existed for both countries (Canada and the United States) to work together. Areas most commonly mentioned included:

The environment and climate change: A number of participants noted that pollution has no borders and that clean air and water were in everyone’s interest, a few - particularly in London - spoke with some concern of the potential for water from the Great Lakes to become a tradeable commodity and how this would be managed given water shortages south of the border. Others spoke of pipeline projects and the need to work collaboratively to minimize environmental impacts.

Trade: Participants in all locations recognized the importance of our country’s trade relationship with the US to our economy and continued prosperity. A number of participants noted that our proximity to U.S.

and our enduring reliance on the U.S. market could be seen as both a benefit and a drawback. This trade relationship benefits us by ensuring relative stability, predictability and convenience as it relates to the flow of Canadian goods into the U.S. However, a few mentioned that there was an inherent danger in not seeking to further diversify our trade relationships.

Border security cooperation and domestic anti-terrorism security: Many participants felt it was important to collaborate with the US on both of these issues given the proximity of our countries to one another, the length of our shared border and the need to ensure a safe and secure North America.

The Canadian Armed Forces

Montreal participants were presented with a series of three possible broad objectives/mission statements that could potentially be used to define the Canadian Armed Forces and asked to take a few minutes to reflect on each of these objectives and to share their perspectives.

Statements tested were as follows:

- Strong at home (Force au pays)
- Secure in North America (Sécurité en Amérique du Nord), and
- Engaged in the World (Engagement dans le monde)

Engaged in the World (Engagement dans le monde)

Of the three statements presented ‘Engaged in the world/Engagement dans le monde’ resonated most strongly among those in both sessions. According to participants, this mission statement was more in line with their perception of what the Canadian Forces is about. Many referenced our long tradition of peacekeeping and of lending assistance to those abroad facing adversity due to natural disasters or otherwise. Others yet felt it important to underscore the use of the word ‘engaged’ which they likened to being ‘proactive’. In their estimation this could refer to both humanitarian or military action and suggests active participation, rather than passive support.

Strong at home (Force au pays)

Participants in both sessions expressed some reservation with this mission statement. For the most part they felt it was not consistent with their perception of Canada’s Armed Forces. There was a sense amongst some that this statement was somewhat boastful and did not accurately reflect our Armed Forces. Moreover, the use of the word ‘Strong’ or ‘Force’ in the French version was off putting for many who felt it was either not believable or too strong of a word in this context.

Secure in North America (Sécurité en Amérique du Nord)

This mission statement was met with mixed reactions. Some felt this mission was something we should be aspiring to and in that sense the Canadian Forces did have a role to play, however, most felt that ensuring security in North America was a shared task between multiple security organizations on both sides of the Canada-US border. Canadian security organizations most often mentioned included the RCMP, CBSA, the CAF, as well as local police services. As such, many had a hard time ascribing this statement solely to the Canadian Armed Forces. There was general agreement that it would be beneficial for Canada to work with our neighbours to the South in order to ensure a safe and secure North

America. That said, participants were quick to add that in so doing Canada should maintain and assert its independence.

NORAD

As part of the discussion related to ‘Secure in North America’ participants in Montreal focus groups were also asked if they were familiar with/had heard of NORAD. With the exception of one or two participants in each group, most were not familiar with the term although when further pressed most said that this type of collaboration between the US and Canada made sense in the current geo-political context.

Cyber Capabilities

Participants in both Montreal sessions were asked what came to mind when they heard the words ‘cyber capabilities’. For the most part, participants offered vague references to ‘data’, ‘technology’ and more generally, ‘the Internet’. One or two participants offered more specific feedback related to electronic surveillance and monitoring. When provided with additional context as to what was meant by cyber capabilities (i.e. ‘space-based surveillance and cyber security’) most felt that this should be an area of shared responsibility between CAF, the RCMP, other federal government law enforcement agencies and local law enforcement depending on the nature of the threat – i.e. drugs, fraud, cyber-crime, cyber-terrorism, etc.

Justice

When presented with a list of core objectives and asked which they felt should be the main objective of the Canadian Criminal Justice System (CJS) a number of participants stated that the **CJS should be focused on addressing the root problems behind the criminal activity**. These participants stated that addressing this objective would potentially help reduce what they observed as an over-representation of marginalized communities in the criminal justice system. Others said efforts should be made to **make the justice system more efficient**. Many participants equated this with **modernizing the justice system to reflect society today**. Conversely, few said that the CJS should be focused **on being less hard on criminals**. Many participants expressed the view that the purpose of the criminal justice system was primarily two fold – preventing crime and ensuring reasonable punishment for crimes committed.

Following the conversation on key objectives for the Canadian Criminal Justice System, participants were asked to reflect on mandatory minimum penalties for persons committing certain types of crimes such as certain offences involving firearms; sexual offences involving children; and impaired driving – in the case of a second or subsequent conviction. Participants in all sessions where this subject matter was discussed had at a minimum a passing understanding of what mandatory minimum penalties were. After an initial conversation, participants were asked, based on what they knew, whether they were in favour of mandatory minimum penalties. Many participants said they indeed supported the use of mandatory minimums. Reasons most often cited for this included that they ensure equal punishment among offenders of the same crime. Participants in all locations also noted the ability for mandatory minimum penalties to provide standardization to crimes, to ensure fair punishment regardless of varying levels of socio-economic attainment. Again, this is in line with the discussed purpose of the justice system of ensuring punishment and prevention.

Those less likely to support mandatory minimum penalties often spoke of the need to ensure judges had some discretionary powers to deal with the particular circumstances of each case presented to them. This view was more strongly held by participants in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. There were mixed views as to whether mandatory minimum penalties were effective means of crime prevention. While many participants felt that mandatory minimum penalties have the potential to act as a deterrent, they do not prevent crime. Some participants, particularly in Toronto, noted that mandatory minimums could potentially make the justice system more efficient by reducing sentencing time and hence, backlogs in the system. Conversely, a number of participants in London and Winnipeg thought mandatory minimums could be costly for the justice system as they can increase the number of those incarcerated.

Participants were also presented a hypothetical case in which the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that mandatory minimums violated Charter Rights, and were asked how the Government of Canada should respond. Participants in Fredericton and London discussed whether or not they believed mandatory minimums violate the Charter. Despite the varying views held on this, the consensus among participants in all locations was that if it was deemed that current legislation around mandatory minimums was in violation of the Charter, the law should be remedied in such a way that allows for mandatory minimums.

Housing

The following discussion took place solely in Fredericton focus groups. Participants were asked to read a short description of a Government of Canada program announced in last year’s federal budget. The program provides loans at a low cost to municipalities and housing developers who construct new affordable rental housing projects. In general, participants were supportive of this concept. This support was largely driven by what many saw as an opportunity to promote innovative approaches to the development of affordable housing, a program that encourages the construction of affordable housing which is in demand, and the general view that this is a suitable program for the Government to initiate. Though both groups were in favour of the general concept, they did voice several concerns. These include skepticism towards government loans for housing developers who some say are not in need of additional funds, and the perception that the program resembles a form of privatization of existing government led affordable housing programs, which made some participants uncomfortable. Lastly, there were those who felt that more time and effort should be focused on solving root causes that lead to the need for affordable housing. To ease several of these concerns, it was recommended by both groups that a regulatory board be established and details of the loan requirements be published.

During this exercise, participants were also provided with a list of potential names for the program. These included:

- Rental Housing Construction Program,
- Affordable Rental Housing Construction Program,
- Rental Housing Loan Program,
- Affordable Rental Housing Loan Program,
- Rental Housing Financing Program,
- Affordable Rental Housing Financing Program,
- Canada Builds Housing, and Canada Builds Affordable Housing.

Participants generally preferred **Affordable Rental Housing Loan Program**, and **Affordable Rental Housing Construction Program** as these were the most descriptive titles. Participants found the term ‘financing’ too vague and had a negative sentiment, and preferred ‘loan’ as it was more specific. Participants also felt it was appropriate to have ‘affordable’ in the title.

While discussing the list of potential program names, a number of participants made a point of stating that it was somewhat curious that all of the options presented referred to the relationship between the government and the builder and made no reference to the ultimate beneficiary of such a program, namely, residents of affordable housing. These participants noted that there was a risk that the general public would assume the title refers to the relationship between the government and residents of affordable housing, and misinterpret the program as one targeted towards residents in affordable housing and not developers.

Business Program Innovation

The following exercise was conducted solely in focus groups facilitated in Fredericton. A government program was described to participants in which innovative businesses would be invited by the government to solve complex government problems by proposing their products as solutions. This program is intended to foster and promote the development of innovative business solutions that could benefit both the public and private sectors.

Overall, in theory participants were in favour of the program. Some participants felt that the program would be effective in fostering innovation in Canada. Others were supportive of the program as they felt it could benefit Canada as a whole and small businesses in Canada in the long run. They felt it was better to look to Canadian small businesses for innovation rather than businesses overseas. There were however some concerns as to how the program would be administered and specifically, how companies would be chosen. Some mentioned the Phoenix system and DND contracts as examples in order to underscore their concerns. This led some to question the feasibility of such a program and others to suggest that it should be tested before fully implemented.

Participants were then provided with a list of possible names for the program and asked to select their favourites, based on the short description provided. Many participants opted for names they felt had positive wording or titles that sounded like a government department. Names most often retained were:

- Innovative Solutions Canada (seen as descriptive, clear and simple yet encompassing the aims of the program)
- Solutions Canada (also simple and broadly speaks to innovation from coast to coast, focused on the ideas behind the problem being addressed – i.e. ‘the solution’)
- Canadian Business Innovation Research (most likely to sound like a government department/program)

Titles such as **Canada Innovates**, **Canadian Innovation Marketplace** and **Canada Buys Innovation** were not favoured as participants felt they were too vague and did not accurately describe the program as they understood it.

Online - Net Neutrality

Focus group participants in Toronto, London, Winnipeg and Vancouver were questioned as to their familiarity with the concept of net neutrality. Awareness of this concept was relatively low. A few participants in each location ventured to provide an explanation of this concept. Participants were presented with a brief description of net neutrality and subsequently prompted for their views. Despite having been provided with this additional information, participants still struggled with the concept. A number of participants equated this concept with internet censorship. In fact, in all four locations the majority of the discussion on net neutrality focused on concerns about internet censorship, rather than accessibility.

Participants were asked their opinion on a government regulated code of conduct for digital platforms such as Facebook and Google to ensure content reflected a diversity of views and local content. Many participants also viewed this as censorship stating that it is not governments’ role to filter content. Those in Winnipeg positioned the role of government as at best an enabler ensuring local content was available, however indicated it should not take on an enforcement role. Those in Toronto felt that as the internet is a global platform, Canadian government control and intervention of content is not feasible. Lastly, participants in London felt that if content curation were to take place, it should be done by businesses that provide content rather than the Canadian government.

Next, participants discussed the role of digital platforms in providing accurate information in the context of ‘fake’ news. Many agreed that while regulation of accurate news is ideal, is it unattainable due to an inconsistent definition of fake news. Those in London, Toronto and Winnipeg agreed that it is the role of citizens to filter their own news, as information accuracy is often based on individual bias. Individuals in Toronto and London also indicated that businesses have the responsibility to fact check, but solely for business integrity purposes. Many participants viewed regulation of digital platforms as a form of censorship.

Themes

Participants in Toronto and London were presented with a list of themes that might describe overarching goals for what the Government of Canada was trying to achieve. These themes were grouped into five broad sections. Participants were then asked to review each section and identify one theme within each that they preferred. They were subsequently asked to consider their five preferred themes and identify which of these resonated most positively with them.

The sections were as follows:

Section 1: *Building a strong middle class, Working for the middle class, Standing with the middle class*

Participants in Toronto did not discuss this section, choosing to focus on others, while those in London selected “A Stronger Middle Class” as the theme that resonated the most. Those who favoured this option most often stated that middle class jobs drive the economy. However, when prompted, participants were hard pressed to provide a clear definition of what, in their opinion, constituted a middle class job.

Section 2: *Progress for the middle class, The promise of progress, Building on progress*

Participants in both Toronto and London selected “Building on progress”. Participants, particularly those in London, stated that they preferred this theme because it sounded as though the government was moving towards a goal. Although not explicitly referenced in the statement, a number of participants linked ‘Building on progress’ with the prospect of a stronger economy, which would in turn lead to job creation and stronger communities.

Section 3: *Skills, innovation, and middle class jobs, Middle class jobs in the new economy, tax fairness for the middle class*

“Skills, innovation, and middle class jobs” was the preferred option among themes presented in this section in both Toronto and London. A number of participants (particularly in Toronto) stated that this theme spoke to the importance of education, which in turn translates to better jobs and a stronger workforce. It should be noted however that for some the term “middle class jobs” lacked in specificity, and asked what kind of jobs were being referenced here specifically. Participants in both locations suggested perhaps the reference here should be to “high-paying jobs” rather than “middle class jobs”.

Section 4: *A healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada, A stronger Canada at home and abroad, A strong and fair Canada at home and in the world*

“A healthier, stronger and more caring Canada” was a clear favourite in Toronto. This theme was seen as all-encompassing and spoke to strengthening communities which results in a more productive and stronger Canada. Reactions were somewhat more mixed in London, some selected “A strong and fair Canada at home and in the world” saying they felt this option was more relatable to the middle class, and focused on building Canada. Others opted for “A healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada” which was in their estimation more aspirational in tone.

Section 5: *Infrastructure investments, Strong and prosperous communities, Building strong communities, Building and connecting communities*

Participants in London chose “strong and prosperous communities” as it represented a promise that is relatable to all Canadians and sets clear goals. “Infrastructure Investments” was the preferred theme in Toronto. According to these participants, infrastructure investments, or lack thereof, directly impact individuals across the country; in particular, poor public transit, and inaccessibility in Northern communities were referenced here. A number of participants in Toronto noted that increasing infrastructure investments would serve to address long needed infrastructure shortfalls as well as provide an avenue for job creation.

Overall Favoured Theme

Participants in Toronto selected “a healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada” as their preferred theme overall. It was seen as aspirational, underscored the need to strive for high standards both in terms of our innovative achievements while highlighting our reputation on the world stage as a caring nation.

Participants in London were less likely to express a strong preference for any one theme however “Building a strong middle class”, “Building on progress”, and “Strong and Prosperous Communities” tended to be retained. Based on focus group discussions it appears that themes with the word “building” were preferred as participants felt this represented moving towards a goal, moving forward, and strengthening the economy.

The following discussions took place solely in Vancouver.

Opioids

Many participants were aware of opioid and fentanyl use and had heard of this issue in the news. Participants were in general agreement that producers and dealers of opioid and fentanyl were the root of the problem. Participants were not aware of any federal government assistance of any kind, for this issue. They were then provided with information about the health accord signed between the British Columbia and Canadian federal government, including specific funding for combatting opioid use. Many participants said they had not heard of the accord, nor the specific funding for the opioid issue. Participants felt the monetary amount allocated to this issue was minimal and others felt that alternative government actions would have a greater impact. Suggested additional federal government solutions included mental health funding and additional funds to target this issue.

Energy

Though many participants were aware of pipeline projects, their specific knowledge was limited. Participants were then provided with additional information on the Kinder Morgan Pipeline and asked to list potential benefits and concerns they had. Benefits discussed included jobs, tax revenues, and royalties. Participants were concerned with potential spills, tankers and the pipeline being an eyesore. The discussion then shifted to the Oceans Protection Plan, a government program concerned with coastal protection investing in spill prevention, spill response and a pollution charge to businesses for an oil spill. Nearly all participants were unaware of this program. Once provided a brief description, participants did not feel as though this program eased their concerns with oil spills, nor did it ease their concerns about pipelines, in particular the Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

The Port of Vancouver

The discussion then shifted to the expansion of the Port of Vancouver, a topic many participants were not familiar with. When discussing the expansion of the South Delta Port, there was not a lot of interest in the topic as participants felt they did not know enough about the project, however, were interested in learning more about dredging and long term expansion plans. The next expansion project, increasing storage container capacity, garnered more interest among group participants. Participants felt this

expansion could lead to an increase in noise, truck traffic, and street congestion. Other concerns included the projects effect on marine life and water access.

3. Appendix

Appendix A. Detailed Research Methodology

This wave of qualitative research is part of a continuous qualitative research project that will include a total of 144 focus groups to be held in multiple waves (up to 18 separate waves) over the 2017 calendar year, with the option of renewing the yearly cycle of research for two additional years.

This second wave was comprised of a series of twelve focus groups, held between February 21st and February 28th, 2017. All group discussions lasted approximately two hours and were conducted in the evening, with the first session in each city starting at 5:30pm and the second starting at 7:30pm. These sessions were held in the following locations:

- Montreal – February 15th
- Fredericton – February 16th
- Toronto – February 22nd
- London – February 23rd
- Winnipeg – February 27th
- Vancouver – February 28th

A total of 12 participants were recruited for each session to ensure that a minimum of eight to ten participants would attend. In total, 107 participants took part in the discussions. All participants received an honorarium of \$75 for attending the sessions at the focus group facilities.

Group participants were meant to be representative of the Canadian population aged 20 years and above in all locations. They were recruited using a formal recruitment screening questionnaire administered via a telephone interview. The screening questionnaire helped ensure that participants included a good cross-section of the general population, with good mixes of gender (half men and half women in all groups), ages, education and income levels, as well as household composition. The fully-detailed recruiting questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

The recruitment screener was devised by Ipsos in collaboration with PCO and in accordance with the specifications of the project authority, the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Qualitative Research (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/rop-por/rechqual-qualres-eng.html>) and following all Market Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA) standards and guidelines for the conduct of qualitative research. All groups were moderated by an Ipsos research professional.

In accordance with the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Qualitative Research, and the MRIA guidelines for the conduct of qualitative research, Ipsos informed participants of their rights under Privacy Law. Ipsos provided participants with details specific to the conduct of the groups, and obtained their consent for audio/video taping of the discussion, the presence of observers, explained the purpose of the one-way mirror, basic rules about privacy and confidentiality including the fact that tapes will be destroyed according to MRIA guidelines, and that participation was voluntary.

As is standard with qualitative research done on behalf of the Government of Canada, the following conditions were also applied for all participants recruited for this study:

- They had not participated in a discussion group within the last six months;
- They had not attended, in the past two years, a focus group discussion or in-depth interview on issues related to the topic at hand;
- They had not attended five or more focus groups or in-depth interviews in the past five years;
- At least one third of the participants recruited for each group must never have attended a group discussion or in-depth interview before;
- They had a sufficient command of English (or French for the Drummondville groups) to fully participate in the focus group sessions; and,
- They or their family are not employed in any of the following:
 - A research firm
 - A magazine or newspaper
 - An advertising agency or graphic design firm
 - A political party
 - A radio or television station
 - A public relations company
 - Federal or provincial government

As with all research conducted by Ipsos, contact information was kept entirely confidential and all information that could allow for the identification of participants was removed from the data, in accordance with the *Privacy Act* of Canada.

Appendix B. Recruitment Guide

Recruitment Screener Government of Canada

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from Ipsos, a national public opinion research firm. On behalf of the Government of Canada we're organizing a series of discussion groups with Canadians to explore current issues of importance to the country. A variety of topics will be discussed and we are interested in hearing your opinions.

EXPLAIN FOCUS GROUPS. About ten people like you will be taking part, all of them randomly recruited just like you. For their time, participants will receive an honorarium of \$75. But before we invite you to attend, we need to ask you a few questions to ensure that we get a good mix and variety of people. May I ask you a few questions?

- Yes **CONTINUE**
- No **THANK AND TERMINATE**

Participation is voluntary. No attempt will be made to sell you anything or change your point of view. The format is a “round table” discussion lead by a research professional. All opinions expressed will remain anonymous and views will be grouped together to ensure no particular individual can be identified.

S1) Do you or any member of your household work in or has retired from:

	YES	NO
Market Research or Marketing	1	2
Public Relations or Media (TV, Print)	1	2
Advertising and communications	1	2
An employee of a political party	1	2
An employee of a government department or agency, whether federal or provincial	1	2

IF “YES” TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, THANK AND TERMINATE

S2) Are you a Canadian citizen at least 20 years old who normally resides in the [INSERT LOCATION] area?

- Yes 1 **CONTINUE**
- No 2 **THANK AND TERMINATE**

S3) How long have you lived in [CITY]? _____

TERMINATE IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS

S4) Are you the head or co-head of your household?

Yes	1	CONTINUE
No	2	THANK AND TERMINATE

S5) Have you ever attended a consumer group discussion, an interview or survey which was arranged in advance and for which you received a sum of money?

Yes	1	MAX. 1/3 PER GROUP
No	2	GO TO Q1

S6) How long ago was it? _____

TERMINATE IF IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS

S7) How many consumer discussion groups have you attended in the past 5 years?

TERMINATE IF MORE THAN 4 DISCUSSION GROUPS

ASK ALL

Q1) Could you please tell me what age category you fall in to? Are you...

Under 20	0	THANK AND TERMINATE
20-24 years	1	} ENSURE GOOD MIX PER GROUP
25-34 years	2	
35-44 years	3	
45-54 years	4	
55-64 years	5	
65+ years	6	
Refuse	9	THANK AND TERMINATE

Q2) Do you currently have children under the age of 18 living in the house with you?
[RECRUIT MIX]

Yes	1
No	2

Q2a) Do you currently have children under the age of 13 living in the house with you?
[RECRUIT MIN 3 per group]

Yes	1
No	2

Q3) How many people above the age of 18 are there in your household?

One	1
More than one	2

Q4) Could you please tell me what is the last level of education that you have completed?

Some high school	1	}	ENSURE
Completed high school	2		GOOD
Some College/University	3		MIX PER
Completed College/University	4		GROUP
RF/DK	9		

Q5) What is your current employment status?

Working full-time	1	}	MAX 3 PER GROUP
Working part-time	2		
Self-employed	3		
Retired	4		
Currently not working	5		
Student	6		
Other	7		
DK/RF	9		

Q6) [IF EMPLOYED/RETIRED] What is/was your current/past occupation?
(PLEASE SPECIFY)

Q7) Which of the following categories best describes your total household income? That is, the total income of all persons in your household combined, before taxes **[READ LIST]**?

Under \$20,000	1	}	Ensure good mix by...
\$20,000 to just under \$ 40,000	2		Recruiting 2-3 from the below \$40K category
\$40,000 to just under \$ 60,000	3		
\$60,000 to just under \$ 80,000	4		
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	5		Recruiting 3-4 from the between \$40 and \$80K category
\$100,000 to just under \$150,000	6		
\$150,000 and above	7		Recruiting 5-6 from the above
DK/RF	99		

Q8) **DO NOT ASK – NOTE GENDER**

Male	1	} ENSURE 50-50 SPLIT
Female	2	

Q9) If you won a million dollars what would be the first two things you would do with the money? (**MUST HAVE TWO RESPONSES TO ACCEPT. TERMINATE IF FLIPPANT, COMBATIVE OR EXHIBITS DIFFICULTY IN RESPONDING**)

TERMINATE IF RESPONDENT OFFERS ANY REASON SUCH AS SIGHT OR HEARING PROBLEM, A WRITTEN OR VERBAL LANGUAGE PROBLEM, A CONCERN WITH NOT BEING ABLE TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY OR IF YOU HAVE A CONCERN.

During the discussion, you will be audio- and videotaped. This taping is being done to assist us with our report writing. Also, in this room there is a one-way mirror. Sitting behind the mirror may be Government of Canada staff, including members of the staff from the department that sponsored this research, and by staff members from Ipsos. This is standard focus group procedure to get a first-hand look at the research process and to hear first-hand your impressions and views on the research topic.

Do you agree to be observed for research purposes only?

Yes	1	THANK & GO TO INVITATION
No	2	THANK & TERMINATE

******(IN EACH LOCATION, PLEASE ENSURE TWELVE (12) PARTICIPANTS ARE RECRUITED FOR 8-10 TO SHOW)******

[Read to Stand-by Respondents]

Thank you for answering my questions. Unfortunately, at this time, the group you qualify for is full. We would like to place you on our stand-by list. This means that if there is an opening in the group, we would then call you back and see if you are available to attend the discussion. May I please have a daytime contact number, an evening contact number and an email address, if you have one, so that we can contact you as soon as possible if an opening becomes available?

[RECORD CONTACT INFO]

[Read to Screened in Respondents]

Wonderful, you qualify to participate in one of these group discussions which will take place on, (DATE) @ (TIME) for no more than 2 hours. The Government of Canada is sponsoring this research. All those who participate will receive a **\$75** honorarium as a thank you for their time.

Do you have a pen handy so that I can give you the address where the group will be held? It will be held at:

Location	Time	Date
Montreal Ad Hoc Research 400 de Maisonneuve Blvd West, Suite 1200	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	February 15 ^h , 2017
Fredericton Crowne Plaza, Fredericton 659 Queen Street	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	February 16 th , 2017
Toronto Head Research, Toronto 1255 Bay Street, 3 rd Floor	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	February 22 nd , 2017
London, Ont Insights, London 546 Adelaide Street North	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	February 23 rd , 2017
Winnipeg Prairie Research Associates, 363 Broadway, Suite 500	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	February 27 th , 2017
Vancouver Ipsos 1285 West Pender Street, Suite 200	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	February 28 th , 2017

We ask that you arrive at least 20 minutes early to be sure you locate the facility and have time to check-in with the hosts. Prior to being admitted into the focus group room you will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement, failure to do so will result in you being denied participation in the focus group session for which you have been selected. Payment of the incentive is contingent on participation in the focus group sessions.

In addition, we will be checking your identification prior to the group, so please be sure to bring two pieces of government issued photo identification with you (i.e. driver’s license, health card or other). Also, if you require glasses for reading, please bring them with you.

As we are only inviting a small number of people, your participation is very important to us. We have invited you to participate based on the questions we went through a moment ago, so we

ask that you do not send a representative on your behalf should you be unable to participate. **IF FOR SOME REASON YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND, PLEASE CALL SO THAT WE MAY GET SOMEONE TO REPLACE YOU.** You can reach us at 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx at our office. Someone will call you the day before to remind you about the discussion.

What would be a good time to reach you?

And at what telephone numbers?

May I please get your name? ON FRONT PAGE

Thank you very much for your help!

Appendix C. Discussion Guides

MONTREAL MODERATOR’S GUIDE – FEBRUARY 15th 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (20 minutes)

- Qu’avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu récemment au sujet du gouvernement du Canada?

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont entendu parler de l’aide du gouvernement fédéral accordée à Bombardier?
 - Pouvez-vous me décrire dans vos propres mots de quoi il s’agit?

PRÉCISER AU BESOIN :

Le gouvernement du Canada a annoncé qu’il octroie une contribution remboursable de 372,5 millions de dollars à Bombardier inc. Les fonds seront versés sur quatre ans et serviront à financer la recherche et le développement entourant le nouvel avion d’affaires Global 7000 ainsi que les activités en cours liées au développement des avions de la C Series.

- Qu’en pensez-vous? S’agit-il d’une bonne ou d’une mauvaise chose?
 - SONDER : Quels sont les avantages de ce financement?
 - SONDER : Avez-vous des préoccupations?

- Qu’avez-vous entendu récemment au sujet des soins de santé?
 - Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet d’ententes de financement entre les gouvernements fédéral et provincial? (Le cas échéant, veuillez me décrire dans vos propres mots de quoi il s’agit.)

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont entendu parler de la réforme électorale? Qu’avez-vous entendu exactement?

CANADA-ÉTATS-UNIS (20 minutes)

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont récemment entendu parler des relations entre le Canada et les États-Unis? Qu’avez-vous entendu au juste?

- Le Canada devrait-il changer sa façon de traiter avec les États-Unis? Si oui, de quelle manière?

- Quels sont les principaux enjeux sur lesquels le Canada et les États-Unis devraient se pencher conjointement?

HANDOUT

- J’ai ici un document qui mentionne certains enjeux. Veuillez classer les trois principaux enjeux qui, selon vous, devraient être abordés par les gouvernements canadien et américain.
 - *Enjeux : environnement et changements climatiques; traitement réservé aux minorités; immigration et réfugiés; oléoducs; échanges commerciaux; sécurité antiterroriste; interventions militaires conjointes outremer; réduction de l’attente aux frontières; coopération en matière de sécurité des frontières*
- (SI LE TEMPS LE PERMET) Quels sont précisément les points à discuter concernant l’enjeu que vous avez classé au premier rang?

DÉFENSE (30 minutes)

- Je vais vous citer quelques objectifs généraux qui pourraient être attribués aux Forces armées canadiennes – à la manière d’énoncés de mission. Gardez à l’esprit qu’il s’agit uniquement de quelques mots; ils n’ont pas pour but de décrire toutes les activités de l’organisation.

Lire tous les éléments, puis discuter :

Force au pays

- Qu’est-ce que cela signifie pour vous?
 - Croyez-vous que ces mots décrivent le rôle actuel des Forces armées canadiennes?

Sécurité en Amérique du Nord

- Qu’est-ce que cela signifie pour vous?
 - Croyez-vous que ces mots décrivent le rôle actuel des Forces armées canadiennes?
- Croyez-vous que les Forces armées canadiennes devraient travailler plus étroitement qu’à l’heure actuelle avec les Américains?
- Qui ici a entendu parler du NORAD?
 - SONDER : Que fait le NORAD? S’agit-il d’une organisation importante?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

The North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) is a United States and Canada bi-national organization charged with the missions of aerospace warning and aerospace control for North America.

In close collaboration with homeland defense, security, and law enforcement partners, NORADS missions are to prevent air attacks against North America, safeguard the sovereign airspaces of the United States and Canada by responding to unknown, unwanted, and unauthorized air activity approaching and operating within these airspaces, and provide aerospace and maritime warning for North America.

Engagement dans le monde

- Qu’est-ce que cela signifie pour vous?
 - Croyez-vous que ces mots décrivent le rôle actuel des Forces armées canadiennes?

- Maintenant, si je vous parlais des « cybercapacités » des Forces armées canadiennes, à quoi ferais-je notamment référence selon vous?
 - Les cybercapacités comprennent la surveillance spatiale et la cybersécurité. S’agit-il de domaines dans lesquels les Forces armées canadiennes devraient agir davantage selon vous?
 - Actuellement, le Canada accuse du retard sur beaucoup de pays en matière de cybercapacités. Le Canada devrait-il s’efforcer de devenir un chef de file mondial en ce qui concerne les cybercapacités dans le milieu militaire; devrait-on essayer de rattraper les autres pays à ce chapitre ou s’agit-il d’un domaine dans lequel les Forces armées ne devraient pas s’impliquer?
 - SONDER : Qu’est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
 - (Si les Forces armées ne doivent pas s’impliquer dans ce domaine) : Croyez-vous qu’un autre organisme devrait être chargé d’agir ou plutôt que le Canada ne doit pas s’impliquer dans ce domaine?

- Que pensez-vous de l’achat des équipements suivants par l’Armée canadienne :
 - Chasseurs à réaction
 - Véhicules téléguidés armés, parfois appelés drones
 - Navires
 - Navires amphibies multimissions (PRÉCISER AU BESOIN : Il s’agit de véhicules marins pouvant accoster dans des conditions difficiles, notamment dans des endroits où il n’y a pas de port ni de quai adapté.)

JUSTICE (40 minutes)

- Si vous aviez à expliquer notre système de justice pénale à un enfant, comment décririez-vous sa principale raison d’être?
 - Certains disent que le système sert à **punir** les criminels, certains disent qu’il sert à **prévenir** le crime et certains disent qu’il sert à **réadapter** les criminels. Est-ce qu’une de ces utilités résonne avec vos croyances?
- Selon vous, le système de justice du Canada gagnerait-il à subir de vastes changements?

HANDOUT

- Je vais vous distribuer un document comportant des objectifs généraux qui se rattachent au système de justice pénale. Pour chacun d’eux, veuillez indiquer votre approbation (pouce en l’air) ou votre désapprobation (pouce en bas) en pensant aux efforts que le gouvernement fédéral devrait y consacrer. Encerclez ensuite deux ou trois objectifs qui vous semblent prioritaires.

NOTE: IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER HERE FOR EASE OF REFERENCE; DOES NOT NEED TO BE PRESENTED THIS WAY TO PARTICIPANTS

Agir davantage pour gérer les facteurs sociaux à l’origine des activités criminelles

Agir davantage pour prendre en compte la situation des groupes marginalisés et vulnérables

Agir davantage pour réadapter les délinquants

Mettre davantage l’accent sur la prévention du crime

Donner des sentences plus sévères aux délinquants

Rendre le système de justice pénale plus équitable

Rendre le système de justice pénale plus rapide, réduisant ainsi les délais du système judiciaire

Rendre le système de justice pénale plus transparent et clair en ce qui concerne les règles et les lignes directrices

Rendre le système de justice pénale plus intelligent

Favoriser une confiance et une loyauté accrues envers le système de justice pénale

Réduire les risques de condamner des innocents

Réduire les coûts liés au système de justice pénale

- Parlons maintenant de quelques-uns de ces objectifs. Qui a dit que l’on devrait « rendre le système de justice plus intelligent »? Sans égard à vos sélections précédentes, qu’est-ce que cela signifie pour vous?
 - Que penseriez-vous d’une série de réformes ayant pour but de « rendre le système de justice plus intelligent »? Je comprends que chaque réforme est à considérer individuellement. Mais que penseriez-vous d’une initiative qui servirait cet objectif général?

- Qui a dit que l’on devrait « rendre le système de justice plus équitable »? Sans égard à vos sélections précédentes, qu’est-ce que cela signifie pour vous?
 - Qui n’est pas traité équitablement à l’heure actuelle?
 - Comment pourrait-on rendre le système de justice plus équitable?
 - SONDER au besoin : Faudrait-il adopter de nouvelles lois, revoir l’application des lois ou changer d’attitude?
 - Selon vous, la prise en compte de la situation personnelle de chacun rendrait-elle le système plus équitable?

Qui a encerclé « agir davantage pour prendre en compte la situation des groupes marginalisés et vulnérables »?

- Trouvez-vous que certains groupes sont actuellement surreprésentés dans le système de justice pénale?
 - SONDER au besoin : Pourquoi, à votre avis?
- Croyez-vous que ces populations sont traitées de manière non équitable à l’heure actuelle?
 - SONDER : Qu’est-ce que vous fait dire cela?

Qui a encerclé « gérer les facteurs sociaux à l’origine des activités criminelles »?

- (Le cas échéant) Quels sont quelques-uns des facteurs sociaux sous-jacents?

- Je vais vous lire deux titres d’appel qui pourraient servir à décrire des projets de réforme du système de justice pénale au Canada. Gardez à l’esprit qu’une courte phrase ne peut tout résumer. Je veux juste savoir comment vous réagiriez si vous entendiez parler d’un projet gouvernemental axé sur chacun des éléments suivants :

Transformer le système de justice pénale

Assurer notre protection et celle de nos collectivités et de nos droits

Transformer le système de justice pénale

Assurer votre protection et celle de vos collectivités et de vos droits

- Quelle est votre réaction à ces titres d’appel? Que penseriez-vous d’un projet gouvernemental allant dans ce sens?
 - SONDER : Y a-t-il une chose en particulier que vous aimez ou qui vous dérange à propos de ces titres d’appel?
- Seule la seconde phrase change. Avez-vous une préférence pour l’une des deux versions? Percevez-vous une quelconque différence entre les deux?

- Connaissez-vous le concept de peines minimales obligatoires?
 - Pouvez-vous m’expliquer de quoi il s’agit?
 - À l’heure actuelle, le Canada adhère-t-il au concept de peines minimales obligatoires? Pour quels crimes?

PRÉCISER AU BESOIN :

Le Code criminel du Canada décrit diverses infractions qui se rattachent à une peine minimale obligatoire. Certaines infractions, par exemple, s’accompagnent d’une période d’incarcération minimale donnée, notamment des infractions avec usage d’armes à feu; des infractions sexuelles envers un enfant et la conduite avec facultés affaiblies (p. ex., en cas de récidive ou de nouvelle récidive).

- Êtes-vous d’accord ou en désaccord avec l’application de peines minimales obligatoires?

- Quels sont les avantages et les inconvénients liés aux peines minimales obligatoires? (Inscrire les réponses sur le tableau de papier)

- Croyez-vous que les peines minimales obligatoires rendent le système de justice pénale plus équitable ou moins équitable?
 - SONDER (si moins équitable) : Moins équitable pour qui?
 - SONDER (si plus équitable) : Plus équitable pour qui?

- Croyez-vous que les peines minimales obligatoires sont efficaces pour prévenir la criminalité?

- Certains disent que les peines minimales obligatoires allouent moins de latitude aux juges pour rendre leur décision dans un dossier donné. Croyez-vous que les juges devraient bénéficier d’un pouvoir discrétionnaire pour se prononcer sur une affaire?

- Supposons que, dans une situation donnée, la Cour suprême stipule qu’une peine minimale obligatoire va à l’encontre de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, comment le gouvernement du Canada devrait-il réagir?
 - SONDER AU BESOIN : Dans un tel cas, la peine minimale obligatoire devrait-elle être abrogée? Le gouvernement devrait-il créer de nouvelles lois? Ou agir autrement?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

FREDERICTON MODERATOR’S GUIDE – FEBRUARY 16th 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (20 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
- Has anyone heard anything about federal government support for Bombardier?
 - Can you describe this to me in your own words?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Government of Canada announced that it will provide \$372.5 million in repayable contributions to Bombardier Inc. This funding will be provided over four years and will fund research and development for the new Global 7000 business jet and ongoing activities related to the development of the company's C Series aircraft.

- What do you think of this? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?
 - PROBE: What are the benefits of this?
 - PROBE: Do you have any concerns?
- What have you heard about health care lately?
 - Have you heard anything about new funding arrangements between the federal and provincial government? (if yes, explain this to me in your own words)
- Has anyone heard anything about electoral reform? What specifically have you heard?

CANADA-US (20 minutes)

- Has anyone heard anything about Canada-US relations lately? What specifically?
- Does Canada need to change the way it deals with the United States? If so, how?
- What are the most important issues for Canada and the US to work on together?

HANDOUT

- I’ve got a handout that has some issues. Please rank the top three you think it is most important for the Canadian and US governments to discuss
 - *Issues: The environment and climate change, the treatment of minority groups, immigration and refugees, oil pipelines, trade, anti-terrorism security, joint military operations overseas, reducing border delays, border security cooperation*
- (TIME PERMITTING) For the issue that you ranked as #1, what specifically needs to be discussed?

CANADA SAVINGS BONDS (5 minutes)

- Who’s familiar with Canada Savings Bonds? How do you feel about them?
- Fewer people are buying Canada Savings Bonds every year, so some people are recommending phasing the program out. What do you think about that?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

Bonds were first introduced as ways to fund the war effort of WWI and WWII. In 1946, the Canada Savings Bonds Program was launched along with the Payroll Savings Program. The number of Canadians buying Canada Savings Bonds has been declining since the 1980s. Increasingly Canadians have been choosing products like GICs, mutual funds, etc. which are readily available and often offer better rates of return.

HOUSING (20 minutes)

- I’m going to describe a Government of Canada program and I’d like to get your opinions of it:

The program is similar to the American Small Business Innovation Research Program, and aims to position the Government of Canada as a conduit for innovative Canadian businesses to commercialize their technologies. What this means is that the government will invite innovative businesses to solve complex government problems by finding places where government can use the products they produce, thereby acting as a ‘first-buyer’.

HANDOUT

- I have a list of possible names for the program, and I’d like you to rank your top 2. Put ‘1’ beside your favourite, and ‘2’ beside your second favourite:

Canadian Business Innovation Research (Le programme canadien pour les entreprises de la recherche sur l’innovation)

Solutions Canada (Solutions Canada)

Canada Innovates (Le Canada innove)

Canada Buys Innovation(Le Canada acquiert l’innovation)

Innovative Solutions Canada (Solutions innovatrices Canada)

Canadian Innovation Marketplace / Le marché canadien de l’innovation

- What did you pick as number 1? Why is it your favourite?
- Are there any names on this list that rub you the wrong way? Why?

- Now I’m going to describe a Government of Canada program as announced in last year’s federal budget:

This program provides low-cost loans to municipalities and housing developers for the construction of new affordable rental housing projects. This initiative would encourage the construction of affordable rental housing by making low-cost capital available to developers during the earliest, most risky phases of development. This initiative could support the construction of more than 10,000 new rental units over five years.

HANDOUT

- I have a list of possible names for the program, and I’d like you to rank your top 2. Put ‘1’ beside your favourite, and ‘2’ beside your second favourite:

Rental Housing Construction Program

Affordable Rental Housing Construction Program

Rental Housing Loan Program

Affordable Rental Housing Loan Program

Rental Housing Financing Program

Affordable Rental Housing Financing Program

Canada Builds Housing

Canada Builds Affordable Housing

- What did you pick as number 1? Why is it your favourite?
- Are there any names on this list that rub you the wrong way? Why?

JUSTICE (40 minutes)

- If you were trying to explain our criminal justice system to a child, what would you say is the main purpose of it?
 - Some people say the system is about **punishing** criminals, some say it’s about **preventing** crime, some say it’s about **rehabilitating** criminals. Do any of these themes strike a chord with you?
- Are there any broad changes you think are needed to Canada’s Justice system?

HANDOUT

- I’m going to give you a handout with some over-arching objectives for the Criminal Justice system. Please give each a thumbs up or thumbs down in terms of whether you feel each one is something the federal government should be working towards. Next, circle the 2 or 3 you think should be the largest priority.

NOTE: IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER HERE FOR EASE OF REFERENCE; DOES NOT NEED TO BE PRESENTED THIS WAY TO PARTICIPANTS

Do more to address the underlying social factors behind criminal activity

Do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable

Do more to rehabilitate offenders

Focus more on crime prevention

Give tougher sentences to offenders

Make the Criminal Justice system fairer

Make the Criminal Justice system more timely, with fewer court delays

Make the system more transparent and clear about rules and guidelines

Make the Criminal Justice system smarter

Promote a greater sense of trust and confidence in the criminal justice system

Reduce the chance of convicting an innocent person

Reduce costs in the Criminal Justice system

- Let’s talk about a few of these. Who said we need to “make the justice system smarter”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - How would you feel about a series of reforms that were summarized as “making the justice system smarter”? I recognize it would depend on the specific reforms, but how would you feel about this as an over-arching objective?
- Who said we need to “make the justice system fairer”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - Who is treated unfairly now?
 - How could we make the justice system fairer?
 - PROBE if needed: Is it about new laws, how laws are enforced, or a change in attitude?
 - Do you think considering everyone’s personal circumstances would make the system fairer?

- Who checked “do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable”?
 - Do you feel any groups are currently over-represented in the criminal justice system?
 - PROBE if needed: Why do you think this is?
 - Do you think these populations are treated unfairly now?
 - PROBE: What makes you say that?
- Who checked “addressing the underlying social factors criminal activity”?
 - (If checked) What are some of the underlying social factors?
- I’m going to read you two taglines that could be used to describe plans to reform the criminal justice system in Canada. Keep in mind, a short sentence can’t get into the details, but I want to know how you would feel if you heard about a government plan to do each of the following:

Transforming the Criminal Justice System

Protecting us, our communities and our rights.

Transforming the Criminal Justice System

Protecting you, your communities and your rights

- What is your reaction to these taglines? How would you feel about a government plan to do this?
 - PROBE: Anything in particular you like or don’t like about these?
- The second line is different between the two of these. Do you prefer one version over the other? Do they leave you with different feelings at all?
- Are you familiar with Mandatory Minimum Penalties?
 - Can you explain to me what they are?
 - Does Canada currently have mandatory minimums? For which crimes?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

There are various offences in the Canadian Criminal Code that carry a mandatory minimum penalty. For example, some offences warrant at least a certain period of incarceration, such as certain offences involving firearms; sexual offences involving children; and impaired driving (e.g. for a second and subsequent conviction).

- Do you agree or disagree with having mandatory minimum penalties?
- What are the benefits and drawbacks to mandatory minimums? (record via flip chart)
- Do you think mandatory minimums make the Criminal Justice system more fair or less fair?
 - PROBE (if less fair): Less fair for whom?
 - PROBE (if more fair): more fair for whom?
- Do you think mandatory minimums are an effective way to prevent crime?
- Some people say that mandatory minimum penalties give judges less discretion when they make decisions about a particular case. Do you think judges should have discretion when deciding cases?

- Let’s say there’s a case where the Supreme Court says that a mandatory minimum violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, how should the Government of Canada respond?
 - PROBE AS NEEDED: should the mandatory minimum be repealed in this case? Should the government create new laws? Something else?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

TORONTO MODERATOR’S GUIDE – FEBRUARY 22nd 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (20 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
- Has anyone heard anything about federal government support for Bombardier?
 - Can you describe this to me in your own words?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Government of Canada announced that it will provide \$372.5 million in repayable contributions to Bombardier Inc. This funding will be provided over four years and will fund research and development for the new Global 7000 business jet and ongoing activities related to the development of the company's C Series aircraft.

- What do you think of this? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?
 - PROBE: What are the benefits of this?
 - PROBE: Do you have any concerns?
- Has anyone heard anything about electoral reform? What specifically have you heard?

CANADA-US (15 minutes)

- Has anyone heard anything about Canada-US relations lately? What specifically?
- Does Canada need to change the way it deals with the United States? If so, how?
- What are the most important issues for Canada and the US to work on together?

Online (20 minutes)

- Who has heard the term “net neutrality”? Can you explain it to me in your own words?

PROVIDE DEFINITION: Net neutrality is the principle that Internet service providers should enable equal access to all content regardless of the source, and without favouring or blocking particular websites.

- Does that explanation make sense to you, or is it still confusing?
- (If understand it) How do you feel about net neutrality?
- Should governments establish codes of conduct to ensure digital platforms like Facebook or Google better reflect a diversity of views and local content?

- Who has heard about “fake news” on the internet?
 - Do digital platforms like Facebook and Google have a responsibility to ensure the accuracy of news and information on their platforms?

JUSTICE (40 minutes)

HANDOUT

- I’m going to give you a handout with some over-arching objectives for the Criminal Justice system. Please give each a thumbs up or thumbs down in terms of whether you feel each one is something the federal government should be working towards. Next, circle the 2 or 3 you think should be the largest priority.

NOTE: IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER HERE FOR EASE OF REFERENCE; DOES NOT NEED TO BE PRESENTED THIS WAY TO PARTICIPANTS

Do more to address the underlying social factors behind criminal activity
Do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable
Do more to rehabilitate offenders
Focus more on crime prevention
Give tougher sentences to offenders
Make the Criminal Justice system fairer
Make the Criminal Justice system more timely, with fewer court delays
Make the system more transparent and clear about rules and guidelines
Make the Criminal Justice system smarter
Promote a greater sense of trust and confidence in the criminal justice system
Reduce the chance of convicting an innocent person
Reduce costs in the Criminal Justice system

- Let’s talk about a few of these. Who said we need to “make the justice system smarter”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - How would you feel about a series of reforms that were summarized as “making the justice system smarter”? I recognize it would depend on the specific reforms, but how would you feel about this as an over-arching objective?
- Who said we need to “make the justice system fairer”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - Who is treated unfairly now?
 - How could we make the justice system fairer?
 - PROBE if needed: Is it about new laws, how laws are enforced, or a change in attitude?
 - Do you think considering everyone’s personal circumstances would make the system fairer?
- Who checked “do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable”?

- Do you feel any groups are currently over-represented in the criminal justice system?
 - PROBE if needed: Why do you think this is?
- Do you think these populations are treated unfairly now?
 - PROBE: What makes you say that?
- Who checked “addressing the underlying social factors criminal activity”?
 - (If checked) What are some of the underlying social factors?
- Are you familiar with Mandatory Minimum Penalties?
 - Can you explain to me what they are?
 - Does Canada currently have mandatory minimums? For which crimes?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

There are various offences in the Canadian Criminal Code that carry a mandatory minimum penalty. For example, some offences warrant at least a certain period of incarceration, such as certain offences involving firearms; sexual offences involving children; and impaired driving (e.g. for a second and subsequent conviction).

- What are the benefits and drawbacks to mandatory minimums? (record via flip chart)
- Do you think mandatory minimums make the Criminal Justice system more fair or less fair?
 - PROBE (if less fair): Less fair for whom?
 - PROBE (if more fair): more fair for whom?
- Do you think mandatory minimums are an effective way to prevent crime?
- Some people say that mandatory minimum penalties give judges less discretion when they make decisions about a particular case. Do you think judges should have discretion when deciding cases?
- Let’s say there’s a case where the Supreme Court says that a mandatory minimum violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, how should the Government of Canada respond?
 - PROBE AS NEEDED: should the mandatory minimum be repealed in this case? Should the government create new laws? Something else?

Themes (15 minutes)

HANDOUT

I’m going to give you a handout with several short sentences that could describe overall goals for what the government is trying to achieve.

They’re obviously all vague by nature of being short, but I want you to circle to check off if you have a positive or negative reaction to each (*use thumbs up / thumbs down*) and then circle the one in each of the five sections that you feel most positive about.

SECTION 1

Building a strong middle class
Working for the middle class
Standing with the middle class

SECTION 2

Progress for the middle class
The promise of progress
Building on progress

SECTION 3

Skills, innovation, and middle class jobs
Middle class jobs in the new economy
Tax fairness for the middle class

SECTION 4

A healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada
A stronger Canada at home and abroad
A strong and fair Canada at home and in the world

SECTION 5

Infrastructure investments
Strong and prosperous communities
Building strong communities
Building and connecting communities

(Adjust discussion length based on time left in groups)

- Out of all these sentences, which one spoke most to you? Why? *(if time permits, can ask for which one in each section was stronger)*
- Did anything on this list rub you the wrong way? Why?
- One of the sentences said “middle class jobs”. What does that term mean to you?
 - Would saying “high paying jobs” speak to you more or less?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

LONDON MODERATOR’S GUIDE – FEBRUARY 23RD 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (20 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?

CANADA-US (15 minutes)

- Has anyone heard anything about Canada-US relations lately? What specifically?
- Does Canada need to change the way it deals with the United States? If so, how?
- What are the most important issues for Canada and the US to work on together?

Online (20 minutes)

- Who has heard the term “net neutrality”? Can you explain it to me in your own words?

PROVIDE DEFINITION: Net neutrality is the principle that Internet service providers should enable equal access to all content regardless of the source, and without favouring or blocking particular websites.

- Does that explanation make sense to you, or is it still confusing?
- (If understand it) How do you feel about net neutrality?
- Should governments establish codes of conduct to ensure digital platforms like Facebook or Google better reflect a diversity of views and local content?
- Who has heard about “fake news” on the internet?
 - Do digital platforms like Facebook and Google have a responsibility to ensure the accuracy of news and information on their platforms?

JUSTICE (40 minutes)

HANDOUT

- I’m going to give you a handout with some over-arching objectives for the Criminal Justice system
Please give each a thumbs up or thumbs down in terms of whether you feel each one is something the federal government should be working towards. Next, circle the 2 or 3 you think should be the largest priority.

NOTE: IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER HERE FOR EASE OF REFERENCE; DOES NOT NEED TO BE PRESENTED THIS WAY TO PARTICIPANTS

Do more to address the underlying social factors behind criminal activity
Do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable

Do more to rehabilitate offenders
Focus more on crime prevention
Give tougher sentences to offenders
Make the Criminal Justice system fairer
Make the Criminal Justice system more timely, with fewer court delays
Make the system more transparent and clear about rules and guidelines
Make the Criminal Justice system smarter
Promote a greater sense of trust and confidence in the criminal justice system
Reduce the chance of convicting an innocent person
Reduce costs in the Criminal Justice system

- Let’s talk about a few of these. Who said we need to “make the justice system smarter”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - How would you feel about a series of reforms that were summarized as “making the justice system smarter”? I recognize it would depend on the specific reforms, but how would you feel about this as an over-arching objective?
- Who said we need to “make the justice system fairer”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - Who is treated unfairly now?
 - How could we make the justice system fairer?
 - PROBE if needed: Is it about new laws, how laws are enforced, or a change in attitude?
 - Do you think considering everyone’s personal circumstances would make the system fairer?
- Who checked “do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable”?
 - Do you feel any groups are currently over-represented in the criminal justice system?
 - PROBE if needed: Why do you think this is?
 - Do you think these populations are treated unfairly now?
 - PROBE: What makes you say that?
- Who checked “addressing the underlying social factors criminal activity”?
 - (If checked) What are some of the underlying social factors?
- Are you familiar with Mandatory Minimum Penalties?
 - Can you explain to me what they are?
 - Does Canada currently have mandatory minimums? For which crimes?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

There are various offences in the Canadian Criminal Code that carry a mandatory minimum penalty. For example, some offences warrant at least a certain period of incarceration, such as certain offences involving firearms; sexual offences involving children; and impaired driving (e.g. for a second and subsequent conviction).

- What are the benefits and drawbacks to mandatory minimums? (record via flip chart)
- Do you think mandatory minimums make the Criminal Justice system more fair or less fair?
 - PROBE (if less fair): Less fair for whom?
 - PROBE (if more fair): more fair for whom?
- Do you think mandatory minimums are an effective way to prevent crime?
- Some people say that mandatory minimum penalties give judges less discretion when they make decisions about a particular case. Do you think judges should have discretion when deciding cases?
- Let’s say there’s a case where the Supreme Court says that a mandatory minimum violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, how should the Government of Canada respond?
 - PROBE AS NEEDED: should the mandatory minimum be repealed in this case? Should the government create new laws? Something else?

Themes (15 minutes)

HANDOUT

I’m going to give you a handout with several short sentences that could describe overall goals for what the government is trying to achieve.

They’re obviously all vague by nature of being short, but I want you to circle to check off if you have a positive or negative reaction to each (*use thumbs up / thumbs down*) and then circle the one in each of the five sections that you feel most positive about.

SECTION 1

Building a strong middle class
Working for the middle class
Standing with the middle class

SECTION 2

Progress for the middle class
The promise of progress
Building on progress

SECTION 3

Skills, innovation, and middle class jobs
Middle class jobs in the new economy
Tax fairness for the middle class

SECTION 4

A healthier, stronger, and more caring Canada
A stronger Canada at home and abroad
A strong and fair Canada at home and in the world

SECTION 5

Infrastructure investments

Strong and prosperous communities

Building strong communities

Building and connecting communities

(Adjust discussion length based on time left in groups)

- Out of all these sentences, which one spoke most to you? Why? *(if time permits, can ask for which one in each section was stronger)*
- Did anything on this list rub you the wrong way? Why?
- One of the sentences said “middle class jobs”. What does that term mean to you?
 - Would saying “high paying jobs” speak to you more or less?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

WINNIPEG MODERATOR’S GUIDE – FEBRUARY 27TH 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (20 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
- What have you heard about health care lately?
 - Have you heard anything about new funding arrangements between the federal and provincial government? (if yes, explain this to me in your own words)

Online (20 minutes)

- Who has heard the term “net neutrality”? Can you explain it to me in your own words?

PROVIDE DEFINITION: Net neutrality is the principle that Internet service providers should enable equal access to all content regardless of the source, and without favouring or blocking particular websites.

- Does that explanation make sense to you, or is it still confusing?
- (If understand it) How do you feel about net neutrality?
- Should governments establish codes of conduct to ensure digital platforms like Facebook or Google better reflect a diversity of views and local content?
- Who has heard about “fake news” on the internet?
 - Do digital platforms like Facebook and Google have a responsibility to ensure the accuracy of news and information on their platforms?

DEFENCE (30 minutes)

- I’m going to read you a few broad objectives that Canada’s Armed Forces could have – kind of like a mission statement. Keep in mind, these are just a few words, they are not intended to describe everything they do.

Read them one at a time, then discuss:

Strong at Home

- What does this mean to you?
 - Do you think these words describe the current role of the Canadian Armed Forces?

Secure in North America

- What does this mean to you?

- Do you think these words describe the current role of the Canadian Armed Forces?
- Do you think the Canadian Armed Forces need to work closer with the Americans than they currently do?
- Who here has heard of NORAD?
 - PROBE: What does NORAD do? Are they important?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

The North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) is a United States and Canada bi-national organization charged with the missions of aerospace warning and aerospace control for North America.

In close collaboration with homeland defense, security, and law enforcement partners, NORAD's missions are to prevent air attacks against North America, safeguard the sovereign airspaces of the United States and Canada by responding to unknown, unwanted, and unauthorized air activity approaching and operating within these airspaces, and provide aerospace and maritime warning for North America.

Engaged in the World

- What does this mean to you?
 - Do you think these words describe the current role of the Canadian Armed Forces?
- Now, if I were to talk to you about the “cyber capabilities” of the Canadian Armed Forces, what do you think this could include?
 - This includes both space-based surveillance and cyber security. Are these areas where you feel the Canadian Armed Forces should be doing more than they are?
 - Canada currently lags behind a lot of countries when it comes to cyber capabilities. Should Canada aim to be a world leader when it comes to cyber capabilities in the military, should we try to catch up to the same level as other countries, or is this something the Armed Forces should not be involved with?
 - PROBE: What makes you say that?
 - (if not involved): Is that because you think another agency should be responsible, or because you don't think Canada should be doing this?
- How would you feel about the Canadian military purchasing the following types of equipment: *(if short on time, feel free to read the full list and just get a sense on any of these they think we should focus on and any they feel we should NOT. If they're ambivalent, that's good to know.)*
 - Fighter jets
 - Armed, remotely piloted vehicles, sometimes called drones
 - Ships
 - Submarines

- Multi-purpose amphibious vessels (CLARIFY AS NEEDED: these are water vehicles which can land in places where the conditions are poor or they don’t have full ports and docks)

JUSTICE (40 minutes)

HANDOUT

- I’m going to give you a handout with some over-arching objectives for the Criminal Justice system. Please give each a thumbs up or thumbs down in terms of whether you feel each one is something the federal government should be working towards. Next, circle the 2 or 3 you think should be the largest priority.

NOTE: IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER HERE FOR EASE OF REFERENCE; DOES NOT NEED TO BE PRESENTED THIS WAY TO PARTICIPANTS

Do more to address the underlying social factors behind criminal activity
Do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable
Do more to rehabilitate offenders
Focus more on crime prevention
Give tougher sentences to offenders
Make the Criminal Justice system fairer
Make the Criminal Justice system more timely, with fewer court delays
Make the system more transparent and clear about rules and guidelines
Make the Criminal Justice system smarter
Promote a greater sense of trust and confidence in the criminal justice system
Reduce the chance of convicting an innocent person
Reduce costs in the Criminal Justice system

- Let’s talk about a few of these. Who said we need to “make the justice system smarter”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - How would you feel about a series of reforms that were summarized as “making the justice system smarter”? I recognize it would depend on the specific reforms, but how would you feel about this as an over-arching objective?
- Who said we need to “make the justice system fairer”? Regardless of whether or not you checked it, what does that mean to you?
 - Who is treated unfairly now?
 - How could we make the justice system fairer?
 - PROBE if needed: Is it about new laws, how laws are enforced, or a change in attitude?
 - Do you think considering everyone’s personal circumstances would make the system fairer?
- Who checked “do more to consider the circumstances of those who are marginalized and vulnerable”?
 - Do you feel any groups are currently over-represented in the criminal justice system?

- PROBE if needed: Why do you think this is?
 - Do you think these populations are treated unfairly now?
 - PROBE: What makes you say that?
- Who checked “addressing the underlying social factors criminal activity”?
 - (If checked) What are some of the underlying social factors?
- Are you familiar with Mandatory Minimum Penalties?
 - Can you explain to me what they are?
 - Does Canada currently have mandatory minimums? For which crimes?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

There are various offences in the Canadian Criminal Code that carry a mandatory minimum penalty. For example, some offences warrant at least a certain period of incarceration, such as certain offences involving firearms; sexual offences involving children; and impaired driving (e.g. for a second and subsequent conviction).

- What are the benefits and drawbacks to mandatory minimums? (record via flip chart)
- Do you think mandatory minimums make the Criminal Justice system more fair or less fair?
 - PROBE (if less fair): Less fair for whom?
 - PROBE (if more fair): more fair for whom?
- Do you think mandatory minimums are an effective way to prevent crime?
- Some people say that mandatory minimum penalties give judges less discretion when they make decisions about a particular case. Do you think judges should have discretion when deciding cases?
- Let’s say there’s a case where the Supreme Court says that a mandatory minimum violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, how should the Government of Canada respond?
 - PROBE AS NEEDED: should the mandatory minimum be repealed in this case? Should the government create new laws? Something else?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

VANCOUVER MODERATOR’S GUIDE – FEBRUARY 28TH 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (20 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?

Vancouver Issues (45 minutes)

Opioids

- Has anyone heard anything about opioids or fentanyl in the news? Can you explain to me what is going on in your own words?
 - Are you aware of anything the federal government has done on this issue?
- (PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT HEALTH ACCORD SIGNED BETWEEN FEDERAL AND BC GOVERNMENT)
 - Who had heard about this?
 - What impact, if any, do you think this will have on British Columbia?
- Coming back to opioids, is there anything else you think the federal government should do?

Energy

- By a show of hands, who has heard news lately about pipeline projects in Canada?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Government of Canada recently approved Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain Expansion project and Enbridge's Line 3 Replacement project, while it rejected Enbridge's Northern Gateway Pipelines project and introduced a crude oil tanker moratorium on BC's northcoast.

- What are the potential benefits and concerns you have about the Government of Canada approving the Kinder Morgan pipeline? *(write on flip chart)*
- *(for those who provide concerns)* Is there anything that could make you feel more comfortable about this project?
- The Government of Canada recently announced an Oceans Protection Plan. By a show of hands, who has heard of this?
 - Can someone explain it to me?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Government of Canada recently announced that it will invest \$1.5 billion over five years in coastal protections. This plan will:

- *Invest in spill prevention, by improving coast guard capabilities and ensuring better ship sonar*
- *Invest in rapid spill response, including new tugboats*
- *Make polluters pay more if they spill*

- What, if anything, do you like most about this plan?
- Does this do anything to ease concerns about safety around the Kinder Morgan pipeline?

Port

- Has anyone heard about a proposed expansion at the Port of Vancouver?
 - (PROJECT 1) The Port of Vancouver is proposing to expand their South Delta Port which they say will be good for the local economy and local jobs. Some people are concerned about the impact of this expansion on wildlife.
 - How do you feel about this proposed expansion?
 - (If unsure) If you feel like you don’t know enough to make a decision now, what are the key things you’d need to know in order to decide?
 - (PROJECT 2) The Port of Vancouver is proposing to increase container storage capacity, which they say will be good for the local economy and local jobs. Some people are concerned that this expansion could mean more noise and pollution, and less natural views from Crab Park on the Downtown Eastside.
 - How do you feel about this proposed expansion?
 - Broadly speaking, when are your largest concerns, if any, about port expansion?
 - PROBE on: safety of orcas, increased risk of oil spill, increased train and truck traffic...

Online (20 minutes)

- Who has heard the term “net neutrality”? Can you explain it to me in your own words?

PROVIDE DEFINITION: Net neutrality is the principle that Internet service providers should enable equal access to all content regardless of the source, and without favouring or blocking particular websites.

- Does that explanation make sense to you, or is it still confusing?
- (If understand it) How do you feel about net neutrality?
- Should governments establish codes of conduct to ensure digital platforms like Facebook or Google better reflect a diversity of views and local content?
- Who has heard about “fake news” on the internet?
 - Do digital platforms like Facebook and Google have a responsibility to ensure the accuracy of news and information on their platforms?

DEFENCE (30 minutes)

- I’m going to read you a few broad objectives that Canada’s Armed Forces could have – kind of like a mission statement. Keep in mind, these are just a few words, they are not intended to describe everything they do.

Read them one at a time, then discuss:

Strong at Home

- What does this mean to you?
 - Do you think these words describe the current role of the Canadian Armed Forces?

Secure in North America

- What does this mean to you?
 - Do you think these words describe the current role of the Canadian Armed Forces?
- Do you think the Canadian Armed Forces need to work closer with the Americans than they currently do?
- Who here has heard of NORAD?
 - PROBE: What does NORAD do? Are they important?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

The North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) is a United States and Canada bi-national organization charged with the missions of aerospace warning and aerospace control for North America.

In close collaboration with homeland defense, security, and law enforcement partners, NORAD'S missions are to prevent air attacks against North America, safeguard the sovereign airspaces of the United States and Canada by responding to unknown, unwanted, and unauthorized air activity approaching and operating within these airspaces, and provide aerospace and maritime warning for North America.

Engaged in the World

- What does this mean to you?
 - Do you think these words describe the current role of the Canadian Armed Forces?
- Now, if I were to talk to you about the “cyber capabilities” of the Canadian Armed Forces, what do you think this could include?
 - This includes both space-based surveillance and cyber security. Are these areas where you feel the Canadian Armed Forces should be doing more than they are?
 - Canada currently lags behind a lot of countries when it comes to cyber capabilities. Should Canada aim to be a world leader when it comes to cyber capabilities in the military, should we try to catch up to the same level as other countries, or is this something the Armed Forces should not be involved with?
 - PROBE: What makes you say that?
 - (if not involved): Is that because you think another agency should be responsible, or because you don't think Canada should be doing this?

- How would you feel about the Canadian military purchasing the following types of equipment: *(if short on time, feel free to read the full list and just get a sense on any of these they think we should focus on and any they feel we should NOT. If they’re ambivalent, that’s good to know.)*
 - Fighter jets
 - Armed, remotely piloted vehicles, sometimes called drones
 - Ships
 - Submarines
 - Multi-purpose amphibious vessels (CLARIFY AS NEEDED: these are water vehicles which can land in places where the conditions are poor or they don’t have full ports and docks)

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)