



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 – Third Round of Focus Groups

FINAL REPORT
April 26, 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	2
2. Sommaire	5
Contexte et objectifs.....	5
Aperçu de la méthodologie.....	6
Faits saillants	6
2. Detailed Findings	10
Themes Addressed.....	10
Government Actions.....	10
Federal Budget 2017	11
Canada – US Relations.....	13
Health Care Transfers.....	14
Opioids.....	15
Telecommunications Industry.....	17
3. Appendix.....	22
Appendix A. Detailed Research Methodology	22
Appendix B. Recruitment Guide	24
Appendix C. Guide de recrutement français.....	29
Appendix D. English Discussion Guides.....	35
Appendix E. Guide de discussion français	44



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 third 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
- The federal government Budget 2017
- Health care funding
- Canada-US relations
- Opioids
- Telecommunications industry
- Housing (Mississauga only)

- Bombardier (Montreal only)
- Net Neutrality (Montreal only)

Overview of Methodology

This third wave of qualitative research was comprised of a series of eight focus groups with Canadians aged 20 years old and above, held between March 21st and March 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:

- Mississauga – March 21st
- Montreal – February 23rd
- Halifax – February 27th
- Burnaby – 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, 79 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 third 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

Budget 2017

Discussions on the federal budget took place in all four locations. However, groups in Mississauga were held before the budget was presented, meaning that the conversation focused on expectations and not actual measures in this city. Sessions in Montreal, Burnaby and Halifax being held after the release of the federal budget for fiscal 2017, participants in these locations were asked to share their general views on what they had heard, read or seen.

Overall, the budget did not leave a lasting impression on most participants. Many said it was a relatively prudent document that did not present major new spending or programs, while also not making major cuts anywhere. A few participants mentioned that they had heard this was a careful budget because of the uncertainty posed by the change of government in the United States. Measures to help caregivers and extend maternal leave were noticed in a positive way, while removal of the tax credit for transit

generated negative comments. When presented with a list of key measures included in the budget, participants reacted positively.

Canada-US Relations

The relationship between Canada and the United States generated spontaneous discussions in all cities. Unprompted mentions of the relationship included concerns over the willingness of the United States to revisit certain provisions of NAFTA, as well as worries over the handling of asylum seekers crossing the border between the United States and Canada and general comments regarding the challenges posed by the new American administration more broadly.

Participants in Mississauga, Montreal and Halifax were asked to comment more specifically on the issue of refugees crossing the border into Canada. Most participants were confused on this issue even though almost all of them had heard about this problem. The main source of confusion was related to the identity and origin of the individuals crossing the border. Most participants did not know if they were refugees, illegal immigrants running away from the US due to changes in American policies, or other types of migrants. Because of this confusion, it proved difficult to get a clear sense of how participants wanted the Canadian government to react to the situation.

Health Care Funding

Participants in Montreal and Mississauga took part in a short discussion on the recent health care accord between their respective provincial governments and the federal government. On a top-of-mind basis, very few participants had heard about the funding agreement and the money targeted to home care and mental health. When presented with the details of the funding agreement for each province, participants generally felt it sounded a good deal, but nevertheless raised a lot of questions regarding the size of the amount provided relative to the actual needs, as well as the reasons those two priorities were chosen. While almost all agreed that mental health and home care were essential needs, some would have liked to know how the decision to focus on these two was taken.

Opioids

The challenges posed by opioids were discussed in all four locations. In each city, participants were asked to share their top-of-mind thoughts on the opioids crisis, before being asked to complete two separate exercises on its causes and solutions. Awareness of the issue varied considerably from one location to the next. Burnaby participants stood out for being most aware of the crisis.

The discussions in Burnaby showed that most participants understood the seriousness of the issue for their community and had heard of fentanyl. They felt that the current situation could be considered an epidemic, with hundreds of people having died from overdoses. Top-of-mind views of the situation in other cities were more scattered due to much lower levels of information.

Participants in all locations were provided with a list of six possible reasons behind the current situation and asked to select what they felt were the top three reasons behind the opioid crisis currently unfolding in Canada. The most important reason provided across locations was people making poor decisions. The

second-most important reason provided for the crisis was the presence of criminal gangs, followed by doctors not prescribing properly and drug companies making unsafe products. Poor border control and lack of policing did not resonate with most respondents and only a handful of participants selected them as one of their top three reasons.

Out of nine possible paths to improving the situation, two solutions dominated rankings across all locations by a wide margin: better regulation of harmful substances and education campaigns to inform the public about the risks. Investing more money into policing stood out as the least favoured option.

Telecommunications Industry

Views of the Canadian telecommunications industry were mostly negative across all locations. When asked to complete a written exercise requesting that participants select up to two words that most appropriately described their impressions of the industry from a list of 16 descriptors, negative words dominated the rankings. The two descriptors selected most often were greedy and uncompetitive, followed by unaffordable, dishonest, unfair and stagnant. Explanations for these selections were mostly linked to negative personal experiences with mobile phone carriers, with a few also complaining about the cost of Internet and cable television. A handful of participants across locations shared more positive views of the industry, viewing it as critical to their lives and innovative.

When asked to select from a list of possible actions that could be taken by the Government of Canada with regards to the telecommunications industry, participants overwhelmingly chose one of two interrelated items: making telecommunication bills more affordable for all Canadians and creating a more competitive Canadian telecommunications industry. These two actions were directly related to one another in that participants felt that reducing the size of bills was the ultimate goal for any action taken, while creating a more competitive environment was the means through which this goal could be achieved.

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. Sommaire

Contexte et objectifs

Le Bureau du Conseil privé (BCP) est l’organisme central de la fonction publique qui appuie le premier ministre ainsi que le Cabinet et ses structures décisionnelles de façon impartiale. Dirigé par le greffier du Conseil privé, le BCP aide le gouvernement à réaliser sa vision et à régler avec rapidité et efficacité les enjeux auxquels font face le gouvernement et le pays.

Dans le cadre de son rôle-conseil auprès du premier ministre, le BCP offre des conseils objectifs en matière de politique et d’information, notamment d’information sur les priorités des Canadiens afin de soutenir le premier ministre et le Cabinet. À cette fin, le Secrétariat des communications et des consultations du BCP appuie le bureau du premier ministre en coordonnant les communications gouvernementales et en mettant en place les grands thèmes de communication du gouvernement, conformément aux priorités établies par le premier ministre, le Cabinet, les comités du Cabinet et le greffier du Conseil privé. Le Secrétariat travaille également en collaboration avec les secrétariats d’orientation du BCP pour conseiller et appuyer le Cabinet et ses comités.

Pour mener à bien son mandat, le BCP avait besoin d’un cycle de collecte continue de données qualitatives pour s’assurer d’avoir un portrait à jour de l’opinion des Canadiens au sujet d’enjeux généraux qui présentent un intérêt pour le gouvernement, par exemple leur point de vue sur ce que devraient être les priorités du gouvernement. En outre, le projet de recherche vise à permettre au gouvernement du Canada de mieux comprendre les tendances émergentes et de mesurer les points de vue des Canadiens sur des enjeux et des projets de politique importants à l’échelle nationale.

Par l’intermédiaire d’un cycle continu de groupes de discussion, le BCP acquiert une bonne compréhension des points de vue des Canadiens sur les enjeux les plus importants auxquels le pays est confronté; les perceptions en ce qui concerne la meilleure façon dont le gouvernement fédéral pourrait s’y attaquer; les attentes quant aux mesures liées aux priorités du gouvernement; et les perspectives sur la façon dont le gouvernement pourrait le plus efficacement concentrer ses efforts pour s’occuper des enjeux émergents. Le projet de recherche permet d’orienter l’élaboration de messages de communication, de produits et de stratégies de diffusion pour s’attaquer aux enjeux prioritaires. Par ailleurs, il permet au gouvernement du Canada d’élaborer et d’améliorer les activités de communication afin de répondre aux besoins particuliers des Canadiens en leur transmettant en temps opportun des renseignements à jour, faciles à comprendre et fondés sur les perceptions actuelles des Canadiens sur les sujets concernés.

Cette troisième vague de la recherche qualitative continue était destinée à recueillir les commentaires des Canadiens sur certains enjeux et questions politiques qui sont importants pour le gouvernement du Canada. Les enjeux dont il a été question pendant les groupes de discussion variaient d’un endroit à l’autre. Voici quelques-uns des sujets qui ont été abordés :

- Connaissance des actions récentes du gouvernement du Canada
- Budget 2017 du gouvernement fédéral

- Financement des soins de santé
- Relations entre le Canada et les États-Unis
- Opioïdes
- Industrie des télécommunications
- Habitation (Mississauga seulement)
- Bombardier (Montréal seulement)
- Neutralité du Net ou du réseau (Montréal seulement)

Aperçu de la méthodologie

La troisième vague de la recherche qualitative consistait en une série de huit groupes de discussion réunissant des Canadiens de 20 ans et plus. Les rencontres ont eu lieu entre le 21 et le 28 mars 2017. Tous les groupes de discussion ont duré environ deux heures et ont été tenus en soirée. Dans chaque ville, la première rencontre débutait à 17 h 30 et la deuxième, à 19 h 30. Ces rencontres ont eu lieu aux endroits suivants :

- Mississauga – 21 mars
- Montréal – 23 mars
- Halifax – 27 mars
- Burnaby – 28 mars

Pour chaque rencontre, 12 participants étaient recrutés afin qu’au moins huit à dix personnes se présentent. Au total, 79 participants ont pris part aux discussions. Tous ont reçu une somme de 75 \$ pour assister aux rencontres là où les groupes de discussion avaient lieu. Le questionnaire de recrutement a permis de s’assurer que les participants formaient un échantillon représentatif de la population générale avec un bon mélange de sexes, d’âges, de niveaux de scolarité et de revenus ainsi que de composition des foyers. Vous trouverez des précisions supplémentaires sur la méthodologie dans l’annexe du présent rapport.

La troisième vague fait partie d’un projet de recherche qualitative en continu qui comptera au total 144 groupes de discussion qui seront tenus dans le cadre de plusieurs vagues au cours de l’année civile 2017, avec la possibilité de renouveler le cycle de recherche pour deux années supplémentaires. Pour l’année civile 2017, le montant du contrat lié à ce projet de recherche s’élève à 916 865,05 \$, TVH comprise.

Faits saillants

Budget 2017

Des discussions sur le budget fédéral ont eu lieu dans les quatre villes. Toutefois, comme les rencontres de Mississauga se sont déroulées avant le dépôt du budget, la conversation dans cette ville a porté sur les attentes à l’égard du budget et non sur le budget lui-même. À Montréal, Burnaby et Halifax, les

rencontres ont eu lieu après la publication du budget fédéral pour l’année 2017. Par conséquent, les participants à ces rencontres ont pu exprimer leurs points de vue sur ce qu’ils avaient vu, lu ou entendu à ce sujet.

Dans l’ensemble, le budget n’a pas laissé une impression impérissable dans l’esprit de la plupart des participants. Ils sont nombreux à dire qu’il s’agissait d’un document relativement prudent qui ne comportait pas de nouveaux programmes ou de nouvelles dépenses d’importance, pas plus qu’il ne prévoyait de coupures majeures. Quelques participants signalent avoir entendu dire que c’était un budget prudent en raison de l’incertitude qui règne à la suite du changement de gouvernement aux États-Unis. Les mesures destinées à soutenir les aidants naturels et à prolonger le congé de maternité sont soulignées de façon positive, alors que l’abolition du crédit d’impôt pour le transport en commun suscite des commentaires négatifs. Par ailleurs, les participants réagissent de façon positive à une liste des principales mesures contenues dans le budget.

Relations entre le Canada et les États-Unis

La question des rapports entre le Canada et les États-Unis déclenche des discussions spontanées dans toutes les villes. Au nombre des commentaires formulés spontanément, on note des préoccupations quant à la volonté des États-Unis de revoir certaines dispositions de l’ALENA, des inquiétudes quant à la prise en charge des demandeurs d’asile qui traversent la frontière canado-américaine et des remarques générales concernant les problèmes que pose plus largement la nouvelle administration américaine.

On a demandé aux participants de Mississauga, de Montréal et de Halifax de commenter de façon plus précise l’enjeu des réfugiés qui franchissent la frontière pour venir au Canada. Si les participants ont presque tous entendu parler de cet enjeu, la plupart ne savent pas très bien ce qu’il en est exactement. La principale source de confusion concerne le nom que l’on donne aux personnes qui traversent la frontière et leur origine. La plupart des participants ne savent pas si ce sont des réfugiés, des immigrants illégaux fuyant les États-Unis en raison de changements apportés aux politiques américaines ou d’autres types de migrants. En raison de cette confusion, il est difficile de savoir exactement ce que pensent les participants à propos de la façon dont le gouvernement canadien devrait réagir à la situation.

Financement des soins de santé

Les participants de Montréal et de Mississauga ont pris part à une brève discussion sur le récent accord sur la santé conclu entre le gouvernement de leur province et le gouvernement fédéral. Lorsqu’on leur demande ce qui leur vient à l’esprit à l’évocation de cette question, ils sont très peu nombreux à avoir entendu parler de l’entente de financement et des fonds octroyés aux soins à domicile et aux soins de santé mentale. Lorsqu’on leur présente les détails de l’entente de financement de chaque province, ils en ont généralement une opinion favorable. Ils soulèvent néanmoins de nombreuses questions quant à l’importance du montant accordé par rapport aux besoins réels et quant aux raisons pour lesquelles la priorité a été accordée à ces deux secteurs. Si presque tous les participants sont d’accord pour dire que les besoins sont grands en matière de soins à domicile et de soins de santé mentale, certains auraient aimé savoir comment la décision a été prise de cibler ces deux secteurs des soins de santé.

Opioides

Les problèmes liés aux opioïdes ont été abordés dans toutes les rencontres. Dans chaque ville, on a demandé aux participants de nous faire part de leurs réflexions spontanées à propos de la crise des opioïdes, puis on leur a proposé deux exercices sur les causes de la crise et les solutions. La connaissance de la question varie grandement d’une ville à l’autre, et ce sont les participants de Burnaby qui sont le plus au fait de la crise.

En effet, il ressort des discussions de Burnaby que la plupart des participants ont entendu parler du fentanyl et qu’ils savent que c’est un problème grave dans leur communauté. Ils estiment d’ailleurs que la situation actuelle pourrait être qualifiée d’« épidémique » puisque des centaines de personnes ont perdu la vie à la suite de surdoses. Dans les autres villes, les opinions sont moins tranchées parce que les participants en savent moins sur cette question que ceux de Burnaby.

Dans toutes les villes, une liste de six raisons possibles expliquant la situation a été présentée aux participants et on leur a demandé de choisir les trois principales raisons qui expliquent selon eux la crise des opioïdes qui sévit actuellement au Canada. Le mauvais jugement de certaines personnes est la principale raison indiquée dans toutes les villes. Viennent ensuite la présence de gangs criminels, le fait que les médecins ne rédigent pas adéquatement leurs ordonnances et, enfin, le fait que les sociétés pharmaceutiques fabriquent des produits non sécuritaires. Les raisons touchant le piètre contrôle frontalier et le manque de services de police trouvent peu d’écho auprès de la plupart des répondants, et seuls quelques-uns choisissent ces raisons parmi les trois principales qu’ils mentionnent.

Sur les neuf solutions possibles qui permettraient d’améliorer la situation, deux dominent largement dans toutes les villes : une réglementation plus stricte à l’égard des substances dangereuses et des campagnes d’éducation pour informer le public au sujet des risques. La solution consistant à allouer plus de fonds aux services de police est celle qui recueille le moins d’appui.

Industrie des télécommunications

Les points de vue des Canadiens sur l’industrie des télécommunications sont surtout négatifs dans toutes les villes. Lorsque, dans le cadre d’un exercice écrit, on présente aux participants une liste de 16 descripteurs et qu’on leur demande de choisir un ou deux mots qui décrivent le plus justement leurs impressions de l’industrie, ce sont des mots négatifs qui dominent les réponses. Les deux descripteurs qui reviennent le plus souvent sont « cupide » et « non concurrentiel », suivis de « inabordable », « malhonnête », « inéquitable » et « stagnant ». Les raisons justifiant ces choix sont le plus souvent liées à des expériences personnelles négatives avec des entreprises de téléphonie mobile, et quelques-unes ont trait au coût des services Internet et de câblodistribution. Seuls quelques participants dans les quatre villes expriment des opinions plus positives à l’égard de l’industrie, qu’ils jugent innovante et essentielle dans leur vie.

Lorsqu’on présente aux participants une liste de mesures possibles et qu’on leur demande de choisir celles que pourrait prendre le gouvernement du Canada à l’égard de l’industrie des télécommunications, ils choisissent dans une très large mesure une de deux solutions interreliées : rendre les frais de télécommunications plus abordables pour les Canadiens et accroître la concurrence au sein du secteur canadien des télécommunications. Ces deux mesures sont directement reliées l’une à l’autre au sens où

les participants jugent qu’une réduction du montant de la facture constitue l’objectif ultime de toute mesure, alors que la création d’un environnement plus concurrentiel constitue le moyen par lequel cet objectif peut être atteint.

Remarque sur l’interprétation des résultats

La recherche qualitative est conçue pour révéler un vaste éventail d’opinions et d’interprétations plutôt que pour mesurer le pourcentage de la population cible qui a une opinion donnée. Ces résultats ne doivent pas être utilisés pour estimer la proportion de la population ou le nombre de personnes qui ont une opinion en particulier, car ils ne sont pas statistiquement extrapolables.

Les groupes de discussion sur les priorités du gouvernement visent à approfondir la compréhension des points de vue des participants et complètent souvent les résultats quantitatifs obtenus au moyen de sondages. Les discussions permettent de traiter en profondeur des enjeux importants, ce que la recherche quantitative ne permet pas. Les renseignements ainsi recueillis sont essentiels pour permettre au Bureau du Conseil privé de jouer son rôle de conseil et d’appui au Cabinet et à ses comités.

2. Detailed Findings

This section of the report presents the detailed findings from eight focus group discussions held in four 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 (shown in order of importance during discussion):

- Legalisation of marijuana
- NAFTA renegotiation / American trade discussions
- Asylum seekers crossing the border from the US into Canada
- Syrian refugees
- Budget 2017
- Canada’s 150th Birthday preparations
- Pipeline projects, mostly Keystone XL
- Efforts to curtail discrimination against Muslims
- Electoral reform
- Tax credits – changes to child tax benefits and removal of transit credit
- Efforts to control the price of housing
- Bombardier
- Veterans
- Funding for transit and infrastructure
- Extension of maternity leave

The moderator subsequently raised the following topics:

- The federal government Budget 2017
- Health care funding
- Canada-US relations
- Opioids
- Telecommunications industry
- Housing
- Financial assistance for Bombardier
- Net Neutrality

Federal Budget 2017

Discussions on the federal budget took place in all four locations. They took on a different form in Mississauga since the budget had not been released when the sessions took place. Sessions in Montreal, Halifax and Burnaby were conducted after the release of the budget, hereby allowing for more in-depth discussions.

Approximately half of Mississauga participants knew that the federal budget would be presented the day following the focus group sessions. Expectations were vague as to what would be included in the budget. A few said they had heard that it would be a prudent budget, without big announcements and few changes made to the current tax system or existing government programs. A few others said they expected tax increases, saying this was always an expectation of theirs when government budgets were presented. However, they could not provide specifics. A handful had heard of the possibility that sugary drinks would be taxed, something they were neither strongly in favour, nor against.

Sessions in Montreal, Burnaby and Halifax being held after the release of the federal budget for fiscal 2017, participants were asked to share their general views on what they had heard, read or seen. The budget having been presented on the eve of Montreal groups, participants from this location displayed higher levels of awareness and remembered more of the specific announcements made compared to their Halifax or Burnaby counterparts. Few participants in the latter two cities could recall specific information about the budget, although most of them knew it had been presented the week prior to the groups.

Despite differing awareness levels, participants mostly shared similar views when asked to describe their general impressions of the budget. Overall, the budget did not leave a lasting impression on most participants. This was neither positive, nor negative. Many said it was a relatively prudent document that did not present major new spending or programs, while also not making major cuts anywhere. A few participants mentioned that they had heard this was a careful budget because of the uncertainty posed by the change of government in the United States. A few also mentioned that the budget did nothing to curb the deficit, which they felt would continue for years to come.

On the positive side, a few participants noted that the budget would provide increased assistance for care givers, which they welcomed. A handful of participants also mentioned that they had heard something about an extended parental leave package, which they also viewed as a positive change. Some in Montreal also heard that the budget allocated additional funds for affordable housing and, albeit tentatively, believed that additional money would be provided to help extend Montreal’s blue subway line. Both were viewed positively.

The termination of the tax credit for transit users stood out as the most unpopular measure announced in the budget. Those who had heard about it mostly felt it was a bad idea to remove the credit. They believed that for many riders, including themselves, this credit made a difference. Many had also heard about an increase in taxes on alcohol and cigarettes, which generated mixed feelings among participants. Some felt it was a good idea to tax bad habits, while others felt they were too heavily taxed already.

Written Exercise on Select Measures Included in Budget 2017

As part of the discussion on the budget, participants in Burnaby and Halifax were provided with the list of budget measures provided below:

- Make skills and retraining programs available to more Canadians
- Allow Canadians on Employment Insurance (EI) to go back to school to learn new job skills without losing their EI benefits
- Provide more Student Loans and Grants to Canadians to help them return to school to learn new job skills
- Fund new work-integrated placements and co-ops each year to give young Canadians relevant work experience
- Create a new EI caregiving benefit for Canadians who must take time off work to care for a critically ill family member (under existing benefits, they only qualify if a family member is terminally ill)
- Encourage innovation in the clean tech, digital, and agri-food sectors
- Increase funding for public transit so that new rapid transit lines are built, new buses are added to routes, and transit systems become more reliable
- Create more affordable childcare spaces
- Build new affordable housing units and repair existing ones
- Close tax loopholes that result in unfair tax advantages for some at the expense of others

From this list, participants were asked to write down which one was the most significant initiative according to them, as well as provide a “thumbs up” or a “thumbs down” to each initiative. Generally, all measures were received positively, barring a few negative comments. Because all measures generated positive reactions, the issues that stood out as most important varied greatly among all participants, with no single measure appearing more significant than others. Individual respondents chose as most important those issues that were most relevant to their personal situations. Participants with young children focused on issues like added affordable childcare spaces, while those struggling to cover their rent selected added funding for affordable housing as their priority, etc.

However, two initiatives less directly related to personal experience ranked high on the list of most impactful measures: closing tax loopholes and encouraging innovation in the clean tech, digital and agri-food sectors. The first one was especially important to Halifax participants, who felt that it was time for the government to force those who could pay more taxes to do their fair share. As for encouraging innovation, it was seen as a good way to create jobs while also benefitting the environment and the long-term prosperity of Canadians.

Infrastructure Needs

Mississauga and Montreal participants were asked to discuss how the federal government should invest the money that had been set aside for infrastructure. Public transit topped the list of spontaneous answers. Many Mississauga participants felt that the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) was overwhelmed with

car traffic and believed that unless the transit system was improved, the situation would only get worse over time. In Montreal, there was a stronger focus on the need to improve rail transportation, not only in the region, but also through the building of a high-speed train link between major cities like Montreal and Toronto, as well as with Northeastern US cities.

Improving roads across the GTA and GMA was also viewed as a priority by many participants. This included both fixing the existing roads and bridges, believed to be in disrepair, as well as increasing capacity to meet the needs of a growing population. However, a few Mississauga participants disagreed with the idea of increased capacity, feeling that the region is already at full capacity and needs to find new transportation solutions.

Affordable housing was another key priority for some in Mississauga who felt that unless more investment was made in this area, the cost of living would keep increasing, leaving many out of a decent place to live. This view was accompanied by a clear sense of worry about the rising cost of real estate in the GTA. Other mentions in both cities included funding for building new schools and hospitals, as well as improving the state of underground infrastructure in the GTA for sewers and rainwater drains to better meet the rising risks associated with climate change, such as flooding or major storms.

Canada – US Relations

Various aspects of the relationship between Canada and the United States were top-of-mind in all locations. They were raised spontaneously at the onset of discussions when participants were asked if they had heard, read or seen anything about the Government of Canada recently. Mentions of the relationship included concerns over the willingness of the United States to revisit certain provisions of NAFTA, as well as worries over the handling of “people” (rarely called refugees by participants) crossing the border between the United States and Canada and general comments regarding the challenges posed by the new American administration more broadly.

Participants in Mississauga, Montreal and Halifax were asked to comment more specifically on the issue of asylum seekers crossing the border into Canada. Discussions showed that most participants were deeply confused on this issue, even though almost all participants had heard about this problem in recent weeks. The main source of confusion was related to the identity and origin of the individuals crossing the border. Some thought they were illegal immigrants trying to run away from the US administration’s tough stance on illegal immigrants. Others felt they may be legal immigrants to the United States who did not feel welcome anymore and decided to come north, or simply American citizens who wanted to come to Canada as a result of the presidential election. Very few participants properly identify these migrants as refugees who had initially landed in the United States and were now trying to come into Canada.

Because of this confusion, it proved difficult to get a clear sense of how participants wanted the Canadian government to react to the situation. While there was a general sense that Canada was more welcoming than the United States, which most saw as a positive thing, participants’ judgement regarding the level of openness that Canada should display depended on their understanding of who was trying to

cross the border and how many of them there were. Those who thought that people crossing the border were likely illegal immigrants mostly wanted the Canadian government to send them back to the United States. These participants believed that there may be good reasons why the United States had not granted these immigrants residency and were therefore hesitant to let them into Canada. Those who believed they were regular immigrants to the United States who now wanted to come to Canada felt they should be treated like other immigrants trying to come into Canada, with the same screening process and timelines.

When participants were informed that these individuals were migrants trying to come into Canada after landing in the United States, they remained divided regarding the proper path forward for the Government of Canada. Some felt that Canada should welcome them as asylum seekers and process them accordingly, like they would do for all other asylum seekers. These participants were also mostly aware of, and opposed to, the tough stance of the US administration related to admittance of individuals from certain countries and on refugees in general and felt that Canada had a duty to help those fleeing from war-torn countries. A few felt that Canada should send asylum seekers back to the United States so their case could be heard there. These participants viewed the United States as a safe country for refugees and did not see why Canada should intervene. They wanted the United States to process them, not Canada.

Health Care Transfers

Participants in Montreal and Mississauga took part in a short discussion on the recent health care accord between their respective provincial governments and the federal government. On a top-of-mind basis, very few participants had heard about the accord and the money to be targeted to home care and mental health. A few participants in Montreal mentioned that they had heard about their provincial health minister not being happy with the federal government imposing some conditions, but they could not comment on the specifics.

When presented with the details of the funding agreement for each province, participants generally felt it sounded like a good deal, but nevertheless raised a lot of questions regarding the size of the amount provided relative to the actual needs, as well as the reasons why those two priorities were chosen. They felt it was hard for them to put this into perspective. While almost all agreed that mental health and home care were essential needs, some would have liked to know how the decision to focus on these two was taken since they could readily think of many other health priorities that the Canadian government could address.

The focus on mental health generated more discussion than home care. Many participants felt that mental health was a growing problem in their community and were happy that the government devoted more attention to it. Most participants agreed that it was reasonable for the federal government to provide special funding for targeted areas like mental health and home care. However, a few participants, particularly in Montreal, viewed health care as a provincial domain that should not be

subjected to federal priorities. They did not disagree with the priorities, but thought that the province was in a better position to judge which health care sectors should be given precedence.

Participants provided a wide range of answers when asked where they would like to see additional health care money invested. Public health was mentioned in both cities as a key area of focus to help prevent major health issues from arising, while some reiterated that mental health and home care were priorities. The need for better regulation and control of prescription drugs was also raised as a key problem in Mississauga, while a few Montreal participants stressed the need for more investments in hospitals and frontline care in general.

Opioids

The challenges posed by opioids were discussed in all four locations. In each city, participants were asked to share their top-of-mind thoughts on the opioids crisis, before being asked to complete two separate exercises on its causes and solutions.

Awareness of the issue varied considerably from one location to the next. Burnaby participants stood out for being most aware of the crisis. Awareness was mixed in Halifax while participants in Mississauga displayed minimal awareness levels. Participants in Montreal were in turn mostly unaware of the issue.

Discussions in Burnaby showed that most participants understood the seriousness of the issue for their community and had heard of the drug fentanyl. They felt that the current situation could be considered an “epidemic”, being aware that hundreds of people had died from overdoses in recent months. This was viewed as a major crisis that needed to be addressed urgently. Many participants instinctively pointed to the Downtown Eastside as the epicentre of the epidemic in the lower mainland of British Columbia. While they believed that younger and poorer individuals were likely the most directly affected by the crisis, they felt that everyone was a potential victim because addiction to opioids could be the result of an earlier addiction to painkillers and not simply caused by previous use of illegal drugs.

Top-of-mind views of the situation in other cities were more scattered due to much lower levels of information. Outside of one Halifax group, where participants shared similar opinions to those in Burnaby, participants from Montreal, Mississauga and the second Halifax group mostly talked about the problems of drug addiction as a general concept without specific mentions of recent deaths across Canada. They generally discussed overuse of prescription drugs (for both patients and doctors) as well as young people experimenting with various illegal drugs, including synthetic ones. Most of them did not know about fentanyl, although a few said the name “rang a bell”. They also did not know where the crisis originated or how important it was. They were surprised when provided basic information about the issue.

Reasons for the Crisis

After this general discussion on the opioid crisis, participants in all locations were provided with a list of six possible reasons behind the current situation and asked to select what they felt were the top three reasons explaining it. These reasons were as follows (shown in order of importance according to participants):

- people making poor decisions
- gangs
- doctors not prescribing properly
- drug companies making unsafe products
- poor border control
- lack of policing

Despite previously described differences in awareness, answers provided were fairly consistent across all cities. The most important reason provided across locations was people making poor decisions. This answer did not reflect a lack of empathy for victims of the crisis among those who selected this answer, but a general belief that individuals are responsible for their plight. They still thought that those affected needed urgent help, but believed they got to this point through actions of their own. Some also explained that they did not single out users when thinking of poor decisions, but felt that drug dealers and some doctors were also to blame for their bad judgement.

The second-most important reason provided for the crisis was the presence of criminal gangs. While it was chosen by a few people in the other three cities, Montreal participants were much more likely to point in that direction. Their choice was driven by their top-of-mind focus on illegal drugs as a general issue, not on the fentanyl problem in particular. Their general focus on the illegal drug trade brought them to blame gangs that controlled this trade on Montreal streets.

Doctors not prescribing properly and drug companies making unsafe products also made it onto many participants’ lists. Those who felt that the fentanyl crisis was a result of a gradual move to stronger and stronger pain killers were more prone to believe that some doctors were at the root of the problem, being too quick to prescribe potentially addictive drugs. Consequently, they thought that more stringent control measures needed to be put in place. Similarly, drug companies were seen by many as focused on the bottom line more than on patients’ well-being. As such, they were believed to disregard or even hide issues related to addiction in order to boost sales of their products.

Poor border control and lack of policing did not resonate with most respondents and only a handful of participants selected them as one of their top three reasons. In fact, many participants spontaneously mentioned that these reasons were irrelevant and should not have been on that list. They believed that drugs such as fentanyl were already present, and even probably made, in Canada, hereby making tougher border controls useless. As for additional policing, many felt this would not change anything because people with opioid use disorder would find a way to secure the drugs, no matter how much more the government invested in policing.

Focus on Solutions

Following the discussion on the causes of the opioid crisis in Canada, participants were presented with another exercise, this time focusing on possible solutions. Nine solutions were provided (shown in order of importance according to participants):

- Better regulation of harmful substances
- Education campaigns to inform the public about the risks
- More treatment programs
- Allow more safe injection sites, to prevent overdoses
- Conduct research and collect better data about the problem
- Tighter rules around doctors
- Better border controls
- Invest more in low income housing
- More money for policing

Out of these nine solutions, participants were asked to select the three most impactful ones according to them. Out of the nine, two solutions dominated rankings, and this by a wide margin: better regulation of harmful substances and education campaigns to inform the public about the risks. Participants who selected better regulations were mostly those who also believed that the opioid crisis was mostly the result of problematic prescription drug use that eventually led to larger problems. They felt that if the government curtailed the use of opioids and other strong painkillers, or monitored them more carefully, it would make a significant difference. Education campaigns were in turn seen as a good way to inform young people of the risks of using illegal drugs and more specifically the risks of using fentanyl, knowingly or not. A few felt that campaigns could also be used to inform the general population about the risks of addiction to opioids, even as legal prescription drugs.

At the other end of the spectrum, investing more money into policing once more stood as the least favoured option, with investments in low income housing and tougher border controls not too far ahead. Burnaby participants were slightly more likely to see a link between lack of quality housing and problematic opioid use because they knew this issue was among the key problems faced in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside.

Telecommunications Industry

Word-Association Exercise

Views of the Canadian telecommunications industry were mostly negative across all locations. When asked to complete a written exercise requesting that participants select up to two words that most appropriately described their impressions of the industry from a list of 16 descriptors, negative words dominated the rankings. The two descriptors selected most often were greedy and uncompetitive, followed by unaffordable, dishonest, unfair and stagnant.

Explanations for these selections were mostly linked to negative personal experiences with mobile phone carriers, with a few participants also complaining about the cost of Internet and cable television. Most participants felt that Canadian mobile phone carriers charged unreasonable prices for their services and often tried to hide some fees or include new charges without warning. They also believed that the market was dominated by a few large conglomerates that controlled prices and prevented smaller and cheaper players from competing. Many thought it was dishonest on the part of larger companies to

create subsidiaries under completely different names with seemingly lower rates, advertising them as small independent players when they were not. The lack of cheaper options was lamented by nearly all participants. A handful of participants decried the overwhelming importance of connected devices in Canadians’ lives and longed for a move away from them.

Participants across all locations spontaneously referred to the price of mobile phone usage in other countries, including the United States and Europe, as evidence that Canadians did not get good value for their money. They believed that consumers in other countries received a more extensive range of services and more data usage for much less money. While some participants said they understood that Canada was a large country with important infrastructure needs, this did not change their impression of the industry, believing that this fact alone did not justify industry pricing strategies. Roaming fees were also raised as a major source of frustration for those who traveled to other provinces or countries, with participants saying the charges were unjustifiably large and were often hidden until it was too late.

A handful of participants across locations shared more positive views of the industry. They felt the industry was critical in that they could not live without it, while a few also said the industry was innovative and contributed to technological advances that were good for the country. Most participants agreed with the essential nature of the industry despite their negative outlook on their pricing and client services. In fact, the indispensable importance of the industry in their lives made participants even more frustrated because they thought they had no choice but to pay the price demanded by Canadian carriers. Some disputed the innovative nature of the Canadian industry because they believed the lack of competition probably slowed down innovation.

Desired Government Actions

Participants in all locations were presented with a list of possible actions that could be taken by the Government of Canada with regards to the telecommunications industry and were asked to select which of these actions should be acted upon as a top priority. Two interrelated actions clearly stood out as key priorities: making telecommunication bills more affordable for all Canadians and creating a more competitive Canadian telecommunications industry. All other actions ranked far behind these two.

These two measures were directly related to one another in that participants felt that reducing the size of bills was the ultimate goal for any action taken, while creating a more competitive environment was the means through which this goal could be achieved. Participants’ choices were directly linked to their previous complaints about the perceived greediness and uncompetitive nature of the Canadian telecommunications industry. Most agreed that if the number of players on the Canadian marketplace were to increase, the dominant companies would be forced to change their business practices and lower the price of their services, while also providing better client services. Those who said that increasing the amount of choice for Canadian consumers was a top priority presented their idea in the same manner as those who wanted more competition: it was about providing cheaper, better services.

The idea of ensuring that telecommunications jobs are based in Canada garnered some support as a key priority in Mississauga, but was not chosen by anyone in other locations. While participants in the other three cities mostly thought this was a good idea, they felt it should not be prioritized over the need to lower prices for Canadian consumers. Finally, the remaining two actions that proposed to make

Canadian companies and Canada world leaders in the telecommunications industry did not generate much support across locations. While participants felt these were not necessarily bad ideas because of the positive externalities created by jobs in a high-tech industry, most felt these goals need not interfere with their main priority: reducing the cost for consumers.

Other Possible Actions

Once the previously discussed exercises were completed, a more general discussion on three possible actions took place. The three actions discussed were to force companies to unlock their phones, encourage the entry of virtual mobile operators on the market and allow international investors and telecommunications companies to do more business in Canada.

Nearly all participants knew about the practice of “locking” phones so they could not be used with other carriers. They almost unanimously felt that this practice was wrong and should not be tolerated. Nevertheless, a handful of participants felt that if this allowed companies to sell cheaper bundles, then maybe it was acceptable for them to do so. This argument was roundly rejected by others who did not think companies were reducing their price because of this practice. For the same reason, most participants did not accept the idea that companies would have to increase their price if the government banned the practice of locking phones. Younger participants were generally less worried about this practice, even if they disliked it, because they thought it was easy to unlock the phone despite carriers’ efforts to stop consumers from doing it.

The concept of virtual mobile operators was hard to grasp for most participants across all locations. They had a hard time understanding why small mobile companies who had to pay the three main carriers to use their infrastructure could in turn provide consumers with cheaper pricing than these large suppliers. Participants felt this made little sense and the concept reinforced their belief that larger carriers were vastly overcharging consumers since they could easily afford to provide virtual mobile operators with lower access fees. Participants remained favourable to the idea of having more companies providing plans at lower cost, but they doubted this would be possible under the current system. They felt that large carriers would likely buy the smaller players and increase prices, which they believed had been the case in previous years.

The third idea, allow foreign investors and telecommunications companies to enter the Canadian market, generated mostly positive, although sometimes hesitant, opinions. On the one hand, many, especially younger participants, felt that new entrants should be welcomed since they would help lower the price for consumers and improve client service through sharper competition. Others were more hesitant to support this approach, mostly because they feared it could create an exodus of jobs outside of Canada. They were not necessarily opposed to the idea, but were concerned about its potential impact.

The following discussions took place solely in Montreal.

Net Neutrality

Participants in Montreal were generally unaware of the concept of net neutrality. The few who thought they had heard something about it mostly described it as an attempt to keep governments from controlling the Internet or from using invasive surveillance techniques. Only one participant gave a proper definition of the concept. Once presented with a definition of the concept¹, most participants remained hesitant to accept that the government should intervene in any way. While many could see why the dominance of certain players may pose a problem for non-commercial content, especially local content from smaller players, they were reluctant to advocate change in the way internet service providers chose which content to publicize. They mostly felt that the beauty of the Internet was that users could go where they wanted when they wanted without a government body to choose what was better or worse for them. Yet a few participants felt it was important to consider some form of intervention to prevent the overwhelming dominance of content that is deemed “more popular” at the expense of quality content that does not reach broader audiences. They feared they may not know what they were missing because they were never exposed to it in the first place.

Bombardier

Participants in Montreal were asked whether they had heard anything recently about federal government support for Bombardier. Most participants had heard something about the deal and shared mixed views about it. Many participants said they heard that the amount provided by the federal government was not as large as what the company was hoping for, while a few also pointed out that the Quebec government provided more money. This understanding of the amount of assistance provided by the federal government was generally not accompanied by a desire to see the amount increased, however. To the contrary, most participants questioned whether governments should provide any monetary support to private corporations. Only a handful shared overtly positive views on this financial assistance and wished it had been more important.

When participants were informed that the money was provided in the form of a loan, most felt that this was more appropriate than a grant since the company would pay the government back over time. It eased concerns of those who felt it was wrong to help private companies using public money.

The following topic was covered solely in Mississauga.

Housing

Participants in Mississauga were deeply concerned about the rising prices of real estate in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) and with the corresponding increases in mortgage payments and rents. They feared the situation was becoming untenable for a growing proportion of the population and would prevent

¹ The definition provided was as follows: 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.

younger generations from ever owning their homes. Participants mostly blamed foreign investors for this situation and felt that these foreign investors should not be welcomed in the market. They spontaneously mentioned that they viewed positively any attempt by the government to impose additional taxes on buyers from outside of the country to curb the current trend.

Following this open discussion on housing, participants were presented with an exercise to be completed on paper. They were thus asked to provide a score from 1 to 10 to each of the following three priority areas, with a score of 10 indicating that it was a crucial challenge and a score of 1 indicating this was not a challenge at all:

- The high cost of buying a house
- Lack of affordable rental supply
- Housing needs of low-income groups

The high cost of buying a house generated scores of 10 for all but a couple of participants, who nevertheless gave it a very high score. Clearly, this resonated with all participants, as explained above. The lack of affordable housing supply was also a crucial concern for most participants, but ranked slightly lower than the overall price of housing. While this mattered to all, a few were not convinced that this was the key driver behind the spike in prices around the GTA. The housing needs of low-income groups generated different views from one group to the next, with the first group being split regarding its importance and the second group being highly concerned about it.

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 eight focus groups, held between March 21st and March 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:

- Mississauga – March 21st
- Montreal – February 23rd
- Halifax – February 27th
- Burnaby – 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, 79 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	} ENSURE GOOD MIX PER GROUP
20-24 years	1	
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		
DK/RF	99		Recruiting 5-6 from the above

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
March 21: Mississauga Infoquest Research 6655 Kitimat Road Unit 12	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	March 21, 2017
March 23: Montreal Ad Hoc Research 400 de Maisonneuve Blvd West, Suite 1200	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	March 23, 2017
March 27: Halifax Corporate Research Associates 7071 Bayers Road , #5001	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	March 27, 2017
March 28: Burnaby Holiday Inn Express Metrotown 4405 Central Boulevard Fraser Room South and North	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	March 28, 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. 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. Guide de recrutement français

Questionnaire de recrutement Gouvernement du Canada

Bonjour, je m’appelle _____. Je vous appelle de la part de la firme Ipsos, une société d’études de marché et de sondages d’opinion publique nationale. Au nom du gouvernement du Canada, nous mettons en place une série de groupes de discussion composés de Canadiens, pour explorer des questions actuelles importantes pour l’ensemble du pays. Les discussions porteront sur divers sujets et votre opinion nous intéresse.

EXPLIQUER LES GROUPES DE DISCUSSION. Environ dix personnes comme vous participeront aux groupes de discussion. Ces personnes seront recrutées de façon aléatoire, comme il a été fait avec vous. Les participants se verront verser \$75 à titre d’honoraires pour leur temps. Mais avant de vous inviter à participer aux groupes, nous devons vous poser quelques questions afin de nous assurer de former des groupes bien assortis et présentant une bonne variété de personnes. Puis-je vous poser quelques questions ?

- Oui **CONTINUER**
 Non **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE**

La participation est volontaire. Nous n’essayons pas de vous vendre quoi que ce soit ni de changer vos opinions. Le déroulement sera une discussion en table ronde menée par un professionnel de la recherche. Toutes les opinions exprimées demeureront anonymes et les points de vue seront regroupés afin d’assurer qu’aucun individu ne puisse être identifié.

S1) Travaillez-vous, vous-même ou un membre de votre famille immédiate, dans l’un des secteurs suivants, ou avez-vous pris votre retraite d’un emploi dans un tel secteur :

	OUI	NON
Études de marché ou marketing	1	2
Relations publiques ou médias (annonces télévisées ou imprimées)	1	2
Publicité et communications	1	2
Employé d’un parti politique	1	2
Employé d’un ministère ou organisme gouvernemental, fédéral ou provincial.	1	2

SI LA RÉPONSE À L’UNE DES OPTIONS CI-DESSUS EST « OUI », REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE.

S2) Êtes-vous un citoyen canadien âgé d’au moins 20 ans qui habite habituellement dans la région de [INSÉRER VILLE] ?

Oui	1	CONTINUER
Non	2	REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE

S3) Depuis combien de temps habitez-vous à [VILLE] ? _____

TERMINER SI MOINS DE 2 ANS

S4) Êtes-vous le responsable ou l’un des responsables de votre foyer ?

Oui	1	CONTINUER
Non	2	REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE

S5) Avez-vous déjà participé à un groupe de discussion de consommateurs, à une entrevue ou à un sondage organisé à l’avance et pour lequel vous avez reçu une somme d’argent?

Oui	1	MAX. 1/3 PAR GROUPE
Non	2	PASSER À LA Q1

S6) À quand remonte cette participation ? _____

TERMINER SI AU COURS DES SIX DERNIERS MOIS

S7) À combien de groupes de discussion de consommateurs avez-vous participé au cours des cinq dernières années ?

TERMINER SI PLUS DE QUATRE GROUPE DE DISCUSSION

DEMANDER À TOUS LES RÉPONDANTS

Q1) Pourriez-vous me dire dans quelle catégorie d’âge vous vous situez ? Avez-vous...

Moins de 20 ans	0	} REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE
Entre 20 et 24 ans	1	
Entre 25 et 34 ans	2	
Entre 35 et 44 ans	3	
Entre 45 et 54 ans	4	
Entre 55 et 64 ans	5	
65 ans et plus	6	} VOUS ASSURER DE RECRUTER UNE BONNE VARIÉTÉ POUR CHAQUE GROUPE.
Refus	9	

REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE

Q2) Avez-vous actuellement des enfants âgés de moins de 18 ans qui habitent avec vous ?
[RECRUTER UNE BONNE VARIÉTÉ]

Oui	1
Non	2

Q2a) Avez-vous actuellement des enfants de moins de 13 ans vivant dans la maison avec vous? **[RECRUIT MIN 3 per group]**

Oui	1
Non	2

Q3) Combien d’enfants de plus de 18 ans habitent dans votre maison ?

Un	1
Plus d’un	2

Q4) Pourriez-vous me dire quel est le plus haut niveau de scolarité que vous avez terminé ?

Études secondaires non terminées	1	} VOUS ASSURER DE RECRUTER UNE BONNE VARIÉTÉ POUR CHAQUE GROUPE.
Études secondaires terminées	2	
Études collégiales/universitaires non terminées	3	
Études collégiales/universitaires terminées	4	
Refus/ ne sait pas	9	

Q5) Quelle est votre situation professionnelle actuelle ?

Employé à temps plein	1	} MAXIMUM DE TROIS PAR GROUPE
Employé à temps partiel	2	
Travailleur autonome	3	
Retraité	4	
Pas employé pour le moment	5	
Étudiant	6	
Autre	7	
Ne sait pas/refus	9	

Q6) **[SI EMPLOYÉ/RETRAITÉ]** Quel est votre travail actuel/quel était votre travail ?
(VEUILLEZ PRÉCISER)

Q7) Parmi les fourchettes suivantes, laquelle représente mieux le revenu total de votre ménage avant impôts? C’est-à-dire, le revenu total combiné de toutes les personnes de votre foyer, avant impôts. **[LIRE LA LISTE]?**

Moins de 20 000 \$	1	} Assurer une bonne variété en...
20 000 \$ à un peu moins de 40 000 \$	2	
40 000 \$ à un peu moins de 60 000 \$	3	
		} Recrutant 2 à 3 personnes de la fourchette de moins de 40 000 \$.

60 000 \$ à un peu moins de 80 000 \$	4
80 000 \$ à un peu moins de 100 000 \$	5
100 000 \$ à un peu moins de 150 000 \$	6
150 000 \$ et plus	7
Ne sait pas/refus	99

Q8) **NE PAS POSER CETTE QUESTION – NOTER LE SEXE**

Homme	1	} ASSURER MOITIÉ/MOITIÉ
Femme	2	

Q9) Si vous gagniez un million de dollars, quelles seraient les deux premières choses que vous feriez avec l’argent? **(DOIT AVOIR DEUX RÉPONSES POUR ACCEPTER. TERMINER SI LE RÉPONDANT RÉPOND D’UNE FAÇON DÉSINVOLTE, D’UNE FAÇON COMBATIVE OU S’IL A DE LA DIFFICULTÉ À RÉPONDRE.)**

TERMINER SI LA PERSONNE QUI RÉPOND FAIT PART D’UNE RAISON TELLE QU’UN PROBLÈME D’OÛÏE, DE VUE OU DE LANGAGE ÉCRIT OU VERBAL, D’UNE CRAINTE DE NE POUVOIR ÊTRE CAPABLE DE COMMUNIQUER EFFICACEMENT, OU SI VOUS-MÊME AVEZ UNE PRÉOCCUPATION AU SUJET DE L’INTERVIEWÉ.

Pendant la discussion, vous serez enregistré(e) sur bande sonore et vidéo. Cet enregistrement nous aide dans la rédaction de notre rapport. De même, la salle dispose d’un miroir sans tain. Il se peut que du personnel du gouvernement du Canada soit présent de l’autre côté du miroir, notamment des membres du personnel du ministère qui parraine cette étude, et des membres du personnel d’Ipsos. Il s’agit d’une procédure de groupe de discussion standard visant à avoir un aperçu direct du processus d’étude et d’entendre directement vos impressions et avis sur le sujet d’étude.

Convendez-vous d’être observé(e) aux fins d’étude seulement?

Oui	1	REMERCIER LE RÉPONDANT ET PASSER À L’INVITATION
Non	2	REMERCIER LE RÉPONDANT ET METTRE FIN À L’APPEL

******(DANS CHAQUE LIEU, VEUILLEZ VOUS ASSURER QUE DOUZE (12) PARTICIPANTS SONT RECRUTÉS POUR EN OBTENIR HUIT À DIX)******

[À lire aux répondants en attente]

Merci d’avoir répondu à mes questions. Malheureusement, pour le moment, le groupe auquel vous êtes admissible est complet. Nous aimerions vous inscrire sur notre liste d’attente. Cela signifie que s’il y a une ouverture dans le groupe, nous vous rappellerons pour voir si vous êtes disponible afin de participer à la discussion. Puis-je avoir un numéro de téléphone où vous joindre pendant la journée et en soirée, ainsi qu’une adresse électronique, si vous en avez une, afin que nous puissions communiquer avec vous dès que possible si une place devient disponible? **[CONSIGNER LES COORDONNÉES]**

[À lire aux répondants sélectionnés]

C'est formidable, vous pouvez participer à l'une des discussions de groupe qui aura lieu le (DATE) à (HEURE) pendant deux heures au maximum. Le gouvernement du Canada parraine cette étude. Tous ceux qui participent recevront une rétribution de **75 \$** en remerciement de leur temps.

Avez-vous un stylo à portée de main afin que je puisse vous donner l'adresse du lieu où le groupe tiendra sa séance? La séance aura lieu à :

Endroit	Heure	Date
Mississauga Infoquest Research 6655 Kitimat Road Unit 12	Groupe 1 – 5:30pm Groupe 2 – 7:30pm	Le 21 mars 2017
Montréal – Français Ad Hoc Recherche 400 Boul. de Maisonneuve Ouest, Suite 1200	Groupe 1 – 5:30pm Groupe 2 – 7:30pm	Le 23 mars 2017
Halifax Corporate Research Associates 7071 Bayers Road , #5001	Groupe 1 – 5:30pm Groupe 2 – 7:30pm	Le 27 mars 2017
Burnaby Holiday Inn Express Metrotown 4405 Central Boulevard Fraser Room South and North	Groupe 1 – 5:30pm Groupe 2 – 7:30pm	Le 28 mars 2017

Nous vous demandons d'arriver au moins 20 minutes à l'avance pour vous assurer de trouver le lieu et avoir le temps de vous inscrire auprès des hôtes. Le paiement de la prime dépend de la participation aux séances de groupe de discussion.

De plus, nous vérifierons votre identité avant la séance, alors veuillez vous assurer d'apporter deux pièces d'identité avec photo produites par le gouvernement (p. ex. permis de conduire, carte d'assurance maladie ou autre). Si vous avez besoin de lunettes pour lire, veuillez les apporter.

Comme nous invitons un petit nombre de personnes, votre participation est très importante pour nous. Nous vous avons invité(e) à participer en fonction des questions que nous avons abordées il y a un instant, nous vous demandons donc de ne pas envoyer un représentant en votre nom si vous n'êtes pas en mesure de participer. **SI, POUR UNE QUELCONQUE RAISON, VOUS N'ÊTES PAS EN MESURE DE PARTICIPER, VEUILLEZ NOUS APPELER AFIN QUE NOUS PUISSIONS VOUS REMPLACER.** Vous pouvez communiquer avec nous au 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx à notre bureau. Quelqu'un vous appellera la veille pour vous rappeler l'événement de discussion.

À quel moment est-il préférable de vous appeler?

À quel numéro de téléphone?

Puis-je avoir votre nom? SUR LA PAGE COUVERTURE

Merci beaucoup pour votre aide!

Appendix D. English Discussion Guides

Discussion Guide – March 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 Minutes)

- Introduce moderator and welcome participants to the focus group.
 - As we indicated during the recruiting process, we are conducting focus group discussions on behalf of the Government of Canada.
- The discussion will last approximately 2 hours. Feel free to excuse yourself during the session if necessary.
- Explanation re:
 - Audio-taping – The session is being audio-taped for analysis purposes, in case we need to double-check the proceedings against our notes. These audio-tapes remain in our possession and will not be released to anyone without written consent from all participants.
 - One-way mirror – There are observers representing the government who will be watching the discussion from behind the glass.
 - It is also important for you to know that your responses today will in no way affect your dealings with the Government of Canada.
 - Confidentiality – Please note that anything you say during these groups will be held in the strictest confidence. We do not attribute comments to specific people. Our report summarizes the findings from the groups but does not mention anyone by name. The report can be accessed through the Library of Parliament or Archives Canada.
- Describe how a discussion group functions:
 - Discussion groups are designed to stimulate an open and honest discussion. My role as a moderator is to guide the discussion and encourage everyone to participate. Another function of the moderator is to ensure that the discussion stays on topic and on time.
 - Your role is to answer questions and voice your opinions. We are looking for minority as well as majority opinion in a focus group, so don't hold back if you have a comment even if you feel your opinion may be different from others in the group. There may or may not be others who share your point of view. Everyone's opinion is important and should be respected.
 - I would also like to stress that there are no wrong answers. We are simply looking for your opinions and attitudes. This is not a test of your knowledge. We did not expect you to do anything in preparation for this group.

Please note that the moderator is not an employee of the Government of Canada and may not be able to answer some of your questions about what we will be discussing. If important questions do come up over the course of the group, we will try to get answers for you before you leave.

- (Moderator introduces herself/himself). Participants should introduce themselves, using their first names only.
 - What are your main hobbies or pastimes?

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (10 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
 - PROBE: What have you heard about health care?
 - Have you heard anything about health care funding?

BUDGET (30 minutes) - Version for all locations, except Mississauga

- Has anyone heard anything about the federal budget?

If YES PROBE IN-DEPTH:

- What did you hear?

- What are your overall impressions of the budget?
- What do you think the overall focus of the budget is?
- What specific initiatives are in it?
- Is there anything in there you like?
- Anything you don’t like?
 - IF YES PROBE: What do others think about (ITEMS MENTIONED)?

HANDOUT

- I’m going to give you a handout with a list of initiatives included in the budget. Please give each a thumbs up or thumbs down. Then, circle what you feel the best initiative on this list is. Next, I’d like you to put check marks next to the ones you feel will have an impact on you and/or your family personally.

Make skills and retraining programs available to more Canadians

Allow Canadians on Employment Insurance (EI) to go back to school to learn new job skills without losing their EI benefits

Provide more Student Loans and Grants to Canadians to help them return to school to learn new job skills

Fund new work-integrated placements and co-ops each year to give young Canadians relevant work experience

Create a new EI caregiving benefit for Canadians who must take time off work to care for a critically ill family member (under existing benefits, they only qualify if a family member is terminally ill)

Encourage innovation in the clean tech, digital, and agri-food sectors

Increase funding for public transit so that new rapid transit lines are built, new buses are added to routes, and transit systems become more reliable

Create more affordable childcare spaces

Build new affordable housing units and repair existing ones

Close tax loopholes that result in unfair tax advantages for some at the expense of others

PROBE A FEW OF THE OPTIONS PARTICIPANTS PLACED CHECK MARKS BESIDE:

- How specifically will you/your family benefit from this?

(MONTREAL ONLY)

- 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?

Budget – Mississauga Version

- Has anyone heard anything about the federal budget? What specifically have you heard?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Budget is a blueprint for how the Government wants to set the annual economic agenda for Canada. The Minister of Finance will deliver the budget speech tomorrow.

- Based on what you may have heard, if anything, what do you expect will be in it? What do you think the government’s priorities will be?
- Last year’s Budget included funding for infrastructure projects, such as roads and transit, which continues through this year. What are the most important infrastructure projects that need funding around the Greater Toronto/Montreal Area?

HOUSING (15 minutes) – Mississauga Only

IF RAISED IN WARM-UP:

- Some of you mentioned housing. What about housing are you personally concerned about?

OPEN IT UP TO THE GROUP:

- What about others in the group: what are the most significant housing challenges facing the Greater Toronto Area?

- I’ve got a handout that has a few examples of possible housing challenges. For each, please indicate how much of a challenge, if at all, you think it is in your local community. MODERATOR TO REMIND PARTICIPANTS TO FOCUS ON THEIR AREA AND NOT OTHER PARTS OF CANADA OR CANADA IN GENERAL

HANDOUT THAT HAS THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLES OF HOUSING CHALLENGES:

- The high cost of buying a house
- Lack of affordable rental supply
- Housing needs of low-income groups

PARTICIPANTS TO COMPLETE INDIVIDUALLY FOLLOWED BY GROUP DISCUSSION:

- Who identified the high cost of buying a house as a major challenge?
 - If major challenge:
 - What are the reasons housing has gotten so expensive?
 - Do you see a role for the Government of Canada in addressing this? What are some strategies that come to mind?

HEALTH CARE (15 minutes) – Mississauga and Montreal Only

- Has anyone heard anything about Healthcare Funding or the Health Accord lately?

If YES PROBE IN-DEPTH:

- What did you hear?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Government of Canada has reached Health Accord deals with virtually all provinces and territories (9 provinces and 3 territories), including most recently with Ontario, Quebec and Alberta.

(MONTREAL ONLY)

The deal with QUEBEC sets federal funding levels for healthcare over the next 10 years, and includes \$2.5 billion: \$1.4 billion for homecare and \$1.1 billion for mental health initiatives.

(MISSISSAUGA ONLY)

The deal with ONTARIO sets federal funding levels for healthcare over the next 10 years, and includes \$4.2 billion: \$2.3 billion for homecare and \$1.9 billion for mental health.

- What, if anything, do you like about this deal?
- Are there any negatives?
- Do you think provinces should have to report back to the federal government on how the money dedicated for homecare and mental health is being spent, and on the progress they are making? What makes you say that?
- With funding levels set for the next 10 years, what should the federal government focus on when it comes to healthcare now?

OPIOIDS (30 minutes)

- Has anyone heard anything about opioids in the news? Can you explain to me what is going on in your own words?
 - Can you name any opioids?(PROBE on familiarity with “Fentanyl” if no one mentions it)
 - As far as you know, is this a problem with legal or illegal substances?
 - Would you describe this as an “opioid emergency”, an “opioid crisis”, an opioid “problem”, or some other word?
- What type of people do you think are most affected by this?
 - If vague answers, PROBE them to rank who they think most falls victim to overdoses on opioids – seniors vs. middle age vs. teenagers, homeless vs. low income vs. middle income vs. high income, drug addicts versus people who don’t use many illegal drugs

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

Opioids are drugs that include prescribed pain relievers and illegal drugs such as heroin and fentanyl. Misuse may lead to addiction, overdose and death. Recently, the emergence of fentanyl and other powerful illicit opioid drugs has led to an unprecedented number of deaths.

- What do you think has led to the current problem with opioids? Who or what is to blame?
 - *Do exercise where they rank the top 3 on this list they think are most responsible for the current problem (even if they don’t know much about the problem, ask them to try exercise based on their perceptions):* drug companies making unsafe products, doctors not prescribing properly, gangs, poor border control, lack of policing, people making poor decisions
- Who do you think is most responsible for acting on the opioid crisis?
 - Local/municipal government? Provincial government? Federal government? Doctors? Others?
- What should federal government do in response?
- *Do exercise where they rank top 3 courses of government action they think would be most effective:*
 - Education campaigns to inform public about the risks
 - Better regulation of harmful substances
 - More money for policing
 - Tighter rules around doctors
 - Better border controls
 - More treatment programs
 - Invest more in low income housing
 - Conduct research and collect better data about the problem
 - Allow more safe injection sites, to prevent overdoses

TELECOMMUNICATIONS (25 minutes)

- We’re going to talk a bit about telecommunications, or telecoms, which includes cell phones, cable TV, and internet.

HANDOUT

- I’m going to give you a handout and I’d like you to circle any of the following words that you feel are an accurate description of Canada’s telecommunications industry. Put a star above the word that you feel describes the industry the best.

Affordable
Competitive
Dishonest
Fair
Greedy
Honest
Innovative
Patriotic
Service-Oriented
Stagnant
Unaffordable
Uncompetitive
Unfair
Disruptive
Critical
Unnecessary

- What are some things, if any, that the Canadian telecommunications industry does effectively?
 - What needs to be improved about Canada’s telecommunications industry?
- If the Government of Canada were to make changes to how telecommunications companies do business in Canada, which of the following goals do you think should be their main priority?
 - Making telecommunication bills more affordable for all Canadians.
 - Increasing the amount of choice Canadians have when it comes to cell phone service providers.
 - Creating a more competitive Canadian telecommunications industry.
 - Encouraging innovation so that Canadian telecommunications companies can become world leaders.
 - Ensuring that Telecommunication Jobs are based in Canada.
 - Ensuring Canada is a world leader in Telecommunications Technologies, and provide the best quality Services
 - *PROBE: Do you think that any of these goals are something the Government should not pursue?*

Now, I am going to read some examples of changes that could be made to the telecommunications industry.

- Currently, telecommunications companies in Canada are permitted to sell phones that have been “locked”, meaning that they are unable to connect to any mobile network other than the network it was activated with. Who is familiar with this?

This practice has been disallowed in some countries, making it easier for anyone to switch their contract to a different mobile network, and some say Canada should similarly outlaw locking phones when purchased.

- What do you think would be positive about preventing companies from locking phones in Canada?
- What do you think would be a downside to this approach?
 - PROBE: Some Telecom companies say that locking phones allows them to sell phones and phone coverage at less expensive prices. They say prices might need to be raised if the Government intervenes to stop phone locking. Does this affect your opinion?

- Who has heard of Mobile Virtual Network Operators?
Mobile Virtual Network Operators are startup mobile companies that do not own their own mobile networks, but are able to offer cell phone plans by negotiation to use pre-existing mobile networks owned by other companies. Some have suggested the Government of Canada should help these companies get started by making it easier for them to access existing mobile networks.

- What do you think would be positive about this approach?
- What might be a downside of this approach?
- Some have suggested the government could allow international investors and telecommunications companies to do more business in Canada.
- What do you think would be positive about this approach?
- What do you think would be a downside to this approach?
- Do you see a difference between letting international investors buy shares of existing Canadian telecommunications companies or letting telecommunications companies from other countries enter the Canadian market?
 - (if yes) What are the differences?

NET NEUTRALITY (15 minutes) (MONTREAL ONLY)

- 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?

ONLY IF TIME PERMITS:

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?
- Has anyone heard anything about asylum seekers crossing into Canada from the US? What have you heard?
 - As far as you know, what happens to these individuals after they cross the border?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

If an individual comes into Canada through a designated port of entry at a land border and makes an asylum claim, the Canadian Border Services Agency (CBSA) assesses whether they can enter Canada.

If an individual illegally crosses into Canada (e.g. walks across a field into Canada), once they are in Canada, they are arrested by the RCMP and transferred to CBSA for an immigration examination. The individual can make an asylum claim.

- What do you think about the Government of Canada’s approach to dealing with these individuals? Does it need to change its approach? How?
 - PROBE: Better border security? Accept more asylum claims?
- Has anyone heard of the Safe Third Countries Agreement? Can you explain what it is?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

The Safe Third Country Agreement between Canada and the United States (U.S.) is part of the U.S.–Canada Smart Border Action Plan. Under the Agreement, refugee claimants are required to request refugee protection in the first safe country they arrive in, unless they qualify for an exception to the Agreement.

Since the 1980s, countries around the world have been using safe third country-type agreements as a way to address pressures on domestic asylum systems from the continued growth of global migration. In the mid-1990s, the United Nations Refugee Agency expressed support for these types of agreements.

- Some analysts say that if this agreement were repealed, there would most likely be an increase of individuals arriving from the United States making an asylum claim in Canada. Based on what you know, how do you feel about this agreement?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

The Safe Third Country Agreement does not apply for individuals who illegally cross into Canada (e.g. walk across a field into Canada, rather than through a designated port of entry). These individuals cannot be returned to the US.

If individuals are eligible to make an asylum claim:

- most are released pending an Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada hearing
- they can access support/interim health services

A successful claim leads to protected person status and individuals can apply for permanent resident status.

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

Appendix E. Guide de discussion français

GUIDE DU MODÉRATEUR – MARS 2017

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

- Présentation du modérateur et mot de bienvenue à l’intention des participants au groupe de discussion.
 - Comme nous l’avons indiqué dans le cadre du processus de recrutement, nous tenons des groupes de discussion pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada.
- La rencontre durera environ deux heures. N’hésitez pas à vous absenter en cas de besoin.
- Explication concernant :
 - L’enregistrement audio – La rencontre est enregistrée à des fins d’analyse, au cas où il serait nécessaire de revérifier la teneur des échanges. Les bandes audio demeurent en notre possession et ne seront transmises à personne sans le consentement écrit de tous les participants.
 - Le miroir d’observation – Derrière la vitre, des observateurs représentant le gouvernement assistent à la rencontre.
 - Il est également important de savoir que vos réponses d’aujourd’hui n’auront aucune incidence sur vos échanges avec le gouvernement du Canada.
 - La confidentialité – Soyez assurés que tout ce que vous direz au cours de la rencontre sera tenu strictement confidentiel. Nous n’attribuons pas les commentaires à des personnes en particulier. Notre rapport présente un sommaire des faits saillants de la rencontre, mais aucun nom n’y est mentionné. Le rapport peut être consulté à la Bibliothèque du Parlement ou à Archives Canada.
- Description du fonctionnement d’un groupe de discussion :
 - Les groupes de discussion favorisent une discussion franche et ouverte. En qualité de modérateur, mon rôle est de guider la discussion et d’encourager tout un chacun à y prendre part. Une autre fonction du modérateur est de veiller à ce que la discussion ne dérape pas et respecte l’horaire prévu.
 - Votre rôle consiste à répondre aux questions et à exprimer vos opinions. Nous voulons connaître toutes les opinions, qu’elles soient minoritaires ou majoritaires. N’hésitez donc pas à vous exprimer, même si vous croyez que votre opinion est différente de celles des autres participants. Les autres peuvent ou non partager votre point de vue. L’opinion de chacun est importante et mérite le respect.
 - J’aimerais également souligner qu’il n’y a pas de mauvaises réponses. Nous cherchons simplement à connaître vos opinions et attitudes. Il ne s’agit pas d’un test de connaissances. Nous n’attendons aucune préparation de votre part en prévision de cette rencontre.

Veillez noter que le modérateur n’est pas un employé du gouvernement du Canada et qu’il est possible qu’il ne soit pas en mesure de répondre à certaines de vos questions concernant le sujet de la discussion. Si des questions importantes sont soulevées pendant la rencontre, nous tenterons d’obtenir les réponses avant votre départ.

- (Le modérateur se présente). Les participants se présentent en mentionnant seulement leur prénom.
 - Quels sont vos passions ou vos passe-temps principaux?

ACTIONS DU GOUVERNEMENT (20 minutes)

- Qu’avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu récemment au sujet du gouvernement du Canada?
 - SONDER : Qu’avez-vous entendu récemment au sujet des relations entre le Canada et les États-Unis?
 - Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de réfugiés qui ont traversé la frontière depuis les États-Unis?

Budget (BRAMPTON ET MONTRÉAL SEULEMENT)

BRAMPTON SEULEMENT:

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont entendu parler du budget fédéral? Qu’avez-vous entendu exactement?

PRÉCISER AU BESOIN :

Le budget est le plan détaillé qu’entend suivre le gouvernement pour établir le programme économique annuel du Canada. Le ministre des Finances prononcera le discours du budget demain.

- D’après ce que vous avez pu entendre, s’il y a lieu, que devrait contenir ce budget? Quelles seront les priorités du gouvernement selon vous?
- Le budget de l’an dernier comprenait le financement de projets d’infrastructures, comme les routes et le transport en commun, qui se poursuivra cette année. Quels principaux projets d’infrastructures nécessitent du financement dans la région du Grand Toronto?

MONTRÉAL SEULEMENT:

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont entendu parler du budget fédéral?

Si OUI, SONDER EN PROFONDEUR :

- Qu’avez-vous entendu?
- Quels projets le budget contient-il en particulier?
- Y a-t-il des aspects qui vous plaisent? Des aspects qui vous déplaisent?
- Quels éléments du budget vous toucheront le plus sur le plan personnel?

PRÉCISER AU BESOIN :

Le budget est le plan détaillé qu’entend suivre le gouvernement pour établir le programme économique annuel du Canada. Le ministre des Finances prononcera le discours du budget cet après-midi.

- Comme le budget a été présenté aujourd’hui, il se peut que vous n’en ayez pas encore entendu parler. Cela dit, compte tenu des priorités du gouvernement, que croyez-vous qu’il contient?
- Le budget de l’an dernier comprenait le financement de projets d’infrastructures, comme les routes et le transport en commun, qui se poursuivra cette année. Quels principaux projets d’infrastructures nécessitent du financement dans la région de Montréal?

(MONTREAL SEULEMENT)

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont entendu parler du soutien du gouvernement fédéral accordé 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 octroiera une contribution remboursable de 372,5 millions \$ 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 C Series.

- Qu’en pensez-vous? Est-ce une bonne chose ou une mauvaise chose?
 - SONDER : Quels sont les avantages?
 - SONDER : Avez-vous des préoccupations?

HABITATION (15 minutes) (BRAMPTON SEULEMENT)

SI LE SUJET A ÉTÉ ABORDÉ PENDANT LA MISE EN TRAIN :

- Certains d’entre vous ont mentionné l’habitation. Qu’est-ce qui vous préoccupe personnellement en matière d’habitation?

S’ADRESSER À L’ENSEMBLE DU GROUPE :

- Qu’en est-il des autres membres du groupe? Quelles sont les principales difficultés en matière d’habitation dans la région du Grand Toronto?
- J’ai ici un document qui comporte quelques suggestions de difficultés en matière d’habitation. Veuillez indiquer dans quelle mesure chaque élément pose un problème dans votre propre

collectivité, s’il y a lieu. MODÉRATEUR : RAPPELEZ AUX PARTICIPANTS QU’ILS DOIVENT SONGER À LEUR PROPRE RÉGION ET NON À D’AUTRES PARTIES DU CANADA OU AU CANADA EN GÉNÉRAL.

EXERCISE SUR PAPIER AVEC LES DIFFICULTÉS SUIVANTES:

- Prix d’achat élevé des propriétés
- Pénurie de logements abordables
- Besoins des groupes à faible revenu en matière de logement

LES PARTICIPANTS RÉPONDENT INDIVIDUELLEMENT PUIS PRENNENT PART À UNE DISCUSSION DE GROUPE :

- Qui considère le prix d’achat élevé des propriétés comme une difficulté majeure?
 - Le cas échéant :
 - Pourquoi les solutions d’habitation sont-elles devenues si dispendieuses?
 - Voyez-vous comment le gouvernement du Canada pourrait agir à cet égard? Des stratégies vous viennent-elles à l’esprit?

SOINS DE SANTÉ (15 minutes) BRAMPTON ET MONTRÉAL SEULEMENT)

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont récemment entendu parler du financement des soins de santé ou de l’Accord sur la santé?

Si OUI, SONDER EN PROFONDEUR :

- Qu’avez-vous entendu?

PRÉCISER AU BESOIN :

Le gouvernement du Canada a conclu des ententes en vertu de l’Accord sur la santé avec neuf provinces et trois territoires, y compris avec le/l’ (PROVINCE DU GROUPE).

(MONTRÉAL SEULEMENT)

L’entente avec le QUÉBEC établit les niveaux de financement fédéraux en santé pour les dix prochaines années. Elle comprend un investissement de 2,5 milliards \$ dans les initiatives en matière de soins à domicile et de santé mentale.

(BRAMPTON SEULEMENT)

L’entente avec l’ONTARIO établit les niveaux de financement fédéraux en santé pour les dix prochaines années. Elle comprend un investissement de 2,3 milliards \$ dans les soins à domicile et de 1,9 milliard \$ en santé mentale.

- S’il y a lieu, qu’est-ce qui vous plaît dans cette entente?
- Comporte-t-elle des aspects négatifs?
- Selon vous, les provinces devraient-elles être tenues de rendre des comptes au gouvernement fédéral sur la façon dont les fonds alloués aux soins à domicile et de santé mentale sont dépensés de même que sur les progrès réalisés? Qu’est-ce que vous fait dire cela?
- Étant donné que les niveaux de financement sont établis pour les dix prochaines années, sur quoi le gouvernement fédéral devrait-il selon vous se pencher maintenant en matière de soins de santé?

OPIOÏDES (30 minutes)

- Y en a-t-il parmi vous qui ont entendu parler des opioïdes dans les actualités? Pouvez-vous m’expliquer ce qui se passe dans vos propres mots?
 - Pouvez-vous nommer des opioïdes? (SONDER sur la connaissance du fentanyl si personne ne le mentionne.)
 - À votre connaissance, existe-t-il un problème en ce qui a trait aux substances licites ou illicites?
 - Utiliseriez-vous des termes comme « enjeu critique des opioïdes », « crise des opioïdes », « problème des opioïdes » ou autres pour décrire la situation?
- Selon vous, quel type de personne est le plus touché par cette situation?
 - Si la réponse est vague, SONDER les gens pour qu’ils indiquent, dans l’ordre, les personnes les plus à risque de subir une surdose d’opioïdes : aînés ou personnes d’âge mur ou adolescents, sans-abris ou personnes à faible revenu ou personnes de classe moyenne ou personnes à revenu élevé, toxicomanes ou personnes qui recourent rarement aux drogues illicites.

PRÉCISER AU BESOIN :

Les opioïdes sont une catégorie de drogues qui comprend des analgésiques d’ordonnance et des drogues illicites, comme l’héroïne ou le fentanyl. Mal utilisés, ils peuvent mener à la dépendance, à une surdose et à la mort. Récemment, l’émergence du fentanyl et d’autres opioïdes illicites puissants a entraîné un nombre inégalé de décès.

- Selon vous, qu’est-ce qui a causé le problème actuel lié aux opioïdes? À qui ou à quoi revient le blâme?
 - *Invitez les participants à indiquer, dans l’ordre, les trois principaux éléments de la liste les plus susceptibles d’être à l’origine du problème actuel (même s’ils ne sont pas très au fait du problème, demandez-leur de répondre en fonction de leur perception) : les sociétés pharmaceutiques qui fabriquent des produits non sécuritaires, les médecins qui ne rédigent pas adéquatement leurs ordonnances,*

les gangs, le piètre contrôle frontalier, le manque de services de police, le mauvais jugement de certaines personnes

- Comment le gouvernement fédéral devrait-il réagir?
- *Invitez les participants à indiquer, dans l’ordre, les trois actions les plus efficaces que le gouvernement pourrait entreprendre selon eux :*
 - Campagnes d’éducation pour informer le public au sujet des risques
 - Réglementation plus stricte à l’égard des substances dangereuses
 - Plus de fonds alloués aux services de police
 - Règles plus strictes pour encadrer les médecins
 - Meilleur contrôle frontalier
 - Plus de programmes de traitement
 - Plus d’investissement dans les logements pour personnes à faible revenu
 - Études et collectes de données plus pertinentes sur le problème
 - Ouverture de plus de sites d’injection supervisée pour prévenir les surdoses

TÉLÉCOMMUNICATIONS (20 minutes)

- Parlons maintenant un peu des télécommunications (ou télécoms), qui comprennent la téléphonie mobile, la câblodistribution et l’Internet.

EXERCICE SUR PAPIER :

- Je vais vous distribuer un document. Veuillez encercler n’importe lesquels des mots suivants qui, selon vous, décrivent fidèlement le secteur des télécommunications au Canada. Mettez une étoile à côté de celui qui décrit le mieux le secteur selon vous.

Abordable
Concurrentiel
Malhonnête
Équitable
Cupide
Honnête
Novateur
Patriotique
Axé sur les services
Stagnant
Inabordable
Non concurrentiel
Inéquitable
Perturbateur
Critique
Superflu

- Quelles sont certaines des choses que le secteur canadien des télécommunications accomplit efficacement, s’il y a lieu?

- Quels sont les points à améliorer en ce qui concerne le secteur canadien des télécommunications?
- Si le gouvernement du Canada voulait apporter des changements quant à la façon dont les sociétés de télécommunications mènent leurs activités au Canada, lequel des objectifs suivants devrait être prioritaire selon vous?
 - Rendre les frais de télécommunications plus abordables pour les Canadiens.
 - Élargir le choix des Canadiens en matière de fournisseurs de services téléphoniques cellulaires.
 - Accroître la concurrence au sein du secteur canadien des télécommunications.
 - Favoriser l’innovation pour permettre aux sociétés de télécommunications canadiennes de dominer le marché mondial.
 - Veiller à ce que les emplois en télécommunications soient basés au Canada.
 - Veiller à ce que le Canada soit un chef de file mondial dans les technologies des télécommunications et offre des services de qualité supérieure.
 - SONDER : *Croyez-vous que l’un ou l’autre de ces objectifs ne devrait pas être poursuivi par le gouvernement?*

Je vais maintenant vous lire des exemples de changements qui pourraient survenir dans le secteur des télécommunications.

- Actuellement, les sociétés de télécommunications canadiennes sont autorisées à vendre des téléphones « verrouillés », c’est-à-dire des appareils qui ne peuvent être activés sur un autre réseau que celui de l’activation initiale. Qui est au courant de cette pratique?
- Cette pratique n’est plus autorisée dans certains pays, ce qui permet aux gens de transférer plus facilement leur forfait sur un autre réseau mobile. Certains disent que le Canada devrait prendre des mesures comparables pour interdire le verrouillage des téléphones à l’achat.
- Selon vous, quels seraient les avantages d’empêcher les sociétés de verrouiller les téléphones au Canada?
- Quels seraient les inconvénients d’une telle approche à votre avis?
 - SONDER : Certaines sociétés de télécommunications affirment que le verrouillage de téléphones leur permet de vendre des téléphones et d’offrir une couverture cellulaire à prix moindre. Selon elles, les prix devront peut-être augmenter si le gouvernement intervient pour mettre fin au verrouillage. Ce point de vue influence-t-il votre opinion?
- Qui a entendu parler des exploitants de réseaux mobiles virtuels?

Les exploitants de réseaux mobiles virtuels sont des sociétés de services mobiles émergentes qui ne possèdent pas leur propre réseau mobile, mais qui sont en mesure d’offrir des forfaits de téléphonie cellulaire grâce à des ententes leur permettant d’utiliser des réseaux de téléphonie mobile déjà établis et détenus par d’autres sociétés. Selon certains, le gouvernement du Canada devrait soutenir

le démarrage de telles sociétés en facilitant leur accès aux réseaux mobiles existants.

- Quels seraient les avantages d’une telle approche selon vous?
- Quels sont les éventuels inconvénients?

- Selon certains, le gouvernement pourrait permettre aux investisseurs internationaux et aux sociétés de télécommunications d’intensifier leurs activités au Canada.

- Quels seraient les avantages d’une telle approche selon vous?
- Et quels en seraient les inconvénients?
- Percevez-vous une différence entre le fait d’autoriser des investisseurs internationaux à acheter des actions de sociétés de télécommunications canadiennes existantes et celui de laisser des sociétés de télécommunications étrangères accéder au marché canadien?
 - (Si oui) Quelles sont les différences?

NEUTRALITÉ DU NET (15 minutes) (MONTRÉAL SEULEMENT)

- Qui a déjà entendu le terme « neutralité du Net »? Pouvez-vous me le définir dans vos propres mots?

FOURNIR LA DÉFINITION : La neutralité du Net est ce principe selon lequel les fournisseurs de services Internet devraient offrir un accès équitable à tous les contenus, indépendamment des sources, sans privilégier ni bloquer de sites Web en particulier.

- Cette explication vous paraît-elle claire ou le concept reste-t-il confus?

- (Si le concept est bien compris) Que pensez-vous du principe de neutralité du Net?

- Le gouvernement devrait-il instaurer des codes de conduite pour s’assurer que les plateformes numériques, comme Facebook ou Google, diffusent davantage de points de vue diversifiés et du contenu local?

Relations Canada – États-Unis

Si le temps le permet

- Est-ce que quelqu’un a entendu quoi que ce soit à propos de demandeurs d’asile qui arrivent au Canada en provenance des États-Unis? Qu’avez-vous entendu?
 - À votre connaissance, qu’arrive-t-il à ces personnes qui traversent la frontière?

RENSEIGNEMENTS CONTEXTUELS À L’INTENTION DU MODÉRATEUR :

Si une personne arrive au Canada par un point d’entrée terrestre désigné et demande l’asile, l’Agence des services frontaliers du Canada (ASFC) détermine si elle peut ou non entrer au pays.

Si une personne entre illégalement au Canada (p. ex. en passant par les champs et en traversant la frontière à pied), une fois arrivée au Canada, elle est arrêtée par la GRC et transférée à l’ASFC pour interrogatoire. La personne peut présenter une demande d’asile.

- Que pensez-vous de l’approche du gouvernement du Canada dans son intervention auprès de ces personnes? Doit-il changer son approche? Comment?
 - SONDER : Renforcement de la sécurité à la frontière? Accepter un plus grand nombre de demandes d’asile?
- Est-ce que quelqu’un a entendu parler de l’Entente sur les pays tiers sûrs? Pouvez-vous expliquer ce que c’est?

CLARIFIER AU BESOIN :

L’Entente sur les pays tiers sûrs entre le Canada et les États-Unis fait partie du Plan d’action canado-américain pour une frontière intelligente. En vertu de l’entente, les demandeurs d’asile doivent réclamer le statut de réfugié dans le premier pays sûr où ils arrivent, à moins d’être admissibles à une dérogation dans le cadre de l’entente.

Depuis les années 1980, partout dans le monde, les pays utilisent des ententes sur les pays tiers sûrs comme moyen d’atténuer les pressions sur les systèmes d’asile provoquées par la croissance soutenue de la migration à l’échelle mondiale. Au milieu des années 1990, le Haut-Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés a accordé son appui à ce type d’ententes.

- Certains analystes affirment que si cette entente était révoquée, il y aurait fort probablement une augmentation du nombre de personnes qui arrivent au pays en provenance des États-Unis en demandant l’asile au Canada. Selon ce que vous en savez, que pensez-vous de cette entente?

RENSEIGNEMENTS CONTEXTUELS À L’INTENTION DU MODÉRATEUR :

L’Entente sur les pays tiers sûrs ne concerne pas les personnes qui entrent illégalement au Canada (p. ex. qui passent par les champs plutôt que par un point d’entrée désigné). Ces personnes ne peuvent pas être renvoyées aux États-Unis.

Si elles sont admissibles à une demande d’asile :

- dans la plupart des cas, elles sont libérées en attendant une audience devant la Commission de l’immigration et du statut de réfugié du Canada
- elles ont droit à des services d’aide et de santé intérimaires

L’acceptation de la demande d’asile confère au demandeur le statut de personne protégée, et celui-ci peut alors présenter une demande de résidence permanente.

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)