




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 – Fifth Round of Focus Groups

FINAL REPORT
July, 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	1
Key Findings 2	
2. Detailed Findings	5
Themes Addressed.....	5
Government Actions.....	5
Canada- United States Relations	5
Poverty	7
Official Languages.....	10
Local Challenges	11
Heritage	12
Impaired Driving.....	15
Public Safety	15
Justice	17
Cyber Security.....	18
3. Appendix.....	19
Appendix A. Detailed Research Methodology	19
Appendix B. Recruitment Guide	21
Appendix C. Discussion Guides	27



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 fourth 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:

- Government of Canada Actions
- Canada-US Relations
- Poverty
- Local Challenges
- The culture sector in Canada
- The CBC
- Impaired Driving
- Public Safety
- Justice
- Cyber Security

Overview of Methodology

This fifth wave of qualitative research was comprised of a series of sixteen focus groups with Canadians aged 20 years old and above, held between May 8th and May 30th, 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:

- May 8th – Moncton
- May 10th – St John’s
- May 15th – North Vancouver
- May 16th – Calgary
- May 23rd – North York
- May 24th – Montreal
- May 29th – Sault Ste Marie
- May 30th – Sudbury

A total of 12 participants were recruited for each session to ensure that a minimum of eight to ten participants would attend. In total, 144 participants took part in the discussions. All participants received an honorarium of \$75 for attending the sessions at the focus group facilities. The screening questionnaire helped ensure that participants included a good cross-section of the general population, with good mixes of gender, ages, education and income levels, as well as household composition. Additional methodological details can be found in the appendix of this report.

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

Key Findings

Local Challenges

In North Vancouver participants were concerned with the cost of housing and a need for improved infrastructure. In Calgary, the discussion was largely focused on the economy and its recent impacts on the job market, and the cost of housing. Those in St. John’s felt there was a decrease in the number of jobs in the community, which was brought to light in an exercise where participants highlighted ‘a shrinking middle class’ as a major concern. During the exercise in Sudbury, healthcare, lack of jobs, and the cost of living were highlighted as concerns for the community, while, those in Sault St. Marie noted a lack of quality jobs in the community and a need for local economic diversification.

Canada -United States Relations

The perspective on Canada-US relations was similar in all locations. Participants felt it was important for the Canadian government to protect its trade interests; compromise in trade agreements would be acceptable, but they did not feel this was necessary at this preliminary stage, and; participants also recognized the need to be cautious when asserting the interests of Canada as the US has a large economy and is one of Canada’s largest trading partners. Discussions of softwood lumber and dairy agreements left participants feeling comfortable with the government’s current approach. It was also widely accepted that Canada and the US should work together on environmental issues, even if this would be difficult to accomplish.

Poverty

Participants in Calgary, North Vancouver and St. John’s noted an increase in poverty in their communities. According to participants, primary factors contributing to this increase ranged from increased housing costs (North Vancouver), weakened provincial economic prospects (Calgary) and the lack of well-paying and steady jobs in their community (St. John’s). Opinions were mixed when asked if the government should focus on ‘reducing the number of Canadians living in poverty’ or; ‘increasing the number of low-income Canadians who join the middle class’, however when asked about the target group for a poverty reduction strategy, the ‘working poor’ was a clear top choice in all locations. Poverty was defined similarly across all groups as the inability to afford all the necessities, which included housing, food, utilities, internet access and healthcare. There were no clear preferences in terms of federal government policies that would be most effective in addressing poverty in Canada, however policies relating to a guaranteed minimum income, skills training, and building affordable housing were most often discussed.

Official Languages

Protecting the French language was important to participants in both Moncton and Sudbury. However, there was a contrast in their ideas of the current state of the French language in Sudbury. Participants overall felt there was an increase in the availability of access to services and education in French in the community, and they did not perceive as much discrimination towards French speakers as in the past. However, participants still feared the sustainability of the French language in their community as there was a general sense that younger generations of Franco-Ontarians were not concerned with the vitality

of their language. During the written exercise the key issue selected by many participants was transmitting the French language and culture to younger generations.

Heritage

Once provided with a description, participants in Sault St. Marie, North York, Montreal and Sudbury recognized the importance of the culture sector in Canada. When asked about the major challenges of the culture sector strong competition, especially American creators and producers as well as a perceived lack of value placed on the culture sector in Canada, were discussed. Those in Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury were conflicted on the government’s relationship with the sector however those in North York felt it was most important for the federal government to support Canadian culture. When asked, many felt going forward the federal government should focus its efforts on partnerships and digitizing Canadian culture.

The news industry was recognized as a struggling industry however a desire to protect the industry as-is was not often expressed as many felt more effort should go into modernizing the industry, through supporting digital content.

CBC was seen as having an essential role in the culture sector for Canadians across all regions and helps to create a sense of national awareness and identity. Many noted the CBC did a good job of promoting local content, felt the amount of indigenous content could be increased, and felt more should be done to target content to younger demographics.

Impaired Driving

At first, participants were not in favour of the random administration of Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) tests, and felt there needs to be substantial cause for a test such as the smell of alcohol or visibly unsafe driving. After some discussion, opinions shifted slightly and most were in favour of a reasonable number of random stops to ensure the safety of all drivers. Overall, participants felt that, approached reasonably, random tests are justified due to the number of deaths from impaired driving and the ability of the tests to reduce this number.

Public Safety

National Security was described by participants in North York, Montreal, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury as relating to protecting Canadian citizens, protecting trade and natural resources, and preventing terrorism both at home and abroad. National security agencies known to participants included the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), and the Department of National Defence (DND). The sharing of information between these agencies was important to many, in particular when saving lives, national security and saving money were of concern. Favoured terms to describe the guiding principles of national security in Canada were safety and security, as they were seen as the basic functions of security policy.

Justice

Those in North Vancouver, Calgary and St. John’s were aware of the existence of mandatory minimum penalties in Canada; however few could name specific details. Overall, participants believed the

existence of mandatory minimums made the criminal justice system more fair, as there were set penalties to anyone who committed a crime regardless of their social status or access to a lawyer. When presented with the idea of increasing some of these maximums and repealing some mandatory minimums, many agreed with increasing the maximums for some crimes, but keeping mandatory minimums. Last, participants were presented with the option for judges to use special exemptions to bypass mandatory minimums. Participants were wary of the influence and bias judges could have on these cases and were comfortable with this suggestion only when it was clear there would be strict criteria and guidelines for a case to be eligible for special exemption.

Cyber Security

Cyber security was described by participants in Calgary and North Vancouver as supervision of online activity and the protection of personal information. In both locations, specific instances of cyber-attacks and threats were named, such as recent cyber attacks against the British Health Services, Alberta Health Services, and attacks on White House cyber security. Participants in both locations had heard the federal government was addressing the issue of cyber security, but felt that compared to other countries this was not a high priority issue for Canada. While overall there was support for protecting the electoral process from cyber-threats, there were several concerns such as a potential for an increased government presence and impact on free speech, as well as concerns on why only electoral process protection was a concern rather than all government services.

Note on Interpretation of Findings

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

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

2. Detailed Findings

This section of the report presents the detailed findings from sixteen focus group discussions held in eight 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:

- Canada- United States relations
- Parliamentary reform
- Canada 150th celebrations
- Electoral reform decision
- Immigration and refugees
- The environment
- Legalization of Marijuana
- Free trade agreement negotiations (NAFTA), notably with respect to softwood lumber and dairy
- Syria (foreign relations, Canadian forces deployment/mission)
- Trade relations with the EU
- Arctic cooperation
- Foreign buyers real estate tax
- Free National Park access

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

- Local Challenges
- Government of Canada Actions
- Canada- United States relations
- Poverty
- Heritage
- Impaired Driving
- Public Safety
- Justice
- Cyber

Canada- United States Relations

When prompted to discuss the current relationship between Canada and the US participants in North Vancouver, Calgary, North York, and St. John’s shared a similar perspective on three key points:

- Participants felt it was important for the Canadian government to protect its trade interests;
- Compromise in trade agreements would be acceptable, but they did not feel this was necessary at this preliminary stage and;
- Participants also recognized the need to be cautious when asserting the interests of Canada as the US has a large economy and is one of Canada’s largest trading partners.

In light of this, participants felt comfortable with their opinion of Canada’s position in negotiations between Canada and the United States. Participants felt Canada could stand firm and respectfully defend its interests in ongoing trade negotiations.

Softwood lumber and dairy

Groups in St. John’s, North Vancouver, and Calgary were probed specifically on views related to softwood lumber and dairy negotiations between Canada and the United States. For the most part initial feedback could best be described as cursory with most simply saying they were aware that negotiations were ongoing. There were some concerns voiced about the potential impacts some of the proposed measures could have on consumers and some participants in North Vancouver made mention of the 20% tariff proposed by the United States which they viewed as unfair. However, many participants made a point of stating that these types of negotiations were fairly typical and that Canada has in the past been successful in defending its interests when it comes to Canada/U.S. trade negotiations.

When probed about their interests in the negotiations and the Government’s position, participants in St. John’s, North Vancouver, and Calgary felt the Government was defending their interests but were somewhat hard pressed to provide details. Though many could not name specifics of the softwood lumber or dairy trade agreements, participants overall were confident that the government could and would represent Canadians interests going forward.

Issues to be discussed between Canada and the US

When asked to discuss areas of opportunity for Canada/U.S. collaboration, a number of participants in all three locations mentioned security issues, specifically border security and cyber security. Other issues mentioned included immigration, and those in Vancouver also made a point of mentioning increased oversight of the oil industry and collaborative disaster planning.

Environmental Issues- Canada and the United States

After the initial discussion on possible areas for collaboration, participants in St. John’s, North Vancouver and Calgary were asked whether Canada and the US should work together on environmental issues. Participants in all three locations agreed that efforts should be made to find opportunities for collaboration on environmental issues even if this may prove difficult.

Participants recognized the short, medium and long term implications of environmental issues for both countries (notably in St. John’s), with a few stating that pollution knows no borders. Participants in Calgary for their part spoke of advancements in oil production technology and the opportunity to share this technology with the United States.

Participants in all three locations noted that environmental issues appeared to be a higher priority in Canada, but that this should not impact Canada’s approach when it comes to working on cross-border environmental issues.

Poverty

The following discussion took place in North Vancouver, Calgary, Moncton and St. John’s. Participants were led through a semi-structured discussion and exercise on poverty in their community and questioned as to how to best address this issue.

Many participants, particularly those in North Vancouver, felt that poverty was becoming increasingly visible in their community, often mentioning seeing more homeless individuals. Participants felt the cost of housing was a major cause of this increase, especially for seniors and young adults. They also noted that the cost of food, and extracurricular activities for children have increased, leaving more families struggling.

Those in Calgary also acknowledged an apparent increase in poverty levels in their community more recently. Several participants noted that economic uncertainty, significant job losses and inadequate wages have contributed to an insecurity related to short, medium and long term economic prospects in their community. Participants also commented on an apparent increase in drug and alcohol addiction which in their opinion go hand and hand with increased poverty levels. A few also expressed concern related to homeless shelter closings and the longer-term effects this would have on the community.

For participants in St. John’s concerns tended to center on the lack of employment opportunities and how this could potentially contribute to increased poverty levels in their community. For these participants, this situation could potentially serve to amplify challenges related to covering household expenses, childcare costs, healthcare and support for an aging population.

Participants in Moncton generally felt that although there was no doubt that poverty has been present in their community for a long time its manifestations are more apparent than they were previously. Participants spoke of the apparent increasing divide between “haves” and “have nots” and how those living in poverty struggled to ensure even a basic quality of life.

Focus for Addressing Poverty

Participants were presented with two options and asked what the Government of Canada’s focus should be when it came to addressing poverty in Canada. Options presented were as follows:

- ‘Reduce the number of Canadians living in poverty’, or;
- ‘Increase the number of low-income Canadians who join the middle class’.

Participants felt both options had merit. Those who opted for reducing the number of Canadians living in poverty felt that addressing poverty head on would have the likely benefit of reducing the strain on the social assistance system in Canada which, in turn, would be beneficial for all Canadians. These individuals felt that of the two options presented this one was more realistic and would likely yield more

immediate benefits for all. Practically speaking, these participants spoke of the need for assistance to allow those living in poverty to attain basic minimal education standards and competencies that would allow them to transition out of a life of poverty.

Conversely, those that selected increasing the number of middle class Canadians tended to base their argument in terms of the broader positive effects this would have on their community’s economic prospects as well as the Canadian economy overall. Those who preferred this option often explained their choice by stating that the factors contributing to poverty are complex and multifaceted and therefore finding a solution to this challenge would require a multipronged approach.

Target Group for Poverty Reduction

Subsequently, participants were asked to consider whether the federal government should be focusing on ‘no income Canadians’, ‘low income Canadians’ or ‘the working poor’ when it came to efforts to combat poverty in Canada. Participants in all locations stated that the government’s focus should be the development of programs to help the working poor.

Most explained their choice by stating that of the three groups presented, these individuals were most likely to be the easiest to transition to the middle class, based on a sense that the working poor were motivated to succeed and mostly self-sufficient. According to these participants, focusing on this audience could potentially yield the greatest returns in the short term, particularly as in many cases these individuals struggle due to low wages.

Defining living in poverty and cost of living

Participants defined ‘living in poverty’ as not being able to afford all of life’s necessities and having to prioritize between them. Participants also noted that living in poverty encompasses more than homelessness and includes those who are forced to prioritize between various necessities because of their individual financial circumstances.

Participants generally associated items such as: housing, food, utilities, transit, basic hygiene, healthcare, dental care, childcare, clothes, telecommunications (internet and phone access) with what can be defined as cost of living expenses. With respect to internet access, some participants stated that the increased presence of and dependence on the internet in our day to day lives as a means communication and of accessing basic information warranted its inclusion on the list.

Government Actions

Following the broad discussion on poverty, focus group participants were presented with a handout which highlighted a series of potential federal government policies and asked to identify those which would be most effective in terms of helping reduce poverty.

The list of policies was as follows:

- Building more shelters to provide food and beds for the homeless

- Investing in skills training so people can find good paying jobs
- Introducing a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians living below the poverty line
- Increasing funding for mental health treatment services
- Building more affordable housing units for low-income Canadians
- Extending Employment Insurance benefits to more Canadians who can’t find work
- Introducing a child benefit so that less children grow up in poverty
- Increasing the Guaranteed Income Supplement for single low-income seniors
- Redefine what counts as “low income” in Canada so that more Canadians are eligible for support
- Subsidizing public transit so that it is easier for the working poor to commute to work

Participants in St John’s tended to gravitate towards ‘guaranteed minimum income for low income Canadians’, ‘increased funding for mental health services’, and ‘investing in skills training’. Those opting for the introduction of a guaranteed minimum income noted it was a way to address the root cause of many issues relating to poverty. Others felt a guaranteed minimum income had the potential to offer additional support to youth and break the cycle of poverty while also giving dignity to seniors who needed support. Those who opted for funding for mental health services noted the interconnectedness of mental health and poverty. Skills training was seen by many participants as a policy that could benefit and prepare young community members for jobs, if skills training offered aligned with employment market needs.

Moncton participants spoke of the need to invest in skills training and more specifically in targeted skills training to ensure that those benefiting from this assistance can easily transition into available jobs rather than developing skill sets that are not aligned with the current employment market. These participants also felt policies focused on building more affordable housing would be beneficial, as housing is seen as a basic necessity and homelessness and poverty often go hand in hand. Participants also suggested policies focused on increasing the guaranteed income supplement for single low-income seniors who, more often than not simply do not have enough to ensure their own subsistence, made sense and would prove beneficial, as would providing a child benefit so that less children grow up in poverty. Many of them saw this as a way of countering an ongoing cycle of poverty.

Those in North Vancouver also favoured investments in skills training as well as efforts to build more affordable housing. Participants felt that providing increased opportunities for skills training would likely lead to better paying jobs and consequently would help set aside some of the challenges presented by increases in the cost of living, while also having a positive effect on the local and national economies. The possibility of providing more opportunities to access affordable housing for low-income Canadians was also well received by those in North Vancouver. Many participants saw this as an effective solution to addressing poverty in their community.

Some participants in North Vancouver also noted that the introduction of a child benefit, increased funding for mental health programs, guaranteed annual income for seniors and a guaranteed annual income for low income Canadians would also likely be effective in reducing poverty in Canada. Those who selected the child benefit felt it could potentially help break the cycle of poverty and would be a direct benefit to those that need it most. Increased funding for mental health programs was retained by some who stated that often poverty and challenges related to mental health are not mutually exclusive; as such addressing one without considering the other would not yield optimum results. These participants noted that funding for mental health programs could be of benefit to millennials and seniors particularly. Finally, efforts to ensure guaranteed annual income programs for low income Canadians

and single seniors living below the poverty line were a way to help those targeted become more self-sufficient.

As was the case in North Vancouver, participants in Calgary also saw the benefits of increased funding for mental health. In addition, they preferred policies that focused on building affordable housing, redefining ‘low-income’ and ‘investing in skills training’.

Those who opted for increased mental health funding felt these investments would benefit all Canadians including those living in poverty, while policies focused on building affordable housing were deemed to be of benefit to families living in poverty. Participants also felt that efforts to redefine what counts as ‘low income’ could potentially help address what some see as a growing divide between the working poor and the middle class. In addition to the aforementioned policy options, participants in Calgary also expressed interest in policies focused on ‘investing in skills training’ which they saw as an effective way to empower those in need. Of note, programs targeting minimum incomes for either those living below the poverty line and single low-income seniors were of less interest in Calgary as they sounded costly.

Participants in all four locations were asked if anything was missing from the list of suggested policies included in the handout. Suggestions included: more support for indigenous communities, tax reform for low income Canadians, as well as an increased focus on healthcare and investments in infrastructure.

Official Languages

The following discussion took place in Moncton and Sudbury. There was agreement by participants in both locations that protecting the French language was important, and some, particularly those in Moncton state that this is part of their identity, their roots. However, discussions showed an interesting dichotomy regarding their assessment of the current state of the French language in their community.

On the one hand, participants mostly felt that the situation of access to services and education in French had improved over time. Participants, especially older ones, believed that there was more discrimination and poorer access to services in French when they were younger, or with previous generations. This view was more strongly held in Sudbury than in Moncton where participants were quick to acknowledge that they live in an officially bilingual province. Some participants in Moncton suggested that measures taken to respect this linguistic duality can at times lead to unnecessary tensions between French and English speakers, and participants pointed to rules around school bus transportation as an example of this.

On the other hand, most participants also said that they feared for the sustainability of the French language. For many the issue was not access to services or respect for the rights of the Francophone community, but a general sense that younger generations did not value their language as much as those that came before, and preferred instead to converse primarily in English to align with broader youth cultural norms in their region. In addition, those in Moncton also expressed concern that it is becoming increasingly difficult to access home grown French cultural content. According to these participants, there is a reliance on content flowing out of Quebec, which for some can at times be difficult to relate to, as it does not reflect their day to day reality.

The key issue for participants in both communities was to find a way to make French more attractive to young people and make them more interested in French culture, especially local matters. Participants feared that French would be less and less important in the community, something they deplored.

This general discussion was directly reflected in the results of a subsequent written exercise completed by participants. In this exercise, where participants had to select the most important challenges facing

their respective Francophone community, very few participants selected issues related to accessibility of government services in French. The most pressing challenges identified by participants was transmitting French language and culture to the younger generations. This was followed by providing better access to French media content, creating a sense of community among French-speaking residents, and the need to keep young Francophones in the region.

Local Challenges

North Vancouver, Calgary, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, and St. John’s participants were asked to discuss local challenges facing their communities. Additionally, those in St. John’s, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury were asked to reflect on positive and negative government actions in their communities. Responses varied from location to location.

North Vancouver participants focused on concerns related to local infrastructure and housing costs. More specifically, transit infrastructure was of concern to participants; many described a need for new bridges, bypasses and overall improved infrastructure planning, as well as water and sewer infrastructure improvements. Additionally, several participants expressed concerns with high prices to own or rent housing, as well as overdevelopment of buildings such as condominiums that were subsequently often left empty.

In Calgary, the discussion of local issues was largely focused on the economy. Many participants were concerned with growing job losses, and they also pointed to the increasing number of houses on the market for sale or rent. These concerns became more apparent throughout the discussion. Other local concerns mentioned included funding shortfalls for transit projects such as a ring road, bike paths, and light rail transit (LRT) projects.

Those in Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury were most likely to reference FedNor when asked about recent government actions. A few in each location had even applied for, and received, funding from the organization for various projects. All participants felt this was a good organization that should be maintained. Few participants were aware that funding for FedNor had been increased, however, when informed of this there was general agreement that this was a positive development.

When prompted to discuss positive government actions in their community, participants in St. John’s mentioned an increase in health care assistance for seniors, increased funding for health care research, beneficial changes to the equalization formula, the guaranteed loan for the Muskrat Falls project, and the new parental leave and child benefit programs of the Federal Government.

Participants were also prompted to discuss federal government actions that had a negative impact on the community. Participants typically conflated provincial or private sector actions with those from the Government of Canada, such as the closure of the Clarendville shrimp plant in 2016 and the Churchill Falls power agreement. Some also referenced the St. John’s Maritime Rescue Sub-Centre closure in 2011. When asked about infrastructure projects that could benefit from the funding for infrastructure in the most recent Federal Government Budget, participants commonly mentioned repairing roadways, in particular highways.

Those in St. John’s, Moncton, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie were also presented with a list of items and asked to note which ones were major concerns in their community. Feedback received varied by location.

When discussing responses, participants in St. John’s often linked the issues of poverty and a shrinking middle class. Many felt there were high levels of unemployment in the community, which in turn

contributed to a shrinking middle class and consequently to higher levels of poverty. Participants also noted this phenomenon would likely contribute to young people moving out of their community to pursue better job opportunities and greater economic stability.

Those concerned with healthcare tended to focus on wait times and the lack of access to quality resources locally. Participants were also concerned about the level of care received by the community’s aging population. A few participants also noted concerns related to ‘integrating immigrants into the community’. Their concerns were not about immigrants entering the community, but rather preventing them from leaving so soon. These participants felt that, like the young, those that immigrate to the community often leave for better opportunities elsewhere.

Participants in Moncton also expressed concerns related to the availability of healthcare services and poverty, particularly in the context of an aging population. Participants equally expressed concerns related to the availability of jobs and more specifically ‘good paying jobs’ as well as concerns related to deteriorating local infrastructure.

‘Availability of healthcare services’, ‘availability of jobs’, and the cost of living were the main concerns for participants in Sudbury. Participants lamented the closure of local hospitals over the years, saying that there was only one true hospital available for locals. The main concern with jobs was the perceived lack of long term full-time jobs with good wages and benefits. Sudbury participants talked about the woes of the mining industry and the lack of diversity in the local economy. For this reason, participants felt it was essential to help local industries and businesses succeed. The cost of living was a key issue mostly because participants felt that income levels did not match the cost of rent in and around the city. The quality of roads and bridges was deemed to be poor and was a source of concern as well. Participants were very vocal about what they viewed as the terrible state of local infrastructure.

The ‘availability of jobs’, specifically quality jobs, were also a major issue in Sault Ste. Marie. Participants were particularly preoccupied by a perceived lack of long-term full time jobs. The need to diversify the local economy was a key issue, as well, with a few participants calling Sault Ste. Marie a “one industry” city. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that many participants stated that support for local business was also important. Northern Ontario participants generally agreed that there was a need for the government to focus more of their efforts and spending on helping local people and communities rather than helping people abroad. Lastly, some expressed concerns related to the integration of immigrants into the community, however there was recognition from other participants that immigration was positive for society and that immigrants to the region integrated well.

Heritage

The following discussion took place in North York, Montreal, Sault Ste. Marie, and Sudbury. Participants were led through a discussion on heritage and the culture sector in Canada. First, participants were asked what comes to mind when they think of the culture sector. In North York, participants mentioned entertainment as well as the idea of culture at a micro level and the culture, ethnic and otherwise, in Canadian cities.

In Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury, the notion of the “culture sector” was not well-understood by participants. Few understood this to refer to the television, radio, music, arts, books and video games. Once a definition was provided, all agreed this was an essential component of Canadian society. There was a strong sense among participants that the culture sector was essential because it represented “who we are as a nation”.

Overall, when asked about the major challenges of the culture sector, there was a sense Canadian producers are facing strong competition, especially from American creators and producers. Those in North York noted the lack of visibility of Canadian content might be in part due to the perceived lack of value placed on the culture sector by Canadians and the federal government, or a lack of exposure and funding of Canadian content compared to the entertainment industries in other countries.

Montreal participants were quick to acknowledge that Canada’s cultural sector is undergoing some major challenges related to the influx of American programming, as well as what some see as the Americanization of Canadian cultural outputs which many were concerned with.

Participants in Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury did not spontaneously think of competition coming from an influx of digital content from other non-Canadian entities such as streaming media companies. This lack of awareness meant many struggled with the reasons for and the impact of potential changes in how cultural creators are supported.

Government of Canada Support

Next, participants were asked whether they felt the role of the federal government should be to;

- ‘Protect Canadian culture’,
- ‘Promote Canadian culture’, or;
- ‘Support Canadian culture’.

There was no consensus among participants in Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury on which the government should be focusing on, but recognized there were differences among the options. Participants in North York preferred the option of supporting Canadian culture. Participants described this support as both financial assistance and structural support. Participants felt that supporting the culture sector would ensure its protection, for future generations, as well as the promotion of Canadian content. Many felt support from the federal government would create more jobs, more revenue in the culture sector, and promote the Canadian identity, potentially increasing tourism. Participants hoped that support would ultimately lead to the culture sector being able to support itself. During the discussion, many participants also highlighted the need for this support to benefit artists and producers of all sizes and scales.

Though many felt support for the culture sector was necessary, several participants in North York discussed concerns about the impact on Canadians through tax increases, and felt other social programs should be prioritized for government funding such as health care and education.

For participants in Montreal, support and protection went hand in hand. Supporting Canada’s cultural content was not only important but necessary to ensure our cultural uniqueness was preserved. Several participants felt that it was unrealistic to try and compete head to head with American programming; rather, they suggested we should be focusing on doing what we do best. When prompted for examples a few mentioned documentary production. According to those in Montreal the Federal Government should be doing more to support the cultural sector as Canadian cultural outputs help promote our culture around the world while resulting in direct economic impacts here at home.

Additionally, most participants indicated that gone was the time when we could or should only be focusing on traditional media outlets or outputs. Participants were prompted about the need for an overhaul of the culture sector in Canada due to the recent shift towards digital offerings of culture content. While this concept was initially confusing for participants, many were quick to note supporting

the culture sector in Canada is important for maintaining our culture and identity, and an opportunity to reap financial benefits. Participants generally reacted positively to the idea of public/private partnerships such as the recent CBC Netflix collaboration of *Anne*; they felt it aided in the promotion of Canadian content while broadening the reach of Canadian content to those switching to online consumption.

Participants recognized the increase in consumption of content on digital platforms. As such, partnerships such as the one above were not only strongly preferred to increase support of the culture sector but also preferred to promote Canadian content. For many, the advent of digital platforms has contributed to a profound paradigm shift that needs to be acknowledged and addressed when considering how best to support the cultural sector in Canada going forward.

The News Industry in Canada

When asked about the role of the federal government in protecting the news industry, in particular newspapers, participants were quick to recognize this was an issue, with a decrease in advertising revenue, and an increase in mobile content. On one hand, some participants felt that the government should protect the industry because, for some Canadians, the more traditional forms of media are their only access to news. Others felt that the government should focus on the fairness and accessibility of internet as news shifts to digital platforms, as well as supporting the transition to digital content as only digital content would remain viable.

In Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie, many said that so-called local newspapers and digital news sources were already more regional than local in scope, so they did not feel very strongly about increased support. Most participants agreed that it was important to get local news, but not all agreed regarding the form this should take. Those who did not think local outlets were important said that if anything deserved attention, it would be picked up by larger outlets or would be disseminated locally through other means, starting with social media.

The Culture Sector and CBC

Last, participants were asked to describe the CBC. Terms such as ‘the face of Canada’, ‘the pillar of Canadian culture’, and ‘Canada’s BBC’ were most often mentioned during the discussion. Those in Montreal used words such as serious, substantive, and cultural reference to describe Radio-Canada. English speaking participants believed it fulfilled an essential role for Canadians from all regions and helped create a sense of national awareness and identity. Montreal participants for their part spoke of Radio-Canada in positive terms, often mentioning the quality of its programming which many saw as more substantive than other media outlets. Participants also spoke in positive terms of the Radio-Canada’s focus on regional coverage.

Many participants noted the importance of the modernization of the CBC, referencing the recent Netflix partnership and integration of modern content on CBC radio as examples of steps in the right direction. Participants did however feel that the current platforms used by the CBC and the associated challenges with accessing content could prove to be barriers to modernization.

When asked about CBC’s role in local content, participants felt it was doing a good job. Most felt that the promotion of local/regional content, such as local cultural creators should continue to be part of the everyday content they produce. There were some participants who felt that beyond promoting local/regional content, the CBC needed to do more to broaden its appeal to younger viewers/listeners.

Participants acknowledge that it is the Government’s responsibility to promote indigenous culture, and many felt CBC was an appropriate platform for the government to use. Many participants stated that they would like to see more efforts put into promoting and producing indigenous cultural content. Regardless of whether they would view it or not, promoting indigenous content was deemed to be the right thing to do.

Impaired Driving

The following discussion took place in North York, Sault Ste. Marie and Montreal. Participants were asked to discuss Canada’s impaired driving laws. The moderator informed participants of the rules of administration of Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) tests, and the deaths in Canada caused by impaired driving. Many participants were initially not in favour of the idea of the ability for police to randomly stop drivers and administer BAC tests, and felt that there needs to be a more substantial cause for a test such as the smell of alcohol, or visibly unsafe driving.

However, after some discussion many shifted their opinions and were in favour of a reasonable number of random stops to ensure the safety of all drivers. Some hesitation towards the test remained as several participants noted they felt there were limits to the number of reasonable tests administered and whether limits would be in place. Overall, participants felt that, approached reasonably, random tests are justified due to the number of deaths due to impaired driving and the ability of the tests to prevent impaired driving.

Public Safety

The following discussion took place solely in North York, Montreal, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury. Participants were led through a discussion on their ideas of national security. When asked to define national security, participants discussed procedures and emergency response times, protecting Canadian citizens, travel, transport, protecting trade and natural resources, Canadian borders, military, protection of Canadian troops abroad, immigration and preventing terrorism, both at home and abroad.

Canadian National Security Agencies

Participants were then asked if they could name any Canadian national security agencies. Organizations most often mentioned were CSIS, RCMP, CBSA, and DND. When asked how they felt about Canadian security organizations sharing personal information of individuals, many agreed with this approach and some had assumed that this was already being done to a certain extent. The recognized benefits of such an approach included increased protection, efficiency in accessing information which in turn results in increased safety and decreased costs, and centralization of the information which in theory should increase the accuracy of data. When presented with trade-offs many participants felt the sharing of information was justified in the context of saving lives and national security and could also have the added benefit of cost savings related to having to only collect the information once.

Few participants expressed any concern with information sharing within Canada, many however were hesitant about sharing personal information with other countries, particularly with the US. However, after some discussion, participants felt that sharing some information in certain situations with other countries was justifiable. Participants discussed issues such as drug trafficking and border issues as these

were deemed to be international challenges which often necessitate broad multi-country collaboration. It should be noted however that although most were not concerned with the notion of their personal information being shared, they had some apprehension related to what happens once this information has been shared.

Finally, participants were asked whether Canada is on the right or wrong track in regards to national security. Overall, participants felt Canada was on the right track.

Public Safety Exercise

Participants were then led through an exercise of guiding principles, in regards to national security. They were asked to select which principles should be used for guidance by the government when it comes to discussions around National Security. The words provided by the moderator were as follows:

- *Communication*
- *Modernize*
- *Transparency*
- *Accountability*
- *Oversight*
- *Safety*
- *Privacy*

Modernize. Most participants agreed with this principle. When asked to provide additional context for their choice participants often spoke of the need to be nimble in order to easily adapt to new realities; the need to have access to the latest technological advancements, and ensure responsible agencies have access to up to date equipment.

Transparency. They related this principle to transparency within public safety organizations in Canada, and what and how they share. They also noted transparency relates to how well public safety organizations work together. Participants noted they did not want information compromised but rather transparency on why actions were carried out.

Oversight. Overall participants felt the government should know the pulse of public safety organizations but remain at arm’s length, and perhaps a need to know basis. Some referenced the analogy of the separation of Church and State when discussing this issue. When discussing this principle, participants spoke of it as a way to ensure the agencies containing the information were held to account and could not abuse their access to information.

Judiciary Oversight. When prompted with this concept by the moderator many felt it was reasonable in certain situations, however some questioned whether judges were necessarily free of bias when making decisions.

Safety. Those who selected this principle said this was the fundamental principle and should be central to any and all discussions around public safety.

Accountability. There were multiple interpretations of this principle. Some equate it with making sure those ‘in charge’ of ensuring Canadians’ safety are held accountable for their actions or lack of actions. Others framed it in the context of ensuring that those who committed crimes were held accountable. Others yet felt it was a way to ensure the government is indeed concerned with safety. Without accountability, participants wondered how safety of the public could be ensured.

Privacy. Participants felt the inclusion of this principle would ensure the government would be mindful of the internal flow of information, from agencies to outside sources, between agencies, and the Federal Government. Participants also felt this principle reflected the need for the Federal Government to uphold the privacy of Canadians’ personal information, which was also highly valued.

Participants discussed whether a trade-off between safety and privacy would be needed. After some discussion participants decided, if necessary, safety was favoured over privacy, based on a sense that the safety of the collective supersedes the privacy rights of the individual. It should be noted that, most felt that the government struck the right balance between the need to ensure privacy and the need to keep Canadians safe.

Specific Security Issues

Participants were questioned specifically on **no-fly lists**. Most were somewhat aware of them, often describing them as a place for individuals whose past records have prevented them from flying. Reactions to no-fly lists were mixed with some feeling they were effective while others were unsure. Regardless of whether they felt they were effective or not, participants generally were in favour of no-fly lists as an added security measure and most felt they should remain in effect.

Most participants were unaware of **sunset clauses**. Sunset clauses were then described to participants as clauses which allow for a law to expire or be put under review after a certain amount of time has passed, to ensure it is still valid. Once presented with more information on the topic, many felt they required more information to fully understand. Overall, participants agreed that such clauses should be reviewed especially for national security issues and policies. Many noted that threats evolve and therefore so should the parameters within these laws. Others simply stated that laws needed to keep pace with the times and sunset clauses would allow for regular reviews to ensure that laws continued to be relevant.

Justice

The following discussion took place in North Vancouver, Calgary and St. John’s. Participants were first asked if they had heard of mandatory minimum penalties and if they existed in Canada. In all groups, participants had heard of the term, and were aware of their existence.

Participants were then asked if they believed mandatory minimums make the criminal system more or less fair. Most participants felt mandatory minimums made the justice system more fair. Some commented that mandatory minimums have a leveling effect by setting clear sentencing parameters for everyone regardless of their ability to obtain legal support.

Participants were asked for their thoughts on repealing some mandatory minimums while also increasing some maximum penalties for certain serious crimes. While participants in North Vancouver and St.

John’s were in favour of increasing the maximum penalties for certain crimes, generally they weren’t in favour of repealing mandatory minimums. Those in Calgary took a different approach and felt that maximum penalties were rarely given and the focus should be on rehabilitation instead.

When asked about their opinions on keeping mandatory minimums but creating special exemptions where judges could bypass the mandatory minimum, most were concerned about potential leniency and inconsistent sentencing. According to these individuals, if special exemptions were allowed there should be strict and clearly defined criteria and guidelines in place. There were those however who felt that special exemptions could apply to minor crimes. This would have the benefit of eliminating some backlog in the justice system.

Cyber Security

Participants in Calgary and North Vancouver were led through a discussion on cyber security. First, they were asked the meaning of cyber security. The discussion in North Vancouver focused on the supervision of online activity, while those in Calgary focused on the protection of personal information. Those in North Vancouver described cyber security with words such as “Big Brother”, vulnerability and surveillance. Participants in Calgary used phrases such as monitoring, the safety of personal information at home, at work or through the bank, and protection against identity theft.

When asked if they had heard anything about recent cyber-attacks against governments around the world, participants’ mentions included the US government, British Health Services, Alberta Health Services, and the Canada Revenue Agency.

Participants were subsequently asked if they had heard anything from the Government of Canada on this topic. Most mentioned a government statement that had been issued on the topic and which discussed actions taken by the government. Some felt this was medium priority issue for the Government of Canada, and worried about what the impact would be on Canadians, while others noted that it did not appear to be a government priority.

Participants were then informed the Government of Canada is taking steps to defend the electoral process in Canada from cyber threats and asked whether this should be a high priority issue. Aside from a few participants in North Vancouver, there was general agreement that this should indeed be a priority for the government – particularly in Calgary - as trust in the electoral process was very important. Some wondered why the focus of increased security was directed towards the electoral process rather than government security more broadly - they felt the security of knowing their votes had been counted was important, as was ensuring their personal information remained protected.

Though there was overall support for protecting the electoral process there were concerns about the implications of increased security on citizens. Participants in North Vancouver discussed the issue of suppression of opinions with an increased government presence, while others in Calgary were concerned with censoring and the impact on free speech.

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 fifth wave was comprised of a series of sixteen focus groups with Canadians aged 20 years old and above, held between May 8th and May 30th, 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:

- May 8th – Moncton
- May 10th – St John’s
- May 15th – North Vancouver
- May 16th – Calgary
- May 23rd – North York
- May 24th – Montreal
- May 29th – Sault Ste Marie
- May 30th – Sudbury

A total of 12 participants were recruited for each session to ensure that a minimum of eight to ten participants would attend. In total, 144 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

RECRUIT 12 FOR 10

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 **CONTINUE**

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. ½ PER GROUP**

No 2 **GO TO Q1**

S6) How long ago was it? _____

TERMINATE IF IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS

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

TERMINATE IF MORE THAN 4 DISCUSSION GROUPS

ASK ALL

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

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

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

Yes	1
No	2

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

Yes	1
No	2

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

One	1
More than one	2

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

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

Q5) What is your current employment status?

Working full-time	1
Working part-time	2
Self-employed	3
Retired	4

Currently not working	5	} MAX 3 PER GROUP
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... Recruiting 2-3 from the below \$40K category Recruiting 3-4 from the between \$40 and \$80K category Recruiting 5-6 from the above
\$20,000 to just under \$ 40,000	2	
\$40,000 to just under \$ 60,000	3	
\$60,000 to just under \$ 80,000	4	
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	5	
\$100,000 to just under \$150,000	6	
\$150,000 and above	7	
DK/RF	99	

Q8) **DO NOT ASK – NOTE GENDER**

Male	1	} ENSURE 50-50 SPLIT
Female	2	

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

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

During the discussion, you will be audio- and videotaped. This taping is being done to assist us with our report writing. Also, in this room there is a one-way mirror. Sitting behind the mirror may be

Government of Canada staff, including members of the staff from the department that sponsored this research, and by staff members from Ipsos. This is standard focus group procedure to get a first-hand look at the research process and to hear first-hand your impressions and views on the research topic.

Do you agree to be observed for research purposes only?

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

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

[Read to Stand-by Respondents]

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

[Read to Screened in Respondents]

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

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

Location	Time	Date
Moncton M5(aka MQO Research) 720 Main Street, 3rd Floor	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 8th , 2017
St John’s M5(aka MQO Research) 55 Duckworth Street	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 10 th , 2017
North Vancouver Vancouver Focus 1080 Howe Street Suite 503	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 15th, 2017

Calgary Qualitative Coordination Suite 120, 707 10th Avenue	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 16 th , 2017
North York Head Research 5075 Yonge Street, Suite 600	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 23 rd , 2017
Montreal Ad Hoc Recherche 400, boul, de Maisonneuve Ouest, bureau 1200	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 24 th , 2017
Sault Ste. Marie Algoma’s Water Tower Inn & Suites 360 Great Northern Road Rooms TBA	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 29 th , 2017
Sudbury Oraclepoll Research 130 Elm Street , Suite 102	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	May 30 th , 2017

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

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

As we are only inviting a small number of people, your participation is very important to us. We have invited you to participate based on the questions we went through a moment ago, so we ask that you do not send a representative on your behalf should you be unable to participate. **IF FOR SOME REASON YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND, PLEASE CALL SO THAT WE MAY GET SOMEONE TO REPLACE YOU.** You can reach us at 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx at our office. Someone will call you the day before to remind you about the discussion.

What would be a good time to reach you?

And at what telephone numbers?

May I please get your name? ON FRONT PAGE

Thank you very much for your help!

Appendix C. Discussion Guides

MONCTON MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 8TH 2017

May 8 – Moncton (French)

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (25 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
 - PROBE: Have you heard anything about the **legalization of marijuana**?
 - Pretend I’ve been away from the country for a while. Explain to me in your own words what the government is proposing to do.
 - What do you think the impact of legalization will be? (*Go to white board and write down POSITIVE outcomes on one paper, NEGATIVE on another, and UNSURE on things people think will happen but they don’t know if it will be good or bad*)
 - There are obviously a lot of details to be worked out when it comes to legalization. Is there one thing you could hear in terms of new rules or procedures that would make you feel better about legalization?
 - PROBE: What have you heard about Canada-US trade?
 - Probe specifically on softwood lumber and dairy
 - How do you feel about this?
 - What has the Government of Canada said?
 - What does the Government of Canada need to do?
 - We talked a bit about trade. Are there other issues Canada and the US should be discussing?
 - PROBE specifically on the environment. How specifically can Canada and the US work together on the environment?

LOCAL CHALLENGES (20 minutes)

HANDOUT:

- I’ve got a handout with various items. I’d like you to put a check mark beside each one that you think is a major concern in your community:

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

- A shrinking middle class
- Ability of local businesses and industries to succeed
- An aging population
- Availability of affordable childcare options
- Availability of healthcare services
- Availability of jobs
- Availability of public transit
- Availability of services
- Cost of housing
- Crime
- Drug overdoses
- Homelessness
- Integrating immigrants into the community
- Level of Employment Insurance benefits for those who can’t find work
- Low high school graduation rates
- Poverty
- Preserving a clean environment
- Protecting the French language
- Quality of roads and bridges
- Traffic congestion
- Young people leaving for opportunities elsewhere

Now I’d like you to circle the top 2 or 3 that you worry about the most

- Was there anything missing from that list?

TIME PERMITTING - DISCUSS A FEW ISSUES THAT WERE CIRCLED: - PROMPT SPECIFICALLY ON POVERTY – WHY WAS IT CIRCLED OR NOT CIRCLED?

- What *specifically* is the problem? *Why* is it a problem?
- Is this something that has been getting worse in recent years or has it always been a problem?

Official Language Minority Communities (25 minutes)

- How important is protecting the French language compared to other challenges?
 - PROBE: Why is this important?
- Does the government need to do more than they are doing?

HANDOUT:

- Now I’d like to focus on your experiences living as francophones in your region. I’ve got a handout with various items. I’d like you to put a check mark beside each one that you think is a major challenge.

Accessing daycare or pre-school services in French

Accessing information from the Government of Canada in French

Accessing media content (e.g. radio, television, Internet, newspapers) in French

Attracting Francophones from outside the region to move here

Ensuring the Francophone community remains strong in the future

Feeling part of the Francophone community here

Keeping young Francophones in the region

Living in French in your region (e.g. participating in sports, attending social events, shopping, etc.)

Speaking in French to a Government of Canada representative

Transmitting the French language and culture to the next generation

Now I’d like you to circle the top 2 or 3 that you worry about the most

- Was there anything missing from that list?

DISCUSS A FEW ISSUES THAT WERE CIRCLED:

- What *specifically* is the problem? *Why* is it a problem?
- Is this something that has been getting worse in recent years or has it always been a problem?
- Do you think the Government of Canada has a role in helping address this challenge?
 - IF YES: what should the federal government do?
- What should the Government of Canada do to ensure the vitality of French in your region? In your province? In Canada?
 - PROMPT AS NECESSARY:
 - funding for community-based organizations that serve the interests of the francophone community?
 - Programs to provide for education in French?
 - Programs to support French-as-a-second language education?
 - Promote Canada’s two official languages?
 - Something else?

POVERTY (30 minutes)

- We touched briefly on poverty earlier in the community challenges section. Do you think it’s more important for the government to try to:

Reduce the number of Canadians living in poverty

OR Increase the number of low-income Canadians who join the middle class

- Why?
- And thinking about who the government should help when it comes to poverty reduction, should they be targeting programs to help “no income” Canadians, “low income” Canadians, or “the working poor”?
- How would you define someone who is “living in poverty”?

- There are official definitions of poverty that compare someone’s income against cost of living prices where they live. What are the key cost of living things you think need to be included in this calculation?

- What, if anything, have you heard the federal government has done to reduce poverty in Canada?

HANDOUT:

- I have a handout with a list of various policies that the federal government either has done or could do in order to reduce poverty. If you were designing a poverty reduction strategy for Canada, put a check mark next to all of the items on this list which you feel would need to be a part of it (keeping in mind that government only has so much money to spend). Then circle the 2 or 3 things on this list which you think would be most effective at reducing poverty in Canada.

Building more shelters to provide food and beds for the homeless

Investing in skills training so people can find good paying jobs

Introducing a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians living below the poverty line

Increasing funding for mental health treatment services

Building more affordable housing units for low-income Canadians

Extending Employment Insurance benefits to more Canadians who can’t find work

Introducing a child benefit so that less children grow up in poverty

Increasing the Guaranteed Income Supplement for single low-income seniors

Redefine what counts as “low-income” in Canada so that more Canadians are eligible for support

Subsidizing public transit so that it is easier for the working poor to commute to work

- Why did you circle the ones you did?

- Was there anything missing from that list?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

ST JOHN’S MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 10TH 2017

May 10 – St. John’s

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (15 minutes)

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
 - PROBE: What have you heard about Canada-US trade?
 - *Probe specifically on softwood lumber and dairy*
 - How do you feel about this?
 - What has the Government of Canada said?
 - What does the Government of Canada need to do?
 - We talked a bit about trade. Are there other issues Canada and the US should be discussing?
 - *PROBE specifically on the environment.* How specifically can Canada and the US work together on the environment?

LOCAL CHALLENGES (35 minutes)

- Thinking about everything the government has done in the past year, what, if anything, do you think will have the most positive impact on St. John’s?
- Have they done anything that you think will have a negative impact on St. John’s?
- Last year’s federal 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 St. John’s?

HANDOUT:

- I’ve got a handout with various items. I’d like you to put a check mark beside each one that you think is a major concern in your community:

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

A shrinking middle class
Ability of local businesses and industries to succeed
An aging population
Availability of affordable childcare options
Availability of healthcare services
Availability of jobs

Availability of public transit
Availability of services
Cost of housing
Crime
Drug overdoses
Homelessness
Integrating immigrants into the community
Level of Employment Insurance benefits for those who can’t find work
Low high school graduation rates
Poverty
Preserving a clean environment
Quality of roads and bridges
Retirement security
Traffic congestion
Young people leaving for opportunities elsewhere

Now I’d like you to circle the top 2 or 3 that you worry about the most

- Was there anything missing from that list?

TIME PERMITTING - DISCUSS A FEW ISSUES THAT WERE CIRCLED: - PROMPT SPECIFICALLY ON POVERTY – WHY WAS IT CIRCLED OR NOT CIRCLED?

- What *specifically* is the problem? *Why* is it a problem?
- Is this something that has been getting worse in recent years or has it always been a problem?

POVERTY (30 minutes)

- We touched briefly on poverty earlier in the community challenges section. Do you think it’s more important for the government to try to:

Reduce the number of Canadians living in poverty
OR Increase the number of low-income Canadians who join the middle class

- Why?
- And thinking about who the government should help when it comes to poverty reduction, should they be targeting programs to help “no income” Canadians, “low income” Canadians, or “the working poor”?
- How would you define someone who is “living in poverty”?
 - There are official definitions of poverty that compare someone’s income against cost of living prices where they live. What are the key cost of living things you think need to be included in this calculation?

- What, if anything, have you heard the federal government has done to reduce poverty in Canada?

HANDOUT:

- I have a handout with a list of various policies that the federal government either has done or could do in order to reduce poverty. If you were designing a poverty reduction strategy for Canada, put a check mark next to all of the items on this list which you feel would need to be a part of it (keeping in mind that government only has so much money to spend). Then circle the 2 or 3 things on this list which you think would be most effective at reducing poverty in Canada.

Building more shelters to provide food and beds for the homeless
Investing in skills training so people can find good paying jobs
Introducing a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians living below the poverty line
Increasing funding for mental health treatment services
Building more affordable housing units for low-income Canadians
Extending Employment Insurance benefits to more Canadians who can't find work
Introducing a child benefit so that less children grow up in poverty
Increasing the Guaranteed Income Supplement for single low-income seniors
Redefine what counts as "low-income" in Canada so that more Canadians are eligible for support
Subsidizing public transit so that it is easier for the working poor to commute to work

- Why did you circle the ones you did?
- Was there anything missing from that list?

JUSTICE (20 minutes)

- Are you familiar with Mandatory Minimum Penalties?
 - Can you explain to me what they are?
 - Does Canada currently have mandatory minimums? For which crimes?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

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

- Do you think mandatory minimums make the Criminal Justice system more fair or less fair?
 - PROBE: Why?

- There have been some instances where the Supreme Court has ruled that a mandatory minimum violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms because the penalties could apply to less serious conduct. How should the Government of Canada respond?
- How would you feel if the Government of Canada repealed some mandatory minimums, but also increased maximum sentences allowed for certain serious crimes?
 - What do you see as the benefits of this approach?
 - What are the drawbacks?
 - PROBE: This would give judges more discretion in sentencing. Do you see this as a good thing or a bad thing?
 - PROBE: Do you believe that judges are able to make the right decisions concerning appropriate sentences for offenders before them?
 - PROBE: Did you know that appellate courts (appeals courts) have the ability to overturn sentences imposed by lower courts in certain cases?
 - In crimes where the mandatory minimum is repealed but the maximum is increased, do you think this would lead to longer or shorter sentences?
 - PROBE: Do you think judges would see increasing the maximum as a signal that they should hand out longer sentences?
- How would you feel about keeping mandatory minimums in place, but creating some special exemptions where judges could bypass the mandatory minimum? (example: juvenile offenders, defendant pleads guilty early, defendant provides useful information to police)

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

NORTH VANCOUVER MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 15TH 2017

CALGARY MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 16TH 2017

May 15 – North Vancouver

May 16 - Calgary

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

WARM-UP (10 minutes)

- What are the largest local challenges facing North Vancouver / Calgary?
- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?

CANADA-US (15 minutes)

- Has anyone heard anything about Canada-US relations lately? What specifically?
 - Has anyone heard anything specifically on Canada-US trade?
 - *Probe specifically on softwood lumber and dairy*
 - How do you feel about this?
 - What has the Government of Canada said?
 - What does the Government of Canada need to do?
- Does Canada need to change the way it deals with the United States? If so, how?
- We talked a bit about trade. Are there other important issues for Canada and the US to work on together?
 - *PROBE specifically on the environment.* How specifically can Canada and the US work together on the environment?

POVERTY (30 minutes)

- How big of a concern, if anything, is poverty locally?
- Which of the following targets do you think is more important for the government to focus on?
 - Reduce the number of Canadians living in poverty
 - OR Increase the number of low-income Canadians who join the middle class
 - Why?
- And thinking about who the government should help when it comes to poverty reduction, should they be targeting programs to help “no income” Canadians, “low income” Canadians, or “the working poor”?
- How would you define someone who is “living in poverty”?
 - There are official definitions of poverty that compare someone’s income against cost of living prices where they live. What are the key cost of living things you think need to be included in this calculation?
- What, if anything, have you heard the federal government has done to reduce poverty in Canada?

HANDOUT:

- I have a handout with a list of various policies that the federal government either has done or could do in order to reduce poverty. If you were designing a poverty reduction strategy for Canada, put a check mark next to all of the items on this list which you feel would need to be a

part of it (keeping in mind that government only has so much money to spend). Then circle the 2 or 3 things on this list which you think would be most effective at reducing poverty in Canada.

Building more shelters to provide food and beds for the homeless
Investing in skills training so people can find good paying jobs
Introducing a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians living below the poverty line
Increasing funding for mental health treatment services
Building more affordable housing units for low-income Canadians
Extending Employment Insurance benefits to more Canadians who can't find work
Introducing a child benefit so that less children grow up in poverty
Increasing the Guaranteed Income Supplement for single low-income seniors
Redefine what counts as “low-income” in Canada so that more Canadians are eligible for support
Subsidizing public transit so that it is easier for the working poor to commute to work

- Why did you circle the ones you did?
- Was there anything missing from that list?

JUSTICE (25 minutes)

- Are you familiar with Mandatory Minimum Penalties?
 - Can you explain to me what they are?
 - Does Canada currently have mandatory minimums? For which crimes?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

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

- Do you think mandatory minimums make the Criminal Justice system more fair or less fair?
 - PROBE: Why?
- How would you feel if the Government of Canada repealed some mandatory minimums, but also increased maximum sentences allowed for certain serious crimes?
 - What do you see as the benefits of this approach?
 - What are the drawbacks?
 - In crimes where the mandatory minimum is repealed but the maximum is increased, do you think this would lead to longer or shorter sentences?
 - PROBE: Do you think judges would see increasing the maximum as a signal that they should hand out longer sentences?

- How would you feel about keeping mandatory minimums in place, but creating some special exemptions where judges could bypass the mandatory minimum? (example: juvenile offenders, defendant pleads guilty early, defendant provides useful information to police)
 - *If positive or unsure* - PROBE: Would this be fine for all crimes involving mandatory minimums, or are there certain types of crimes where you don’t think this should be allowed (*PROBE for examples*).

Cyber (20 minutes)

- Who is familiar with the term cyber security? What does it mean?
 - Have you heard anything about cyber attacks against governments around the world?
- Has the government of Canada said anything on this topic?
- The government of Canada has said it is exploring ways to defend Canada’s electoral process from cyber threats.
 - How high of a priority should this be for the government?
 - PROBE: Why is this a high/low priority?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

NORTH YORK MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 23RD 2017

MONTREAL MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 24TH 2017

SAULT STE MARIE MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 29TH 2017

SUDBURY MODERATOR’S GUIDE – MAY 30TH 2017

May 23 – North York

May 24 – Montreal

May 29 – Sault Ste Marie

May 30 – Sudbury

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

WARM-UP (10 minutes) ALL CITIES

- What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada lately?
- Has anyone heard anything about Canada-US relations lately? What specifically?
 - Has anyone heard anything specifically on Canada-US trade?
 - PROBE: What has the Government of Canada said?

- PROBE: What does the Government of Canada need to do?

LOCAL CHALLENGES (35 minutes)

ASK ONLY IN SAULT STE MARIE AND SUDBURY

- Thinking about everything the government has done in the past year, what, if anything, do you think will have the most positive impact on Sault Ste Marie / Sudbury?
- Have they done anything that you think will have a negative impact on Sault Ste Marie / Sudbury?

HANDOUT:

- I’ve got a handout with various items. I’d like you to put a check mark beside each one that you think is a major concern in your community:

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

A shrinking middle class
Ability of local businesses and industries to succeed
An aging population
Availability of affordable childcare options
Availability of broadband internet
Availability of cell phone service
Availability of healthcare services
Availability of jobs
Availability of public transit
Availability of services
Cost of housing
Crime
Drug overdoses
Gun control
Homelessness
Integrating immigrants into the community
Level of Employment Insurance benefits for those who can’t find work
Low high school graduation rates
Poverty
Preserving a clean environment
Protection of the French language
Quality of roads and bridges
Retirement security
Traffic congestion
Young people leaving for opportunities elsewhere

Now I’d like you to circle the top 2 or 3 that you worry about the most

- Was there anything missing from that list?

TIME PERMITTING - DISCUSS A FEW ISSUES THAT WERE CIRCLED:

- What *specifically* is the problem? *Why* is it a problem?
- Is this something that has been getting worse in recent years or has it always been a problem?
- What local industries need help the most?
 - Has the federal government done anything for them?
- Are people familiar with FedNor?
 - What do they do?
 - Has anyone heard of increased funding for FedNor in this year’s federal budget? Will this make a difference?

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES MINORITY COMMUNITIES (25 minutes)

ASK ONLY IN SUDBURY

- How important is protecting the French language compared to other challenges?
 - PROBE: Why is this important?
- Does the government need to do more than they are doing?

HANDOUT:

- Now I’d like to focus on your experiences living as francophones in your region. I’ve got a handout with various items. I’d like you to put a check mark beside each one that you think is a major challenge.

Accessing daycare or pre-school services in French

Accessing information from the Government of Canada in French

Accessing media content (e.g. radio, television, Internet, newspapers) in French

Attracting Francophones from outside the region to move here

Ensuring the Francophone community remains strong in the future

Feeling part of the Francophone community here

Keeping young Francophones in the region

Living in French in your region (e.g. participating in sports, attending social events, shopping, etc.)

Speaking in French to a Government of Canada representative

Transmitting the French language and culture to the next generation

Now I’d like you to circle the top 2 or 3 that you worry about the most

- Was there anything missing from that list?

DISCUSS A FEW ISSUES THAT WERE CIRCLED:

- What *specifically* is the problem? *Why* is it a problem?

- Is this something that has been getting worse in recent years or has it always been a problem?
- Do you think the Government of Canada has a role in helping address this challenge?
 - IF YES: what should the federal government do?
- What should the Government of Canada do to ensure the vitality of French in your region? In your province? In Canada?
 - PROMPT AS NECESSARY:
 - funding for community-based organizations that serve the interests of the francophone community?
 - Programs to provide for education in French?
 - Programs to support French-as-a-second language education?
 - Promote Canada’s two official languages?
 - Something else?

HERITAGE (35 minutes)

ALL CITIES

- What comes to mind when you think of the Culture sector in Canada?
 - *(if not mentioned) The culture sector includes the creation of films, TV, music, video games, and books.*
- What are the major challenges facing this sector in Canada?
- Should the federal government have a role in protecting Canadian culture, promoting Canadian culture, or supporting Canadian culture?
 - Which of these approaches should be the focus? (*protecting, promoting, or supporting*)
- Does the government need to change the way it supports the culture sector in Canada?
 - What needs to change?
 - Why is this change needed?
- Some people say we need a major overhaul of the way we treat the culture sector in Canada, given the shift to more digital content. Do you agree or disagree with this sentiment?
- Does the government need to do more to support the Culture sector in Canada?
 - *(if no) Why not?*
 - *(if yes) What are the strongest reasons to support this sector? (write on flip chart)*
 - Do you see economic benefits to supporting this sector?
 - *I’m going to read you three statistics about the Culture sector in Canada: This sector generates \$54.6 billion dollars in economic activity each year; This sector makes up 3% of Canada’s GDP; There are 630,000 full-time jobs in this sector*
 - Do any of these numbers surprise you?
 - Of the three figures, which do you find most meaningful?
 - Does this change the way you feel about the sector?
 - Do you see benefits in the Government of Canada helping Canadian content creators promote and sell their products internationally? What specific benefits?

- The CBC recently partnered with Netflix to make the TV show “Anne”. What do you think about these types of partnerships? Do you see benefits to doing more of them?
- Now I want to talk about the news industry in Canada. What challenges, if any, are facing this industry?
- Are you concerned about the economic struggles facing the news and newspaper industry in Canada?
 - (SUDBURY AND SAULT STE MARIE ONLY) How would you feel if Sudbury/Sault Ste Marie were left without a daily local newspaper?
- Does government have a role to ensure this industry survives?
 - Why or why not?
 - How would you feel about the government providing financial support to this industry?
- Another institution connected to the culture sector is the CBC. How would you describe the CBC to someone who is not from Canada?
- Are changes needed to the CBC? What specifically?
 - PROBE: What about CBC radio? Are changes needed there?
 - Does the CBC do a good job promoting local content? How would you feel about them doing more of that?
 - Does the CBC do a good job promoting indigenous culture? How would you feel about them doing more of that?

IMPAIRED DRIVING (10 minutes)

ASK IN NORTH YORK, SAULT STE MARIE, MONTREAL

- Have you heard anything about Canada’s impaired driving laws recently? What have you heard?
 - PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Have you heard about any proposed changes to these laws?
- Did you know that police can already stop any driver to check if they are following the rules of road, including whether the driver has a valid licence and insurance, and whether they are sober?
- Do you think that allowing police officers to give drivers a roadside breath test for alcohol, even in situations where they don’t suspect the driver has been drinking, would make our roads safer?
 - Some people say that police should be allowed to demand a test in these situations, because so many people are killed by impaired drivers each year.
 - Others think that many people who haven’t been drinking tested for nothing.
 - What do you think?

FOR THOSE WHO SAY TESTED FOR NOTHING:

- Impaired Driving is the leading criminal cause of death and injury in Canada. Some studies show that 1,000 people are killed every year, and thousands more are injured. Studies in other countries (including Australia and Ireland) have shown that roadside breath tests significantly reduce fatal crashes, in some cases by more than 40%. Does this change your perspective?

- Do you think that police officers should be allowed to pull drivers over when they notice an infraction like a broken tail light? Do you think that these types of stops are okay because they protect the public?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

The Government of Canada is introducing proposed legislation that would reform the entire impaired driving regime in the Criminal Code. The first part of the proposed legislation would ensure that a robust drug-impaired driving regime is in place before cannabis legalization occurs. Proposed changes include, new “legal limit” drug offences and new tools to better detect drug-impaired drivers.

The second part of the proposed legislation would reform the entire Criminal Code transportation regime to create a new, modern, simplified, and more coherent system to better deter drug and alcohol-impaired driving.

Part 2 of the proposed legislation would significantly reform the area of impaired driving. Some key elements would include:

- simplifying and modernizing the transportation provisions, including the impaired driving provisions, in the Criminal Code to create a more coherent and efficient legislative framework
- authorizing mandatory alcohol screening to make it easier to detect whether a driver is impaired
- eliminating some defences that encourage risk-taking behaviour
- making it easier to prove blood alcohol concentration for some impaired driving offences
- clarifying what information the Crown is required to disclose to prove blood alcohol concentration

The existing transportation provisions in the Criminal Code have evolved in a piecemeal fashion over the years. As a result, they are complex and difficult to understand, even for legal practitioners. The proposed reforms would make the legal framework clearer and more coherent. They would also increase deterrence, make it easier to detect impaired drivers, and simplify investigations and proof of impaired driving offences. These measures are expected to result in shorter trials and reduced delays.

PUBLIC SAFETY (45 minutes) ASK FULL VERSION NORTH YORK AND MONTREAL. DO ABBREVIATED VERSION IN SAULT STE MARIE WHERE ASK FIRST BULLET POINT, THEN DO EXERCISE. THEN DISCUSS EXERCISE AS TIME PERMITS.

- When we talk about national security, what comes to mind?
 - What are the largest national security threats facing Canada right now?
- As far as you know, what government agencies play a role in National Security?
 - *There are several agencies who play a role in National Security, including CSIS, CSEC, the RCMP, CBSA.* How would you feel about these agencies sharing more data with each other on security issues?

- What are the benefits of this?
- Does this cause you any concerns?
 - (if yes) PROBE on specific concerns. Are there certain types of data or certain situations where you are more comfortable with them sharing information?
- Do you think the Government of Canada is on the right track or the wrong track when it comes to National Security?
 - PROBE: Why do you say that?
 - (if wrong track) What needs to change?
- Before getting into specifics, I want to take a step back and talk about the basic principles of national security. I’m going to give you a worksheet with some words on it, and I want you to circle the one you feel should be the number one principle guidance for the government when it comes to discussions around National Security:

Words: Communication, Modernize, Transparency, Accountability, Oversight, Safety, Privacy,

- Was anything missing on this list? Is there another word you would use?
- Were there any words on this list that you felt should NOT be part of a government strategy on National Security?
- I want to now discuss how you interpreted some of these words.
 - COMMUNICATION
 - Who selected communication as their word? Why did you pick it?
 - MODERNIZE
 - Who selected modernize as their word? Why did you pick it?
 - Do people feel that our approach to national security needs to be modernized? Why?
 - TRANSPARENCY
 - Who selected transparency as their word? Why did you pick it?
 - For everyone else, what does “transparency” mean to you in the context of national security? Is this important? Why?
 - Did anyone not understand the meaning of this word or how it is connected to national security?
 - ACCOUNTABILITY
 - Who selected accountability as their word? Why did you pick it?
 - For everyone else, what does “accountability” mean to you in the context of national security? Is this important? Why?
 - Did anyone not understand the meaning of this word or how it is connected to national security?

- OVERSIGHT
 - Who selected oversight as their word? Why did you pick it?
 - For everyone else, what does “oversight” mean to you in the context of national security? Is this important? Why?
 - Did anyone not understand the meaning of this word or how it is connected to national security?
 - Sometimes people talk about “parliamentary oversight” in this context. Are you familiar with what that term means?
 - In simple terms, this means that Members of Parliament can review activities carried out by national security agencies. How do you feel about this type of oversight?
 - Another term people use is “judicial oversight”. Are you familiar with what this term means?
 - In simple terms, it means judges must approve some national security actions before they are carried out. How do you feel about this type of oversight?
- For the last two words, I want to approach this a bit differently. First, who picked “SAFETY” as their core principle? Why?
 - And who picked “PRIVACY” as their core principle? Why?
- Do you feel like there needs to be a trade-off between safety and privacy when it comes to national security issues?
 - (If yes) Do you feel the government is striking the right balance? Or do they need to tilt more towards ensuring the safety of Canadians, or protecting the privacy of Canadians?
 - For those who have concerns about privacy, what are they specifically?
 - PROBE: Is it more a matter of principle, or do you think not doing enough to protect privacy will lead to bad outcomes?
 - (PROBE if bad outcomes) In what type of situations?
- Finally, I want to raise a few specific security issues, to see who is familiar with them. Who has heard anything about “No-fly lists”?
 - What specifically have you heard?
 - Do these work well, or are changes needed?
- Has anyone heard about sunset clauses?
 - These clauses mean that laws which are passed today will expire in a few years unless they are renewed. This is done to make sure that laws are still relevant down the line. How do you feel about the use of sunset clauses for some national security laws?
 - Another approach is to say that the law won’t disappear at that time, but that Parliament will need to review it after a number of years to make sure it is still valid. How do you feel about this?
- We’ve talked a lot about National Security. My final question on this topic is for those of you have concerns about privacy (even if it isn’t your top concern). Based on everything we’ve discussed,

what’s the one thing you would want to hear about any proposed national security measure that would put these concerns about it infringing on privacy to rest?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)