



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 – Wave 7 of Focus Groups

FINAL REPORT
September, 2017

Ipsos Public Affairs
1 Nicholas Street, Suite 1400
Ottawa ON K1N 7B7
Tel: 613.241.5802
Fax: 613.248.7981
www.ipsos.ca

« Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français »



Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
Background and Objectives	1
Overview of Methodology	2
Key Findings (To be updated)	2
2. Detailed Findings	6
Themes Addressed.....	6
Government Actions.....	6
Canada-United States Relations	6
Local Challenges	9
Vancouver Issues.....	10
Taxes.....	11
Youth Policies	13
Youth Volunteering	15
Seniors Policies.....	16
Disabilities	17
Apologies	18
3. Appendix.....	20
Appendix A. Detailed Research Methodology	20
Appendix B. Recruitment Guide	22
Appendix C. Discussion Guides	34



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 seventh 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
- Local Challenges/Community Specific Issues
- Canada-US Relations
- Taxes
- Seniors Policies
- Youth Policies
- Youth Volunteering
- Disabilities
- Apologies

Overview of Methodology

This wave of qualitative research was comprised of a series of 12 focus groups with Canadians aged 20 years old and above, held between July 10th and August 3rd, 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:

- July 10th – Sorel
- July 12th – Edmonton
- July 18th – Thunder Bay
- July 19th – Hamilton
- August 1st – Vancouver
- August 3rd – Charlottetown

A total of 12 participants were recruited for each session to ensure that a minimum of eight to ten participants would attend. In total, 122 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

Canada -United States Relations

In all groups, discussion on Canada- United States relations quickly focused on trade relations, in particular NAFTA, as participants felt trade was essential for a strong economy in Canada. These discussions focused on three main points of concern: the perceived different perspectives between Canada and the US, both in society and in government; concerns about specific trade aspects, in particular lumber and dairy; and concerns about the unpredictability of negotiations and whether Canada can/should maintain a firm stance. These beliefs carried on during the issues exercise when discussing negotiations between the two countries where participants were most concerned with the issues of the environment and climate change, anti-terrorism security, immigrants and refugees, trade, and treatment of minority groups.

Local Challenges

Participants in Sorel, Thunder Bay and Charlottetown, identified health care, local economic prospects, the ability to find affordable housing, poverty and homelessness and an aging population as issues of most concern in their community. Participants most often explained their choices based on either having been directly impacted by some of these issues or because they see them as ongoing issues affecting their community. Other issues mentioned included environmental concerns and transportation off the Island (for those in Charlottetown).

Vancouver Issues

Awareness of the Port of Vancouver was mixed among groups however, for those who were aware, the Port was described as important infrastructure for the community which was currently undergoing expansion. Participants felt the Port supported the local community by providing jobs and strengthening the economy. Participants also discussed Granville Island, describing it as a tourist hub that was often crowded, and most assumed that the Island was owned and operated by the city. When provided with information that the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) owns the property, and were developing plans for redevelopment, participants felt costs for such a redevelopment should be assumed by the CMHC.

Taxes

Participants in all sessions agreed that the tax system needs reform. Participants tended to support initiatives targeted at the wealthy and which were intended to close tax loopholes, increase taxation levels and prevent fraud. There was agreement in all locations that big corporations and the top 1% should be paying more taxes, many saying that despite having the means to do so, they don't pay their fair share as it stands. Some also felt churches and religious groups should pay more taxes. Conversely, the working poor, low income Canadians, students and veterans were most often identified as groups that should benefit from tax relief.

There was also an appetite amongst some to see small businesses pay less taxes – explanations for this point of view most often focussed on the contributions of these small businesses to local economies through job creation.

Participants struggled with defining what they would deem to be the ‘top 1%’ - definitions ranged those earning more than \$60,000 to those earning \$1 million dollars or more a year.

There was very little interest in any tax measure intended to change the tax rate for small businesses to ensure they were more aligned with those paid by larger businesses. Most simply said that small businesses often struggle to make ends meet and simply don’t have the financial wherewithal that larger businesses do.

Of the six possible measures intended to make the tax system fairer, support was highest for:

- the introduction of measures intended to ensure family members of a business owner who are receiving any type of payment from the corporation are indeed contributing to the business.
- taking steps to tax business investment portfolio income at a higher rate if it is taken out of the portfolio for reasons other than to upgrade or improve the business.

As for some of the other options presented to participants, reactions were mixed. Participants who opposed them often said that these measures seemed to target individuals who had taken on a certain level of risk to ensure the success of their business and, as such, these types of benefits seemed reasonable. These proposed measures included:

- Taxing corporations without any employees at the same rate at which personal income is taxed;
- Taxing cash in business accounts which are included as part of the sale of a business to lessen the amount of tax paid overall;
- Treating employee stock options more like regular income, and
- Lowering the tax threshold for tax exemption of the sale of a business which currently stands at \$850,000.

When asked what funds generated by Government of Canada tax reform efforts should be targeted towards, the most often-mentioned measures included debt repayment and healthcare transfers to the provinces.

Youth Policies

Government actions that participants felt would have a positive impact on youth included:

- Tax cuts to the middle class and increases for the wealthy;
- funding provided for transit system upgrades;
- Increased non-repayable tuition grants for low and middle income students;
- the healthcare deal to increase funding for home care and mental health;
- the Canada Child Benefit;
- the investment of \$165 million in a Youth Employment Strategy including Canada Summer Jobs;
- the expansion of Employment Insurance (EI) benefits to parts of the country who have experienced significant job losses;

- the introduction of a plan to legalize marijuana; and
- the rejection of the Northern Gateway Pipeline.

Actions that were more likely to garner mixed reactions included the decision to allow the Kinder Morgan project to proceed as well as efforts to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan.

Youth Volunteering

Most youth group participants said they either currently volunteer or have volunteered in the past, and do so for a variety of reasons. For some it is out of a desire to help others or as a way of giving back to their community. For others, it is an alternative to monetary contributions, a means of socializing with others and/or to gain experience that may be useful when applying for scholarships or future employment opportunities. There was no clear consensus as to a preferred name for a potential Government of Canada volunteer program. Reactions to the options presented were measured at best.

Seniors Policies

In Charlottetown participants felt Government actions that have had the most positive impact on their community were the Caregiver Tax Credit; the healthcare deal signed with PEI to increase funding for homecare and mental health; the new deal to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan; lowering the age of Old Age Security; and increasing the Guaranteed Income Supplement for low income seniors. Infrastructure spending was also important to participants including spending on hospital infrastructure, affordable and accessible housing, affordable and accessible transit and more community centres.

Disabilities

When asked to define disabilities, participants highlighted both physical and mental disabilities. Challenges described by those with disabilities included stigma, financial challenges, employment challenges, quality of life, and a lack of accessible services and support. After being provided with a list of potential Government of Canada actions participants felt that improving access to employment for people with disabilities was the most important as it increased quality of life. Participants did not see funding disability services as a tradeoff but rather as vital to strengthening communities overall. Participants had mixed opinions about fining businesses that were not accessible to those with disabilities, however they thought government infrastructure spending on public spaces should be contingent on these projects being accessible to those with disabilities.

Apologies

Overall, participants agreed that apologies were very important to acknowledge and heal from the past, set standards for society, and to provide education on the issue. Criteria suggested for formal apologies included whether the incident was an overt action by the federal government, with long-term effects and was a legal/moral issue. Participants did not feel too many high-profile apologies could diminish the significance of an apology but did feel that the apology must be accompanied with action to show changes have been made.

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 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 subject 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 (NAFTA)
- Not mentioning Alberta in a Canada Day address
- Prime Minister attending local events
- Canada’s 150th celebrations
- Immigration and refugees
- Legalization of Marijuana
- BC forest fires – Federal Government not matching donations to disaster relief as was done for the Fort McMurray forest fire in 2016
- Omar Kahdr settlement
- More assistance for the poor
- Focussing on assistance for seniors
- Bank of Canada raising interest rates
- Phoenix payroll system
- Free Canada Parks pass
- Infrastructure spending
- Child tax benefit
- Border control of asylum seekers

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

- Government of Canada Actions
- Local Challenges/Community Specific Issues
- Canada-US Relations
- Taxes
- Parent Policies
- Seniors Policies
- Youth Policies
- Youth Volunteering
- Disabilities
- Apologies

Canada-United States Relations

Participants in Vancouver and Charlottetown were asked what they had heard recently about Canada-US relations. In both locations, the discussion quickly focussed on the ongoing NAFTA renegotiations between Canada, the United States and Mexico. When asked why discussions about NAFTA are occurring, many felt they were initiated by the United States and their desire to revisit the current agreement in order to ensure that it was more favourable to U.S. interests. Group discussions on NAFTA focused on three main points of concern:

- The perceived different outlooks between Canada and the US, both in society and in government;
- Concerns about specific trade aspects, particularly soft wood lumber and dairy; and
- Concerns about the unpredictability of negotiations and whether Canada can/should maintain a firm stance.

Different Outlooks

When asked about the reasons for negotiations, most participants stated that negotiations were started by the United States following their most recent presidential election. Participants felt the negotiations were a result of what some see as a protectionist stance of the United States government. Participants expressed concern that the current position held by the U.S. could make negotiations between all three NAFTA signatories more challenging. There was a recognition among focus group participants that the United States would likely carry more weight during negotiations due to the size of their population, the number of companies based in the United States, and the sheer volume of trade between Canada and the United States.

Beyond NAFTA negotiations, some participants noted growing concerns about differences in perspectives between Canadians and many Americans. Those in Vancouver, in particular, were concerned about the spillover impact these different viewpoints could have on Canadian society.

Specific concerns

Specific concerns about the NAFTA renegotiations centred around trade, and the potential economic impacts for Canada. Those in Charlottetown mentioned specifically the effects of the renegotiations on the lumber and dairy industries which they felt would affect those in Central and Western Canada. As far as participants knew, these aspects of trade were up for renegotiation during current NAFTA discussions. Other concerns noted included the potential impacts on subsidies, tariffs, duties, car manufacturing as well as Canadian currency.

Concerns of unpredictability

When asked about their opinions on Canada’s current approach to its relations with the United States reactions were somewhat mixed. Many characterized Canada’s current approach towards negotiations as calm, laid back, and using a ‘wait and see’ approach. This perceived attitude, combined with the perceptions of an unpredictable US bargaining position that was focused solely on the interests of the United States, left several participants concerned about ongoing negotiations.

While participants had a hard time defining the current negotiation strategy, many noted the current approach of the Canadian government appeared to be measured and calculated. Most were confident that the Canadian government would successfully defend our resources and that negotiation outcomes would be relatively positive.

Some however felt that negotiations would be difficult due to what they saw as philosophical difference between the governments of each country, and, as such, they were concerned that Canada would be

left with an inferior deal once the negotiations are over. These participants felt the Government of Canada should take a more assertive stance in defending Canadian economic interests.

Most participants said they would feel good if NAFTA negotiations were ratified by all three countries, if the results of the negotiations were fair for all involved, and if, as a country, Canada does not give away too much in the interest of securing a new agreement.

Issues Exercise

Participants in Vancouver were given a list of issues and asked to rank the top three they felt were most important for Canada and the United States government to discuss. The issues were as follows: *the environment and climate change, the treatment of minority groups, immigration and refugees, oil pipelines, trade, anti-terrorism security, joint military operations overseas, reducing border delays, and border security cooperation*. Issues most often selected as priorities for Canada/U.S. discussion and collaboration were trade, the environment and climate change and immigrants and refugees.

Trade- A number of participants ranked trade discussions as the priority going forward. Much of the discussion and reason for this selection centered on upcoming NAFTA negotiations. Participants often referenced the size and importance of the Canada/U.S. trade relationship and the importance of this relationship to our current and future economic prospects.

The Environment and Climate Change- Participants felt that climate change is occurring, as confirmed via numerous scientific studies, and that immediate action was needed to find a solution to help lessen its impact on current and future generations. While participants acknowledged that there may be some skepticism in the US about the existence and causes of climate change, dealing with this issue must remain a priority for the two countries, as inertia will lead to dire consequences.

Immigrants and Refugees- Several participants felt this discussion should be framed in the context of the treatment of minority groups and that Canada had a responsibility to underscore the importance of the proper treatment of immigrants and refugees. Some also drew a parallel between this issue, concerns related to anti-terrorism security, and the need to control immigration to ensure national security.

Environmental Issues- Canada and the United States

Participants were asked about their opinions on US and Canada setting joint targets for emissions and the use of renewable energy. While most agreed this was a good idea, they also wondered how realistic such an agreement would be, particularly in the context of the current political climate in the United States. Participants’ skepticism was related to what many saw as clear differences in the importance given to environmental priorities between Canada and the United States.

Participants were then provided information on the tri-lateral deal between Canada, The United States and Mexico on reducing emissions and renewable energy. When asked, nearly all supported the initiative, however participants were skeptical about whether the United States and Mexico would follow through on their targets. Regardless of whether other signatories honour their commitment there was agreement that Canada should respect the agreement. Participants saw potential economic

opportunity largely associated with the diversification of our reliance on traditional energy sources, and additionally represented an opportunity for Canada to set a positive example for other countries.

Local Challenges

Participants in Sorel, Thunder Bay, and Charlottetown were asked about local challenges in their communities. They were then presented with a handout of various items that represented potential challenges in their community and asked to select those they felt were major concerns. Issues of common concern in all three communities were access to health care services, concerns about the local economy (often linked to the ability of local businesses and industries to succeed and the related impact on the availability of jobs), the ability to find affordable housing, and local poverty/homelessness (this was particularly the case in Sorel and Thunder Bay). Participants also expressed concerns related to an aging population.

Availability of healthcare services were deemed to be a major concern by participants in all three communities. Much of the discussion focussed on the lack of health care services available to the local population. More specifically, participants spoke of the lack of health care professionals, wait times, bed shortages and worries related to insufficient access to senior and home care services. Participants in Charlottetown and, to a lesser extent, in Thunder Bay, drew a link between the availability of health care services and their community’s ability to attract and retain qualified health care professionals.

Ability of local businesses and Industry to succeed/availability of jobs- These issues were the source of much discussion in Sorel and Thunder Bay. Participants often spoke of the importance of small business in terms of its contribution to their local economy, and of how strong local businesses and industry were vital to ensuring a diversified local economy and good paying jobs. Participants in both locations expressed much angst related to the ability to manage household budgets in an era of increased housing costs and perceived rising poverty levels - all of which they often associated with the lack of good paying jobs. They also worried about the long-term prospects for their communities as a result of people (particularly youth) having to pursue job opportunities elsewhere.

An aging population/retirement security- Participants in all three locations spoke of challenges associated with access to, and affordability of, local healthcare services for seniors. These discussions were often framed in the context of seniors’ care services that were seen as overly complex and difficult to access. Participants often spoke of the lack of homecare services as well as the costs of prescription drugs and dental care. Others mentioned the costs associated with hospitalizing seniors as well concerns about the sustainability of Old Age Security. More broadly, many noted concerns of having enough income in their senior years, and being able to afford necessities such as housing, and food.

Participants in Thunder Bay also framed their concerns in the context of an increasing tendency for those younger to seek opportunities elsewhere, meaning the average age of those living in Thunder Bay is likely to rise. Their counterparts in Sorel were more likely to question the ability to care for those retiring in a context where those retired outnumber those still working.

Preserving a clean environment- Participants in all three locations felt this was an important issue, especially with respect to water quality, pollution levels and the need to make climate change a priority going forward.

Some other issues of concern included:

Opioid addiction and overdoses- Many (particularly those in Charlottetown and Thunder Bay) felt that opioid addiction and overdoses are growing problems that have the potential to seriously impact anyone regardless of socio-economic status.

Crime- This issue was the focus of much discussion in Thunder Bay and was often linked to local economic challenges (i.e. the lack of jobs) as well as poverty and homelessness.

Cost of housing- Participants in all three locations highlighted the challenges associated with finding affordable housing whether it be for those wishing to become home owners, those looking for rental accommodations or, as was discussed in Charlottetown, for those elderly and/or disabled looking to find safe affordable housing.

Transport off the Island- Many participants in Charlottetown spoke of the cost of tolls to leave the island which represented an increased financial burden for residents needing to travel elsewhere for medical reasons.

Quality of roads and bridges- A particular concern for participants in Thunder Bay was the deteriorating quality of the roads in their region which many felt was not likely to improve anytime soon.

Vancouver Issues

Groups in Vancouver opened with a discussion on local issues including the Port of Vancouver and Granville Island.

Participants felt the Port was good for the region as it provided jobs, and, more generally, served as an economic engine for the local and provincial economy as a commercial hub. Participants did not have strong views on the Port one way or the other, and the consensus seemed to be that the Port was well-managed. A few mentioned being aware of past issues related to drug smuggling however most felt these issues were not common occurrences.

Participants were then asked for top of mind views as they related to Granville Island. Mentions tended to focus on difficulties associated with accessing the Island whether it be due to traffic issues or the lack of available parking. Participants also characterized Granville Island as a tourist hub, crowded, busy in the summer time and as a place to engage in water sports. Some participants felt Granville Island had unique offerings while others felt it was trying to be too many things at the same time.

Participants were not aware that Granville Island was owned and operated by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, rather most assumed it was a municipally owned property.

Only a few participants were aware of plans to redevelop Granville Island. Participants were then read the following short description of proposed redevelopments to Granville Island, to which they reacted favourably:

A report came out earlier this year with a proposal to redevelop the island. Among the recommendations is building a staircase and elevator from the Granville Street bridge to the island, to encourage people to take public transit, walk, and bike there, instead of driving. The plan would also expand market space, create a central plaza, and create an arts and

innovation hub.

Some said the redevelopment would increase much needed accessibility to the space, especially for those with physical disabilities. Others felt the proposed changes would help attract more people from downtown. Others felt the changes would help lessen crowd congestion. Despite participants’ mostly favourable response to the proposed redevelopment, some worried that redevelopment might cause the space to lose some of its uniqueness.

When asked who should be responsible for paying for the project, it was near-unanimous that the owner and operator of the space, CMHC, should be responsible for the cost. Some participants said that the local community should be consulted prior to work commencing, and that special care should be taken to ensure that the redevelopment of the Island did not have a negative impact on small businesses currently operating on the site.

Taxes

Groups in Sorel, Edmonton, Thunder Bay and Hamilton were asked about the tax system in Canada. There was general agreement in all sessions that the tax system was in need of reform. On the whole, groups were in support of closing tax loopholes, increased taxation and tax fraud preventative measures targeting the wealthy.

Next, participants were led through an exercise about taxes. They were provided a list of groups in Canada and asked to indicate three groups they felt should pay more in taxes and three groups they felt should pay less in taxes. The groups were as follows: *the middle class, the working poor, low-income Canadians, families of young children, big corporations, small corporations, small business owners, the top 1% of income earners, veterans, churches and religious groups, charities, retired Canadians, and students.*

In all locations, the groups most frequently selected to pay more in taxes were big corporations and the top 1%, followed by churches and religious groups. When prompted, there was no clear consensus on the annual income for those in the 1%. Rather, participants offered a wide range of responses which varied with each market; \$60,000 to \$250,000 (Sorel), \$100,000 to \$1.5 million (Edmonton), \$500,000 to \$1 million (Hamilton) and from \$250,000 to \$1 million + (Thunder Bay). Despite the differences in definitions, participants felt it was fair that the taxes of the top 1% increase as they can afford to pay more taxes, currently benefit from tax breaks and loopholes, and often use tax shelters. Overall, they said that these measures would lead to a more equitable distribution of wealth.

Most participants felt big corporations would be able to afford an increase in taxes as they had large profits, used a lot of resources, and, similar to the top 1%, are currently benefiting from loopholes and could do more to contribute their fair share.

When asked why churches and religious organizations should be paying more in taxes, participants often said that their impression was that these groups benefit from significant tax exemptions. Many viewed these types of organizations as businesses, and said that, while they do good for the community, they should be treated as businesses for tax purposes.

Groups most frequently identified to pay less taxes were the working poor, low income Canadians, students, and veterans. Those who opted for the working poor spoke of how these individuals often struggled to cope financially despite working hard and that tax relief would go a long way to helping them provide the necessities of life for both themselves and their families. Similar arguments were provided for advocating tax relief for those living in low income situations; participants often stated that these individuals struggle to simply survive. According to participants, income thresholds for low-income Canadians ranged from those earning less than \$10,000, up to less than \$40,000 a year.

Students were also identified as needing tax relief. Many noted that it is difficult for them to work a lot while in school, while having tuition expenses, and are therefore forced to strike a balance between work and school while trying to secure the skill set necessary to ensure stable employment in the future. Other groups selected to pay less taxes were veterans. Participants often spoke of their contribution to the country.

Some participants also felt small business owners should benefit from reduced taxes as they were often seen as making a significant contribution to our economy through job creation. A few participants selected the middle class as a group to pay less taxes. When prompted, these participants defined the middle class as those with an annual income of \$50 000 to \$150 000.

At the end of this exercise participants were asked what word or phrase they would use to describe the tax changes they had proposed. Initial responses among all locations were “balance,” “fair,” and “equality.”

There was very little support for changing the tax rate for small businesses so that it was aligned with the rate paid by large businesses. In fact, most participants stated that small businesses should pay lower tax rates than larger businesses. They said that this was because small businesses do not have the same financial wherewithal as larger businesses, often contribute directly to local economies, are often struggling financially, and are a source of employment in their respective communities. Next, participants were questioned as to the feasibility of incremental increases in taxes for small businesses over the course of a number of years in order to bring small business tax rates in line with those of larger businesses. This option was generally not endorsed, for similar reasons. Finally, participants were asked about the option of raising taxes for small businesses but providing an exemption on equipment and technology to encourage innovation and growth. Many felt that although some small businesses might benefit from such an initiative, many would not due to the nature of their business. Others wondered whether this would simply create an opportunity for yet another tax loophole.

To complete the discussion on taxes, participants were provided with a list of statements and possible changes to taxes relating to businesses and employment intended to make the tax system fairer. Most felt it was reasonable to require proof that family members are contributing to a corporation if they are receiving a salary. Those in favour of such an initiative often spoke of this being a way of making the system fairer. Participants were also in favour of the Government taxing investment portfolio income at a higher rate if it is taken out of the portfolio for reasons other than upgrading/improving the business as for many this was deemed to be a tax loophole. Participants were less inclined to support changes to

capital gains. They felt this practice was important for businesses as cash is viewed as an asset for business purposes.

When discussing the option of employee stock options, participants felt this should still be taxed at a different rate as they often carry more financial risk than cash, encourage investment, and are also a valuable means of growth for new businesses. Participants were indifferent to the threshold of \$850,000 as tax-free profits on the sale of a business and felt the income is currently beneficial to those selling their businesses. Reactions to the exemptions for the sale of farms to family members were mixed, with many wondering about the definitions of ‘sale’ and ‘family’.

Participants were then probed about their knowledge of the Employment Credit. Overall participants were not aware of this credit. Some agreed that higher income earners should not benefit from this credit but favoured a sliding scale decrease rather than one single cutoff.

Finally, participants were presented with a list of ways the government could spend revenues raised from these tax reforms and asked which option they would prefer. The list of options presented was as follows:

- *divide up the revenues and mail a check for that amount to every Canadian,*
- *return the money to provinces through transfers that fund healthcare,*
- *pay down the federal debt,*
- *raise the threshold of annual income every Canadian can earn before they have to pay any federal tax (right now the threshold is just over \$11 000),*
- *cut taxes in the lowest tax bracket, and*
- *cut taxes for the middle class.*

The most frequently selected options were to pay down the federal debt as it was seen as a responsible thing to do, as well as return the money to provinces through transfers that fund healthcare, as participants saw an important need for funding in healthcare services.

Youth Policies

Edmonton and Hamilton focus groups were conducted with those between 18 and 34 years of age. These participants were led through a discussion on youth issues and policy. The discussion began with the moderator asking participants to name any federal government policies, programs and services intended to benefit young people. The policies, programs and services for young people that were top of mind for participants included: student loans, grants and scholarships; changes to the Canada Child Benefit; Registered Education Savings Plan (RESP); Young Canada Works; youth entrepreneur grants; free Parks Canada pass and the Government of Canada’s current position on LGBTQ2 issues.

Participants were then provided with a list of Government of Canada actions from the past year and asked to circle up to five things they felt would have the most positive impact on them and their communities.

Some participants in Edmonton were surprised to learn that Alberta and the federal government had signed a healthcare deal to increase funding for home care and mental health while others were

pleasantly surprised to hear about the funding to upgrade the wastewater treatment. Likewise, there was little to no awareness of the Prime Minister’s Youth Council in either market.

Participants were subsequently asked which of the Government of Canada actions presented would be most likely to have a positive impact on them and their communities. Actions most often cited included:

Regarding government efforts to ***Cut taxes on middle class and raised taxes on the wealthy***, participants in both markets felt this action would positively impact them directly as they identify as either from low income or middle class families. Ultimately most felt this action would have a positive financial impact for them. In addition, the consensus among most was that the rich could be taxed a little more.

Many participants in Edmonton felt ***the funding provided for transit system upgrades*** such as the light rail transit (LRT) expansion was important as it brought the local LRT up to the standard seen in other cities. Participants noted that the transit system is a service that is widely used and improvements may reduce the number of cars on the road. Several participants in Hamilton also thought funding for transit system upgrades was necessary.

When discussing the ***Increased non-repayable tuition grants for low and middle income students and Enhanced the Canada Student Loans Program***, participants welcomed financial support for students. Participants in both markets were of the view that students are our future and should not be burdened with debt after graduating.

As mentioned above, many participants were surprised that the Government of Canada ***Signed a healthcare deal (with provinces) to increase funding for home care and mental health***. A number of participants felt this would be beneficial not only for the elderly but also for those struggling with addiction. A couple of participants in Hamilton specifically mentioned that this funding could help patients transition from youth oriented services to adult services in mental health care.

Participants in both Edmonton and Hamilton were supportive of Government of Canada actions associated with ***the Canada Child Benefit***. According to many, the changes to the Canada Child Benefit are effective in helping families with children cope with the costs of raising a family. Likewise, participants in both markets felt actions such as the ***investment of \$165 million in a Youth Employment Strategy including Canada Summer Jobs*** was important as a strategy to help youth gain valuable employment experience.

There were some, particularly in Edmonton who felt the ***expanded EI benefits to parts of the country who have experienced significant job losses*** had merits particularly in the context of the oil and gas industry. Participants in Hamilton also thought this was beneficial for students wishing to focus on school and because of a job market that is seen to be constantly evolving.

Participants reacted favourably to government actions that focussed on ***introducing a plan to legalize marijuana***; participants often spoke of additional revenues generated by the legal sale of cannabis products while others noted that proposed changes would likely lessen the burden on the criminal justice system. That said, some, particularly those in Edmonton, were quick to note that there was still much uncertainty regarding the regulatory framework that was to accompany this action. Some participants, particularly those in Hamilton, felt it was important for the future of Canada’s environment that the Government of Canada ***rejected the Northern Gateway Pipeline***. However, there

were those who questioned the Government of Canada’s decision to allow **the Kinder Morgan project to proceed** due to its perceived associated environment risks.

There was also mixed support for the **deal with the provinces to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan (CPP)**. Those in favour most often spoke of the positive impact this agreement would likely have on their parents as they reach retirement age. These participants also felt that this agreement would serve to better support all Canadians in the future while having the added benefit of allowing more Canadians to retire sooner. This would, in turn, help free up employment opportunities for those entering the job market. Those less supportive of this action questioned the long-term viability of the CPP.

Finally, participants were asked if the government should be doing something that is not on the list. Those in Edmonton felt health care could be enhanced to cover dental care and similar benefits for low-income and unemployed Canadians. Others in Edmonton mentioned RESP and entrepreneurship grants. In Hamilton, some questioned whether more needed to be done to prevent what they saw as potential abuse of the social assistance system. For these participants this was a matter of fairness for those working and struggling financially.

Youth Volunteering

Participants in Edmonton and Hamilton were led through a discussion on volunteering. Most participants were either currently volunteering or had previous experience as a volunteer. Motivations for volunteering included: the desire to help people, in some cases children and youth in particular; that it makes you feel good; that you are giving back to the community; that they don’t have money to donate so give their time; the opportunity to interact with people; making a difference; acquire/test out a new skill or career; life experience for your CV/ scholarships; and, associated perks (i.e. at festivals and events).

Participants were introduced to a potential Government of Canada volunteer program and were then shown a list of potential names and tag lines for this program and were asked to rank their top three choices.

There was no clear consensus as far as a preferred name and some stated that they did not like any of the choices presented, while some said they narrowed their selections by eliminating the ones they absolutely did not like. Reactions to options tested are as follows:

- **YouCan-** of the options presented, this one tended to be the preferred option. Words used to describe it included clever, encouraging, engaging, empowering and positive. Also, participants said the name is not as vague as some of the other options with regards to the purpose of the organization.
- **Youth Service Initiative-** Participants who chose this name liked it because it was straightforward and described the organization.
- **Canoe-** Participants that chose this name felt it was very Canadian. To them, it sounded fun and adventurous and they could relate to it personally. A number of participants cautioned however that, while they liked the name, it made no sense without the tag line while others dismissed it unequivocally.

- **LifeX**- Participants who chose this name felt that it was flashy, future-sounding and could be used in a marketing campaign. Some participants reacted negatively to this name because they said it sounded like a prescription drug or SpaceX.
- **Myvo**- Participants who chose this name felt it sounded modern and trendy, and would be a good name for an app.
- **Far and Wide**- Participants who chose this name said that it sounded diverse and made them think of Canada and also the world.
- **Make the World**- Participants who chose this name said they like the way it sounded – it had a global and positive message.
- **Vola**- Participants who chose this name felt they could see that it had to do with volunteering whereas the other names they could not.
- **Formation and Canada Volunteer Corps**- Participants who chose these names generally saw them as somewhat intuitive; however, a number of participants noted that **Canada Volunteer Corps** had military connotations.
- **YouthConnex** - those who opted for YouthConnex suggested it implied youth connections through technology which many saw as in line with youth interactions today.
- **Magoshan** – Participants struggled with this option. For some it seemed to be “trying too hard” whereas for others it simply did not resonate at all.

Participants in Edmonton said that they would expect the name of a Government of Canada volunteer program to have Canada or something with a C in the name (i.e. CanVolunteer, CanConnect, YouCan). Others suggested using a relevant word (i.e. REACH) as a name for the program and use it as an acronym. Participants in Hamilton suggested Youth Connection, CanYou, Building Blocks, Grassroots Community and Volunteer Canada as names for the program.

Participants in Hamilton discussed potential taglines and were asked what the tagline should convey to possible volunteers. They felt that the tagline should convey what the volunteers would be getting out of the experience (i.e. adventure, fun, meeting people). They mentioned it should also include messages about making Canada and the world a better place as well as building character, skills and confidence.

Seniors’ Policies

Focus groups in Charlottetown were conducted with those aged 55+ and these participants participated in a discussion on seniors’ issues, policies and programs from the federal government. The discussion began with the moderator distributing a list of Government of Canada actions and asking participants to select those they feel will have the most positive impact on them and their community.

Actions most commonly addressed during the ensuing conversation included: the Caregiver Tax Credit; the health care deal signed with PEI to increase funding for homecare and mental health; the new deal to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan; lowering the Age of Old Age Security; Increasing the Guaranteed Income Supplement for low income seniors; the introduction of a plan to legalize marijuana, and cutting taxes on the middle class and raising taxes on the wealthy.

Created a new Caregivers Tax Credit- Reactions to this initiative were positive. Many participants saw this new tax credit as a way to help ensure that those in need of care and wishing to stay at home and

continue to be part of their community have the ability to do so. Some participants noted that it is expensive to stay at home and that support like this will make it easier.

Signed a healthcare deal with PEI to increase funding for homecare and mental health- participants were very much in support of the increase in funding towards these health services. According to them, this initiative would lessen the financial burden on those needing such services as well as potentially on family members acting as caregivers. Though a few participants had not heard of this initiative before the sessions, they felt it was important as it addressed large health issues in their community that cannot be ignored.

Signed a deal with provinces to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan- Participants had also not heard of this initiative but were quick to agree that it would have a positive impact, providing much needed assistance in personal financial management.

Lowered the age you can receive Old Age Security from 67 to 65- When prompted about this option, participants felt it was a good idea, especially for those working in low income jobs which can sometimes be more physically demanding. According to them, such an initiative will be helpful for seniors.

Increase the Guaranteed Income Supplement for low income seniors- Awareness of this initiative was mixed. Those who were aware were hard pressed to provide much in the way of details. Despite not knowing any details, participants welcomed the initiative and said it would be helpful.

Introduced a plan to legalize marijuana- Reactions to this initiative were mixed. Participants who were in favour felt it was good for medicinal marijuana users as it would provide more options for buying marijuana legally, thus limiting risks associated with illicit purchases. Overall participants felt more education was needed on the issue.

Cut taxes on the middle class and raised taxes on the wealthy- Many participants noted this initiative was important as it speaks to fairness of the tax system. Some participants noted that they pay their fair share of taxes and expect all other Canadians, including millionaires, to do the same.

When asked about initiatives that could have a negative impact, participants highlighted *Introduced a national price on carbon pollution*. Participants viewed this initiative as a tax on seniors. While they recognized environmental issues are important, they felt this was a tricky balance to maintain as many participants already felt they were already paying a lot for heating and gas.

Lastly, participants were asked about infrastructure investment programs that would have the most benefit for seniors. According to participants in Charlottetown, the focus should be on investments in hospital infrastructure, affordable and accessible housing, affordable and accessible transit, as well as more community centres for exercise programs and other activities to improve mental health.

Disabilities

Participants in Vancouver were led through a discussion on disabilities issues. When asked what kinds of disabilities come to mind when thinking of people with disabilities, participants said they thought of both physical and mental disabilities and disabilities that are both visible and not.

The ensuing discussion focussed on what participants saw as the most pressing challenges facing Canadians with disabilities. Participants spoke of financial challenges, discrimination, employment challenges, quality of life issues as well as the social stigma often associated with having a disability.

Participants were then questioned about their awareness of actions taken by the Government of Canada to help Canadians with disabilities. There were vague references to increases in disability cheques and some references to increased funding for mental health.

Following this initial discussion participants were then presented with a series of specific actions that could be taken by the Government of Canada to help Canadians with disabilities including:

- improving building accessibility for people with disabilities;
- improving access to employment for people with disabilities;
- improving transportation options (including air, train, ferry and bus) for people with disabilities; and
- improving government customer service for people with disabilities.

Of the options presented, *improving access to employment for people with disabilities* was seen as most important. Participants said it would have a direct impact on improving quality of life due to the financial benefits associated with having a job, while also facilitating more opportunities for social interaction. Further, they said that it had the potential to lessen the financial burden on Canada’s social safety net. When asked about trade-offs between funding disability support initiatives and other Government of Canada initiatives, participants felt it was the government’s responsibility to provide such support. A number of participants noted that actions were also needed for those dealing with mental disabilities.

When participants were subsequently asked who should be responsible for ensuring workplaces were more accessible for those with disabilities, reactions were mixed. Initially participants tended to say this should be the employers’ responsibility. However, participants were quick to make the distinction between small and large employers, based on a sense that large corporations are more likely to have the financial wherewithal to deal with the costs associated with making a workplace accessible, whereas this may simply not be financially feasible for small businesses. Participants were generally not in favour of imposing fines on employers who failed to make their workplace accessible for the reasons highlighted above. However, some participants suggested that, rather than punitive measures such as fines, the government should consider providing incentives (in the form of tax credits) to encourage compliance.

Lastly, participants were asked if they felt Government of Canada should only provide infrastructure funding to buildings and projects that are accessible. Overall participants felt it was reasonable and acceptable for this to be the case in public spaces, such as new transit buses and platforms.

Apologies

Participants in Vancouver were asked about apologies made by the Government of Canada. Initially, participants were presented with high level information on past and future apologies to take place by the Government of Canada in order to contextualize the discussion.

Most participants felt it was important for the Government to initiate these types of apologies – particularly in the interest of reconciling with those who had been directly affected by previous actions. They felt that while the past cannot be changed, apologies are an important way to acknowledge wrongdoings and are part of the healing process. For many, such official apologies were important to ensure that beliefs are not perpetuated and to set standards for society going forward. Criteria suggested for formal apologies included whether the incident was an overt action by the federal government, with long-term effects and was a legal/moral issue.

Ultimately participants felt that apologies are an important way to acknowledge the concerns of those who were mistreated. When asked if too many high-profile apologies could diminish their individual significance, most did not feel this would be the case.

3. Appendix

Appendix A. Detailed Research Methodology

This seventh wave of qualitative research was comprised of a series of 12 focus groups with Canadians aged 20 years old and above, held between July 10th and August 3rd, 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:

- July 10th – Sorel
- July 12th – Edmonton
- July 18th – Thunder Bay
- July 19th – Hamilton
- August 1st – Vancouver
- August 3rd – Charlottetown

A total of 12 participants were recruited for each session to ensure that a minimum of eight to ten participants would attend. In total, 122 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.

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. 1/3 PER GROUP
No	2	GO TO Q1

S6) How long ago was it? _____

TERMINATE IF IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS

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

TERMINATE IF MORE THAN 4 DISCUSSION GROUPS

ASK ALL

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

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

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

Q5) What is your current employment status?

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

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
 - \$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
- } 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

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
Sorel Hotel de La Rive-Centre de congress 165 chemin Sainte-Anne, Sorel-Tracy. Yamaska B : Clients; Yamaska C : Participants	Group 1 – 5:30pm Low Income Group 2 – 7:30pm High Income	July 10, 2017
Edmonton Trend Research 10147 – 104 Street NW	Younger Canadians 18-34 Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	July 12, 2017
Thunder Bay Valhalla Inn 1 Valhalla Inn Road	Group 1 – 5:30pm Low Income Group 2 – 7:30pm High Income	July 18, 2017
Hamilton Plaza Hotel & Conference Center, 150 King Street East. Michigan Room : Clients Superior Room : Participants	Younger Canadians 18-34 Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	July 19 th , 2017
Vancouver Focus 1080 Howe Street Suite 503	Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	August 1, 2017
Charlottetown MQO Research 97 Queen Street	Seniors 55+ Group 1 – 5:30pm Group 2 – 7:30pm	August 3, 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!

Questionnaire de recrutement

Gouvernement du Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Oui 1 **CONTINUER**

Non 2 **REMERCIER ET TERMINER L’ENTREVUE**

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

TERMINER SI MOINS DE 2 ANS

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

Oui 1 **CONTINUER**
Non 2 **CONTINUER**

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

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

S6) À quand remonte cette participation ? _____

TERMINER SI AU COURS DES SIX DERNIERS MOIS

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

TERMINER SI PLUS DE QUATRE GROUPE DE DISCUSSION

DEMANDER À TOUS LES RÉPONDANTS

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

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

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

Oui 1

Non 2

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

Oui 1
 Non 2

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

Un 1
 Plus d’un 2

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

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

Q5) Quelle est votre situation professionnelle actuelle ?

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

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

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

Q8) How many people above the age of 18 are there in your household?

One	ASK Q9
More than One	SKIP TO Q 10

Q9) Was your household’s income for 2016 greater or less than 75 thousand dollars?

1. \$75K OR GREATER	CONTINUE FOR POSSIBLE RECRUIT TO GROUP 2
2. LESS THAN \$75K	CONTINUE FOR POSSIBLE RECRUIT TO GROUP 1

Refused 9 THANK AND TERMINATE

Q10) Was your household’s income for 2016 greater or less than 100 thousand dollars?

1. \$100K OR GREATER	CONTINUE FOR POSSIBLE RECRUIT TO GROUP 2
2. LESS THAN \$100K	QUALIFIES FOR GROUP 1

Refused 9 THANK AND TERMINATE

Q11) **NE PAS POSER CETTE QUESTION – NOTER LE SEXE**

Homme	1	} ASSURER MOITIÉ/MOITIÉ
Femme	2	

Q12) Si vous gagniez un million de dollars, quelles seraient les deux premières choses que vous feriez avec l’argent? **(DOIT AVOIR DEUX RÉPONSES POUR ACCEPTER. TERMINER SI LE RÉPONDANT RÉPOND D’UNE FAÇON DÉSINVOLTE, D’UNE FAÇON COMBATIVE OU S’IL A DE LA DIFFICULTÉ À RÉPONDRE.)**

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

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

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

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

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

[À lire aux répondants en attente]

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

[À lire aux répondants sélectionnés]

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

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

Endroit	Heure	Date
Sorel Hotel de La Rive-Centre de congress 165 chemin Sainte-Anne, Sorel-Tracy. Yamaska B : Clients; Yamaska C : Participants	Groupe 1 – 5:30pm Groupe 2 – 7:30pm	July 10 2017

Nous vous demandons d’arriver au moins 20 minutes à l’avance pour vous assurer de trouver le lieu et avoir le temps de vous inscrire auprès des hôtes. Avant votre admission dans la salle de groupe de discussion, vous devrez signer une entente de non-divulgation; si vous ne le faites pas, votre participation à la séance de groupe de discussion pour laquelle vous avez été sélectionné(e) sera refusée. Le paiement de la prime dépend de la participation aux séances de groupe de discussion.

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

Comme nous invitons un petit nombre de personnes, votre participation est très importante pour nous. Nous vous avons invité(e) à participer en fonction des questions que nous avons abordées il y a un instant, nous vous demandons donc de ne pas envoyer un représentant en

vosre nom si vous n’êtes pas en mesure de participer. **SI, POUR UNE QUELCONQUE RAISON, VOUS N’ÊTES PAS EN MESURE DE PARTICIPER, VEUILLEZ NOUS APPELER AFIN QUE NOUS PUISSIONS VOUS REMPLACER.** Vous pouvez communiquer avec nous au 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx à notre bureau. Quelqu’un vous appellera la veille pour vous rappeler l’événement de discussion.

À quel moment est-il préférable de vous appeler?

À quel numéro de téléphone?

Puis-je avoir votre nom? SUR LA PAGE COUVERTURE

Merci beaucoup pour votre aide!

Appendix C. Discussion Guides

**SOREL MODERATOR’S GUIDE- JULY 10TH 2017
EDMONTON MODERATORS GUIDE- JULY 12 2017
THUNDER BAY MODERATOR’S GUIDE- JULY 18TH 2017
HAMILTON MODERATOR’S GUIDE- JULY 19TH 2017**

- July 10 – Sorel (split by income)
July 12 – Edmonton (split by youth)
July 18 – Thunder Bay (split by income)
July 19 – Hamilton (split by youth)

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

WARM-UP (5 minutes) ALL CITIES

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

LOCAL CHALLENGES (35 minutes) ASK ONLY IN SOREL/THUNDER BAY

- Thinking about everything the government has done in the past year, what, if anything, do you think will have the most positive impact on the local community here?
- Have they done anything that you think will have a negative impact on the local community?

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
- Cost of post-secondary education
- 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
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?

YOUTH POLICIES (25 minutes) ASK ONLY IN EDMONTON (YOUTH) / HAMILTON (YOUTH)

- What policies, programs and services, if any, has the government done that benefit young people?
- These are some things the Government of Canada has done over the past year. Please circle up to five things on this list which you feel will have the most positive impact on you and your community.

Invested nearly \$3 billion a year in new skills training programs for Canadians
Signed the Paris Climate Change Agreement
Approved Kinder Morgan and Line 3 pipelines
Cut taxes on middle class and raised taxes on the wealthy
Expanded EI benefits to parts of the country who have experienced significant job losses
Increased immigration rates
Introduced national price on carbon pollution
Rejected Northern Gateway Pipeline
Signed a free trade deal with European Union
Signed deal with provinces to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan
Introduced the Canada Child Benefit

- Introduced legislation to protect the rights of transgender people
- Introduced plan to legalize marijuana
- Created a Prime Minister’s Youth Council to advise the Prime Minister from a youth perspective
- Increased non-repayable tuition grants for low and middle income students
Invested \$165 million in a Youth Employment Strategy including Canada Summer Jobs
Enhanced the Canada Student Loans Program
 - (HAMILTON ONLY) Signed a healthcare deal with Ontario to increase funding for home care and mental health

- (HAMILTON ONLY) Provided funding for Hamilton public transit system, including 16 new buses, and 370 new bus shelters across the city.
 - (HAMILTON ONLY) Provided funding to upgrade wastewater treatment, and to inspect and replace wastewater pipes and pumping stations in Hamilton
 - (EDMONTON ONLY) Signed a healthcare deal with Alberta to increase funding for home care and mental health
 - (EDMONTON ONLY) Provided funding for 17 water and wastewater infrastructure projects across Alberta
 - (EDMONTON ONLY) Provided funding for new buses, LRT expansion, and other transit system upgrades in Edmonton
- Was there anything on this list you had not heard about before, that you were surprised to find out about?
 - Think about the one you circled which will have the most positive impact on young people in Canada?
 - PROBE: Why specifically do you feel it will have a positive impact?
 - Was there anything on this list which you feel will have a negative impact on young people in Canada?
 - PROBE: Why specifically do you feel this will have a negative impact?
 - Thinking again of young people in Canada, is there something else the government should be doing?

YOUTH VOLUNTEERING (10 minutes) ASK ONLY IN EDMONTON (YOUTH) / HAMILTON (YOUTH)

- I’d now like to change to the topic of volunteering. Does anyone here volunteer? For what types of organizations?
- What are the primary reasons people choose to volunteer? What about you specifically?
- HANDOUT: If the Government of Canada were to name a volunteer program, which could connect you to opportunities in Canada and abroad, which name do you prefer? Please rank your top three choices. Feel free to add any suggestions you may have.

LifeX
Vola
Myvo
Far and Wide
Make the World
Youth Service Initiative
Vol.ca
Canada Corps
Other _____

- What are the reasons for your choice(s)?
- Is there anything missing from this list?
- Are there any items on the list that you do not like? Why?

OTHER POLICIES (35 minutes) ASK ONLY IN EDMONTON (NON-YOUTH) / HAMILTON (NON-YOUTH)

- What policies, programs and services, if any, has the government done that benefit people like you?
- These are some things the Government of Canada has done over the past year. Please circle up to five things on this list which you feel will have the most positive impact on you and your community.

- Invested nearly \$3 billion a year in new skills training programs for Canadians
 - Signed the Paris Climate Change Agreement
 - Approved Kinder Morgan and Line 3 pipelines
 - Cut taxes on middle class and raised taxes on the wealthy
 - Expanded EI benefits to parts of the country who have experienced significant job losses
 - Increased immigration rates
 - Introduced national price on carbon pollution
 - Rejected Northern Gateway Pipeline
 - Signed a free trade deal with European Union
 - Signed deal with provinces to strengthen the Canada Pension Plan
 - Introduced the Canada Child Benefit
 - Introduced legislation to protect the rights of transgender people
 - Introduced plan to legalize marijuana
 - Increasing Guaranteed Income Supplement for low income seniors
 - Lowering age you can receive Old Age Security from 67 to 65
 - (HAMILTON ONLY) Signed a healthcare deal with Ontario to increase funding for home care and mental health
 - (HAMILTON ONLY) Provided funding for Hamilton public transit system, including 16 new buses and a new maintenance facility
 - (HAMILTON ONLY) Provided funding to upgrade wastewater treatment, and to inspect and replace wastewater pipes and pumping stations in Hamilton
 - (EDMONTON ONLY) Signed a healthcare deal with Alberta to increase funding for home care and mental health
 - (EDMONTON ONLY) Provided funding for 17 water and wastewater infrastructure projects across Alberta
 - (EDMONTON ONLY) Provided funding for new buses, LRT expansion, and other transit system upgrades in Edmonton
- Was there anything on this list you had not heard about before, that you were surprised to find out about?
- Think about the one you circled which will have the most positive impact on you and your community. Explain to me what this positive impact will be.
 - PROBE: Why specifically do you feel it will have a positive impact?

- Was there anything on this list which you feel will have a negative impact on you and your community?
 - PROBE: Why specifically do you feel this will have a negative impact?

TAXES (60 minutes)

- Do you believe the tax system in Canada needs reform?
 - WHY?
- HANDOUT: Imagine you are reforming the tax system in Canada. Keeping in mind that the government needs tax revenue to pay for services, put a plus next to *up to 3* groups you think should pay more in taxes, and a minus next to *up to 3* groups you think should pay less in taxes. Feel free to write in any other groups you think are missing, and add a + or – next to them.
 - The middle class
 - The working poor
 - Low-income Canadians
 - Families of young children
 - Big corporations
 - Small corporations
 - Small businesses owners
 - The top 1% of income earners
 - Veterans
 - Churches and religious groups
 - Charities
 - Retired Canadians
 - Students
- Why did you select the groups you did who should pay more in taxes?
 - *PROBE on top 1% of income earners if selected:* At what level of annual income do you think the top 1% starts?
 - Which of the following objectives would you rather see the government focus on when reforming the tax system – making the richest Canadians pay their fair share, making the rich pay more in taxes, or closing tax loopholes that are primarily used by the richest Canadians to reduce the taxes they pay?
 - *PROBE on WHY for mentions of “small corporations” and “small business owners”*
 - *[YOUTH GROUPS ONLY] PROBE on WHY for mentions of “students”.*
- Why did you select the groups you did who should pay less in taxes?
 - *PROBE on “the middle class”:* At what income range do you think the government would need to cut taxes for in order for them to benefit the middle class? (e.g. between \$X,000 a year and \$Y,000 a year)

- *PROBE on “low-income Canadians”*: At what income range do you think the government would need to cut taxes for in order for them to benefit low-income Canadians? (e.g. between \$X,000 a year and \$Y,000 a year)
- *PROBE on WHY for mentions of “small corporations” and “small business owners”*
- *[YOUTH GROUPS ONLY] PROBE on WHY for mentions of “students”*.
- If you had to choose on word or expression to sum up or describe the totality of the changes you proposed, what would it be? In other words, what would the impact on the tax system be if the tax increases and decreases you proposed came to pass?
- One of the options on the list was “small corporations”. What type of examples come to mind when you think of small corporations? (*don’t need to name specific examples, looking for the type of businesses you think of*)
 - *PROBE*: Did you know that small corporations also include many dentists, doctors, lawyers, and consultants, many of whom don’t have any employees?
 - Should these types of people be treated the same way as other small businesses?
- Does anyone know what the tax rate is for small businesses and large businesses in Canada? (...) *The federal tax rate is 15% for large businesses and 10.5% for small businesses.*
 - Do you think it would be fairer if they were taxed at the same rate or is having a lower rate for small business fairer? *WHY?*
 - Some people say having a lower rate for smaller businesses discourages them from hiring more employees and becoming larger businesses? Is this a concern?
- How would you feel about increasing the small business tax rate to the same level as large businesses, but phasing in the rate so that new businesses pay less when trying to establish themselves? For instance, a new business might pay no tax in its first year, 3% in its second year, 6% in its third year and so on until it is eventually paying the same 15% rate that large businesses pay.
- How would you feel about increasing the small business tax rate to the same level as large businesses, but providing a tax exemption on equipment and technology, to encourage innovation and growth?
- I am going to read out a series of other possible changes to taxes related to businesses and employment. *For each one, ask if participants think the change will make the tax system more or less fair, and WHY?*
 - Right now, small corporations can hire family members and split income with them whether or not those family members are actually doing any work. The more family members that are doing this, the less tax they all pay. Some are suggesting the Government should require proof that family members are actually doing work for a corporation if they are receiving a salary.

- Sometimes individuals create one-person corporations without any employees. This allows them to turn their personal income into capital gains or business income, which is taxed at a much lower rate than personal income. Some are suggesting that the Government should tax corporations without any employees at the same rate personal income is taxed.
- Private corporations can use an investment portfolio with the purpose of upgrading their business in the future. However, sometimes corporations do not end up spending this money on improving their business, and may use it to save taxes on personal income. Some are suggesting the Government should tax this money at a higher rate if it is taken out of the portfolio but not used to improve their business.
- Sometimes business owners have a large amount of cash in their business account. If the business owner withdraws this cash to use as their personal income, they are taxed on this personal income, just like any Canadian. When a business owner sells their business, they must pay tax based on the amount gained in the sale – i.e. capital gains tax. Capital gains are taxed less than regular personal income. So, some business owners include the cash in their business account as part of the sale, so that they pay less tax overall. Some are suggesting the Government should prevent this practice.
 - PROVIDE EXAMPLE AS NECESSARY: Let’s say a business owner wants to sell their business for \$1 million, and they have \$100,000 in cash in their business account. The business owner would pay personal income tax on the \$100,000 cash, and they would pay tax on the \$1 million sale based on the capital gains tax rules. However, let’s say instead that the business owner includes the \$100,000 as part of the sale, so they sell the business for \$1.1 million. In this case, they would pay the capital gains taxes on the entire \$1.1 million. Because the \$100,000 in cash is taxed at a lower rate when it’s part of capital gains taxes, the business owner would pay less tax overall than if they sold for \$1 million and kept the \$100,000 cash (the amount of tax they would pay on the \$100,000 when it’s included with the sale would be lowered by as much as 50%).
MODERATOR NOTE: ASSUME ALL OF THIS OCCURS WITHIN THE SAME YEAR.
- When employees have company stock options, they pay less tax than they would if they were paid the same amount as part of their salary. Some are suggesting that employee stock options should be treated more like regular income so that individuals with stock options are paying the same amount of tax as they would if they had been paid an equivalent amount in cash.
 - PROBE: Who do you think benefits from Employee Stock Options?
- When you sell a business now, you don’t pay any taxes on the first \$850,000 of profits from the sale, and then you pay a capital gains tax on half of everything above this amount. Some are suggesting that this threshold of \$850,000 should be lowered.

- One current exception occurs when you sell your farm to a family member. In this case, you do not pay taxes on the profits from the sale. Do you think other businesses should also be exempt from paying taxes if they are sold to family members?
- Who here is familiar with the Employment Credit? Who here believes they receive this credit?
This is a tax credit of a bit over \$1,000 that all employed Canadians receive.
 - Some have suggesting changing this credit, so that higher income earners do not receive it, but lower income earners receive a larger credit. How would you feel about this?
 - *PROBE if supportive:* Where should the cut-off be? At what income level should you stop receiving the credit?
- For most of the above measures, we didn’t talk about how the money raised would be spent, but there are a number of things the government could do with revenue raised. Which of the following would you prefer to see the money raised go towards? *Read list and then ask people what they think should be done and WHY.*
 - Divide up the revenues and mail a check for that amount to every Canadian
 - Return the money to provinces through transfers that fund healthcare
 - Pay down the federal debt
 - Raise the threshold of annual income every Canadian can earn before they have to pay any federal tax (right now the threshold is just over \$11,000)
 - Cut taxes in the lowest tax bracket
 - Cut taxes for the middle class
- Of all the tax changes we talked about today, what is the one measure you would most like to see the government implement?
- And are there any measures you absolutely would not want to see them implement?

VANCOUVER MODERATOR’S GUIDE- AUGUST 1ST 2017
CHARLOTTETOWN MODERATOR’S GUIDE- AUGUST 3RD 2017

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

Aug 1 - Vancouver

Aug 3- Charlottetown

INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

WARM-UP (5 minutes) ALL CITIES

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

VANCOUVER ISSUES (25 minutes)

ASK IN VANCOUVER

- Have you heard any news about the Port of Vancouver lately?
- How do you feel about the Port?
- How important do you feel it is to the region?
- Do you think it is well managed?

- How do people here feel about Granville Island? How would you describe it to someone who isn’t from Vancouver?
 - Are you aware of who owns and manages Granville Island? (for moderator background: It is owned and operated by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, a Crown corporation of the Government of Canada)
- Has anyone heard about plans for Granville Island redevelopment?
 - *A report came out earlier this year with a proposal to redevelop the island. Among the recommendations is building a staircase and elevator from the Granville Street bridge to the island, to encourage people to take public transit, walk, and bike there, instead of driving. The plan would also expand market space, create a central plaza, and create an arts and innovation hub.*
 - How do you feel about this proposal? What do you see as the benefits or the drawbacks?
 - (IF FAVOURABLE) Who do you think should be responsible for paying for this project?

CANADA-US (35 minutes)

ALL CITIES – BUT ONLY 25 MINUTES IN CHARLOTTETOWN

- What have you heard lately about Canada-US relations?

HANDOUT:

- I’ve got a handout that has some issues. Please rank the top three you think it is most important for the Canadian and US governments to discuss: RANK1-2-3

- *Issues: The environment and climate change, the treatment of minority groups, immigration and refugees, oil pipelines, trade, anti-terrorism security, joint military operations overseas, reducing border delays, border security cooperation*
- Are there any other issues missing from this list you think are important for the two countries to work on?
- What did you pick as your top issue?
 - WHY is this issue important?
 - What specifically on this issue needs to be discussed?

START CHARLOTTETOWN GROUPS HERE

- (IF TRADE SELECTED: A few of you mentioned Trade as a top issue). Who here has heard about NAFTA negotiations? (show of hands)

Pretend I’ve been overseas for the past few years. So I know what NAFTA is and have heard a little bit of high level news about what’s going on in Canada and the US, but haven’t heard anything about NAFTA negotiations.

- Explain to me why NAFTA negotiations are happening.
- Explain to me what exactly is involved in the negotiation process.
- What do you expect the result of these negotiations to be?
- Thinking about these negotiations, are there any sectors that you are especially concerned about?
- Do you think the Government of Canada has a good negotiation strategy, or do they need to change their strategy?
- Complete this sentence for me: “I will feel good about a new NAFTA agreement if _____”
- Another issue some people said was important for Canada-US is the environment. How do you feel about Canada and the US setting joint targets for emissions and use of renewable energy?
- Last year, Canada, the US, and Mexico agreed to a tri-lateral deal that set emission reduction targets and renewable energy targets. They also agreed to work together on clean tech development.
 - Is this important? Why?
 - Do you expect the countries to follow through on this?
 - Should Canada take action on its own on these targets if other countries do not?

DISABILITIES (25 minutes) ASK IN VANCOUVER

- I want to talk about disabilities for a bit. When you think about people with disabilities, what specific types of disabilities come to mind?

- What are the largest challenges facing Canadians with disabilities?
- Are you aware of any actions the Government of Canada has taken to help Canadians with disabilities?
- Which of the following types of actions do you think would be most important for the government to take: (*show of hands, then discuss WHY it’s important*)
 - Improving building accessibility for people with disabilities
 - Improving access to employment for people with disabilities
 - Improving transportation options (including air, train, ferry, and bus) for people with disabilities
 - Improving government customer service for people with disabilities
- Is there something else missing on this list that the Government of Canada needs to do to help Canadians with disabilities?
- Compared to other priorities, how important do you feel it is for the government to introduce legislation touching on these issues?
 - (*if important*) WHY?
- Should workplaces be encouraged to hire people with disabilities?
- Should employers be responsible for making workplaces more accessible to people with disabilities, or should it be up to the government to provide funding for this?
 - Thinking about building accessibility, if companies or organizations do not make their buildings more accessible to people with disabilities, should they be fined?
- How would you feel about the Government of Canada only providing infrastructure funding to buildings and projects that are accessible to Canadians with disabilities? So, for example, the government would not fund new transit buses and platforms which are not accessible?

APOLOGIES (10 minutes)

ASK IN VANCOUVER

The Government of Canada has made formal apologies to groups who were mistreated historically. For example, in 2008 the government apologized for the mistreatment of First Nations in the residential schools system. In 2016, the Government of Canada apologized for turning back the Komagata Maru, a ship full of Sikh, Muslim, and Hindu refugees fleeing persecution in Indian in 1914. Later this year, the federal government will apologize for actions taken against LGBTQ2 Canadians in the army and public service from the 1950s to the 90s.

- Do you feel these type of high profile apologies are important?
 - PROBE on why or why not?
- How should the government decide which historical incidents receive a formal apology?

- Does doing too many of these types of apologies diminish the significance of the ones which are made?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)