



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

Spring 2019 Focus Groups (Second Cycle) **Final Report**

Prepared for the Privy Council Office of Canada

August 2019

Supplier name: Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

Contract Number: 35035-182754/001/CY

Contract Value: \$249,535.19 (including HST)

Award Date: 2019-03-20

Delivery Date: 2019-08-06

Registration Number: POR 139-18

For more information on this report, please contact the Privy Council Office at: publications@priv.gc.ca

Spring 2019 Focus Groups (Second Cycle)

Final Report

Prepared for the Privy Council Office of Canada
Supplier name: Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.
August 2019

This public opinion research report presents the results of a series of focus groups conducted by Phoenix SPI on behalf of the Privy Council Office. The research study was conducted with Canadians aged 18 and older between May 8 and May 29, 2019. In total, 12 focus groups were conducted in six locations across the country: Etobicoke/Scarborough, Saint John, Quebec City, Ottawa, Calgary, and Prince George.

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from the Privy Council Office. For more information on this report, please contact the Privy Council Office at: publications@priv.gc.ca or at:

Privy Council Office
85 Sparks Street
Room 1000
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A3
Telephone: 613-957-5153
Teletypewriter (TTY): 613-957-5741
Fax: 613-957-5043

Catalogue number:

CP22-177/5-2019E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN):

978-0-660-32216-2

Related publications (registration number: POR 139-18):

Catalogue number CP22-177/5-2019F-PDF (Final report, French)

978-0-660-32217-9

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Prime Minister of Canada, 2019.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : Groupes de discussion printemps 2019 – Deuxième cycle

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Research Objectives and Purpose.....	1
2. Methodology	1
3. Limitations and Use of the Research Results.....	2
4. Summary of Findings	2
Detailed Findings	7
1. Government of Canada News.....	7
2. Local Infrastructure (Quebec City).....	8
3. Local Issues (Ottawa).....	10
4. Environment	12
5. Pipelines.....	19
6. Steel	20
7. Fisheries	23
8. Vaccine Messages.....	26
9. Seatbelts on school buses.....	29
Appendix.....	30
1. Recruitment Screener	30
2. Moderator’s Guide.....	36

Executive Summary

The Communications and Consultations Secretariat of the Privy Council Office (PCO) provides advice and support to the Government of Canada, the Clerk of the Privy Council, as well as federal departments and agencies on matters relating to communications and consultations. One tool used by PCO in order to fulfil this mandate is public opinion research. Phoenix Strategic Perspectives (Phoenix SPI) was commissioned by PCO to conduct a series of focus groups to explore the views of Canadians on current events of relevance to the federal government.

1. Research Objectives and Purpose

The main objective of the focus groups was to explore the perceptions of Canadians on the state of current events, which included their opinions on the environment, steel, pipelines, fisheries, and vaccines. This input was needed because complex issues are often difficult to communicate to the Canadian public in a manner that is easily and clearly understood. The target population for the focus groups was adult Canadians aged 18 and older. By carrying out this research, PCO was able to ensure a better understanding of the views and concerns of the public. This understanding will be used to develop effective communications strategies and products.

2. Methodology

Twelve focus groups were conducted with Canadians, with two groups conducted in each of the following locations: Greater Toronto Area (GTA)¹, Saint John, Quebec City, Ottawa, Calgary, and Prince George. The groups in Quebec City were conducted in French and the groups in the GTA, Saint John, Calgary, and Prince George were conducted in English. In Ottawa, one group was conducted in English and one in French. In all locations, except Ottawa, groups were segmented by gender (one group with men and one with women). All groups included a mix of participants by age, employment status, income, and education. Groups in Ottawa also included a mix by gender.

The following additional specifications applied to this research: eleven individuals were recruited by phone for each two-hour group; participants received an honorarium of \$100 in appreciation of their time. All groups were held in a facility that allowed observation of the sessions, either behind a one-way mirror, or via closed-circuit TV in a room adjacent to the meeting room where the focus groups took place.

In total, 107 Canadians took part in this research:

Location	Language	Audience	Number of Participants	Date and Local Time
GTA, ON	English	Male	9	May 8; 5:30 pm
GTA, ON	English	Female	8	May 8; 7:30 pm
Saint John, NB	English	Female	10	May 14; 5:30 pm
Saint John, NB	English	Male	10	May 14; 7:30 pm
Quebec City, QC	French	Male	9	May 15; 5:30 pm

¹ Participants were recruited from Scarborough and Etobicoke.

Quebec City, QC	French	Female	9	May 15; 7:30 pm
Ottawa, ON	English	Male/female	8	May 21; 5:30 pm
Ottawa, ON	French	Male/female	8	May 21; 7:30 pm
Calgary, AB	English	Female	9	May 28; 5:30 pm
Calgary, AB	English	Male	9	May 28; 7:30 pm
Prince George, BC	English	Male	9	May 29; 5:30 pm
Prince George, BC	English	Female	9	May 29; 7:30 pm

All steps of the project complied with *The Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research*.

The investigators for this study were Philippe Azzie and Alethea Woods. Philippe moderated the groups in the GTA, Saint John, Quebec City, and Ottawa. Alethea moderated the groups in Calgary and Prince George. Both moderators contributed to the final report.

3. Limitations and Use of the Research Results

This research was qualitative in nature, not quantitative. 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. As such, the results provide an indication of participants' views about the issues explored, but they cannot be generalized to the full population of Canadians. Specifically, 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.

4. Summary of Findings

Government of Canada News

Among things participants had seen, read, or heard about the Government of Canada recently, the most commonly identified ones were the SNC-Lavalin affair and the price on pollution, typically termed a "carbon tax". Other top-of-mind issues were identified by smaller numbers. These included pipelines, legalization of cannabis, tension between China and Canada, the Phoenix payroll issue, U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminium, negotiating a North American free trade agreement, Canada's garbage dispute with the Philippines, the court case in relation to defence procurement, migrants crossing the U.S. border into Canada irregularly, Canada changing its policies regarding refugees, the prime minister's travels to Tofino, subsidies for purchasing electronic vehicles, a national Pharmacare program, taxing of Netflix, federal advertisements about drinking and driving, an increase to the child tax benefit, granting the government of Quebec a role in nominating judges to the Supreme Court of Canada, financial contributions to the reconstruction of Notre Dame cathedral in Paris, and the transfer from a healing lodge back to a federal prison of an individual serving a life sentence for first-degree murder.

Environment

The price on pollution was most often top-of-mind when participants were asked what they recalled about the environment lately. Asked explicitly if they had heard of the Paris Agreement on

climate change, most participants said they had, routinely describing it as an international agreement to deal with climate change or an international agreement to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Most participants were doubtful that Canada would reach its target under the agreement of reducing its GHG emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. At the same time, most participants also said it is important for Canada to do so or at least try to do so.

Virtually all participants in Saint John, Quebec City, and Ottawa said they were aware of the environmental issue around plastics and plastic pollution. When it came to what they would most like to see government do, they were most likely to identify banning single use plastics, followed by eliminating plastic pollution and reducing plastic pollution.

For their part, most participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough, Saint John, and Calgary, said they had heard about the Government of Canada's plan to put a price on pollution. Things heard about the plan included paying a higher price at the pump for gasoline, receiving an incentive (typically termed "a rebate" or "credit"), that there will be a penalty for big emitters of greenhouse gases, that some provincial governments oppose it and have taken the Government of Canada to court, that it is aimed at businesses, that the Alberta government may eliminate its pricing on pollution system, and that there is debate/criticism/disagreement about the Government of Canada's plan.

In Calgary, participants were asked what they know about the environmental assessment process in Canada. No one claimed to know anything about this process, although several participants thought they might have heard something about changes to the rules or process. Most shared the view that the environmental assessment process has the potential to strike a good balance between the environment and the economy.

Steel²

There was widespread awareness among participants in the GTA, Saint John, and Quebec City that U.S. tariffs had been imposed on Canadian steel and aluminum, but limited awareness of anything else beyond that fact. Reaction to the imposition of the tariffs was critical, with participants routinely suggesting that the measures are not justified, go against the principles of free trade, reflect the protectionist views of the current U.S. administration, and result in a 'lose-lose' situation for both countries. There was a near consensus that Canada should keep its countermeasures in place (but not increase them), but participants were divided when asked if Canada should refuse to ratify the new free trade agreement until the U.S. removes its tariffs between those who said yes and those who said they did not know.

There was support across these groups for Canada and the U.S. reaching a compromise whereby the tariffs would not be completely eliminated, but an agreement reached to lower them or change the way steel trade works between the countries to resolve some U.S. concerns. That said, support was based on the assumption that the compromise would be beneficial to both countries.

Compared to all the other issues facing Canada-U.S. relations, the steel tariff was described as important, primarily because it was seen as a microcosm of Canada-U.S. relations in general (i.e. an indication of the state of relations between the two countries). It was also seen as important

² Issues in this section were explored with participants in all locations except Prince George, but questions asked in Ottawa and Calgary were revised following the U.S. government announcement that it would lift tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum.

because of the economic implications and consequences it was having and could have in the future for both countries.

Following the U.S. announcement that they were lifting tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum, at least a few participants in each group in Ottawa and Calgary indicated being aware of this. Participants' impressions as to why the U.S. agreed to lift the tariffs included the following: the U.S. administration wanting to deliver a new free trade agreement ahead of the next presidential election, growing opposition to the tariffs in a number of U.S. states, opposition and pressure from industry, a need for Canadian steel and aluminium, and, possibly, a goodwill gesture from the U.S. administration in response to Canada's arrest of a Huawei executive at the U.S.' request.

There was a virtual consensus that the lifting of these tariffs was good news for Canada, but also a widespread assumption that other issues will emerge on the Canada-U.S. relations front. Reasons given to explain this assessment included the perceived unpredictability of the U.S. administration and potential developments in the Huawei affair.

Fisheries

In the minds of participants, the expression 'Indigenous priority access to the fishery' was most often associated with advantageous access to the fishery. Examples of this included the right to fish first or before other fishers, the right to fish longer than other fishers (e.g. yearlong or outside prescribed fishing seasons), the right to fish without restraints on catches, not being subject to standard licensing requirements (e.g. ability to fish without a permit), and the right to sell fish commercially.

Most participants suggested that 'Indigenous priority access to the fishery' was reasonable, or a good thing, given that Indigenous peoples were first occupants of the territory. Perceived benefits included potentially contributing to reconciliation, improving management of the fisheries, assisting Indigenous communities economically, and rejuvenating Indigenous culture. Concerns about Indigenous priority access to the fishery related primarily to monitoring/managing priority access in order to prevent abuses, particularly overfishing for commercial purposes.

There was positive reaction to the idea of Indigenous communities sharing in the decision-making and management of fisheries in their traditional territories. Perceived benefits associated with 'co-management of fisheries' included better management of natural resources resulting from cooperation, benefiting from the knowledge of Indigenous peoples when it comes to fisheries, promotion of reconciliation, a model for managing relations with Indigenous peoples more generally (i.e. in other areas), and enhancing Canada's international reputation/image in terms of its relationship with its Indigenous peoples.

Concerns about this approach included ensuring a balanced approach that takes into account the perspective of non-Indigenous fishers as well, maintaining transparency about the process of co-management, apprehensions that co-management will be understood as implying equality between partners (based on a sense that Canada should be the senior partner in the relationship), and apprehensions about people potentially claiming indigenous status in order to claim benefits associated with co-management.

Vaccine messages

Participants were given a handout with different pieces of information about vaccines and asked to identify anything that reassured them, anything that did not, and anything they found confusing or unclear. Overall reaction to the document ranged from positive to neutral, with participants routinely observing that it is clear and easy to understand. In terms of its impact, the most widespread effect it had on participants was to solidify or confirm their existing opinions about vaccines (which were overwhelmingly positive). Specifically, the information did not tend to create new doubts or alleviate existing ones, nor did it tend to provide new information or influence decisions to vaccinate either positively or negatively.

When it came to sources they would go to for information about vaccines, participants most often identified a family physician or healthcare provider (with participants unanimous in the feeling that they can ask questions to their healthcare provider about vaccines).

The contract value was \$249,535.19 (including HST).

Political Neutrality Certification

I hereby certify, as a Senior Officer of Phoenix Strategic Perspectives, that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not contain any reference to electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leader.

Signed:



Alethea Woods, President
Phoenix Strategic Perspectives

Detailed Findings

1. Government of Canada News

Things seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada

Participants collectively identified a variety of things they had seen, read, or heard about the Government of Canada recently. The two issues most commonly identified were the SNC-Lavalin affair followed by the price on pollution, typically termed a “carbon tax”. A host of other issues were identified by smaller numbers of participants. These included the following:

- pipelines;
- legalization of cannabis;
- tension between China and Canada over the possible extradition to the US of a Huawei executive;
- the Phoenix payroll issue;
- U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminium;
- negotiating a North American free trade agreement;
- Canada’s garbage dispute with the Philippines;
- the court case in relation to defence procurement;
- migrants crossing the U.S. border into Canada irregularly;
- Canada changing its policies regarding refugees;
- the prime minister’s travels to Tofino;
- subsidies for purchasing electronic vehicles;
- a national Pharmacare program;
- taxing of Netflix;
- new federal advertisements about drinking and driving;
- an increase to the child tax benefit;
- granting the government of Quebec a role in nominating judges to the Supreme Court of Canada;
- financial contributions to the reconstruction of Notre Dame cathedral in Paris;
- the transfer from a healing lodge back to a federal prison of an individual serving a life sentence for first-degree murder.

Issues identified in specific locations included federal government financing of a tramway in Quebec City (identified in Quebec City), shipbuilding contracts that will allow the Coast Guard to expand its patrol capability (Prince George), U.S. duties on Canadian softwood lumber (Prince George), and new mortgage rules (Calgary).

Money Laundering (Prince George)

Participants in Prince George were asked if they had heard anything lately about money laundering. Virtually everyone had heard something about this and think that money laundering is a problem in British Columbia. When asked to explain money laundering, participants mentioned that it involves cash payments for goods, such as homes and vehicles, which, in turn, has affected the cost of living. Many pointed to money laundering as the cause of high housing costs in the province. While money laundering is viewed as a problem, most participants did not consider it as important

as other issues, such as immigration, opioids, the Trans Mountain Expansion (TMX), First Nations housing, poverty and health care, to name a few.

No-one knew with certainty whether the Government of Canada had done anything about money laundering, but several participants thought the federal government might have or might be doing something to address the problem. After exploring participants' awareness of federal government actions in relation to money laundering, participants were given the following information and asked for their reaction:

In the Government of Canada's budget this spring, they announced \$70 million to spend on anti-money laundering initiatives, including for the CRA and RCMP to investigate these crimes, especially in the housing sector.

In response, most participants said that the federal government needs to do more to address the issue.

2. Local Infrastructure (Quebec City)

Local infrastructure project most in need of funding

Participants in Quebec City identified a variety of local infrastructure projects which they felt were most in need of funding in their city. These included building a third bridge (le troisième lien), repairing existing bridges, improving the existing public transit system and/or extending it (including building a tramway), extending highway 40, undertaking road repairs, and investing more in school and hospital infrastructure. It was also observed that reparations/renovations to Place d'Youville in the old city are needed. In terms of perceived priorities, men tended to emphasize a third bridge while women tended to emphasize road maintenance and infrastructure related to hospitals and schools. Men also tended to emphasize extending the public transit system (e.g. building a tramway) while women tended to emphasize improving the existing public transit system.

Re-Painting CN Bridge

All participants had heard about the Quebec City CN bridge needing to be re-painted and issues surrounding it such as who should pay for it and was it necessary/important. Some added that this issue has been around for years and generates debate periodically.

Asked if re-painting the bridge is important or a good idea, participants tended to suggest that it depends on the reason/justification. For example, most women said that they would consider it important for safety reasons (e.g. if the accumulating rust constituted a safety hazard) and/or for historical reasons (e.g. if not re-painting it caused damage to this important heritage site). Conversely, women did not consider re-painting the bridge important if it were for purely aesthetic reasons. Not as many men consider re-painting the bridge important. While a few said they would consider it important for historical reasons (i.e. maintaining a heritage site), most saw it as an aesthetic issue (i.e. covering up the rust) and felt the money required could best be spent elsewhere, like building a new bridge.

With one exception, the estimated cost of re-painting the bridge did not change anyone's opinion about the need to repaint it. One participant who had been undecided about the importance of re-painting the bridge, opposed it when learning that the estimated cost to do so was \$400 million.

In terms of who should be responsible for paying the cost of re-painting, there was widespread agreement that the cost should be shared by the three levels of government (the city, the province, and the federal government), as well as CN.

Third Bridge

All participants had also heard talk about building a third bridge in Quebec City. Such talk was described as typically involving discussions or debates around the following issues: is it necessary?, how much will it cost?, where would it be built?, and what are the alternatives (e.g. a tunnel, public transit)?

There were differences of opinion on the issue of the importance of a third bridge or whether or not it is a good idea. Most men considered it important to build a third bridge because of traffic congestion on the two existing bridges and because of the urban sprawl Quebec City has experienced over the years. Among women, a few were in favour of building a third bridge, a few were against it, and a few were uncertain. Those who did not consider a third bridge important or a good idea provided the following reasons to explain why: the focus should be a public transit system instead of trying to accommodate more vehicles, the emphasis should be on upgrading/repairing the two existing bridges, and other options should be considered, such as a tunnel or improving the ferry service.

In terms of who should be responsible for paying for a new bridge, most men were of the opinion that the cost should ultimately be borne by the users of the bridge. Beyond that specification, the widespread assumption was that the cost should be shared by the three levels of government (the city, the province, and the federal government).

New Public Transit

As with the previous infrastructure projects, all participants had heard about plans for a new public transit system in Quebec City. Such talk was described as typically including discussions or debates around the issue of necessity (e.g. how many people will it serve?, should the existing system be improved instead?), and the issue of cost (i.e. how much will it cost?).

Here as well, there were differences of opinion regarding the importance of a new transit system or whether or not it was a good idea. Those in favour suggested that it would help contain urban sprawl, be more environmentally-sound by reducing car traffic, increase the fluidity of traffic in the city (i.e. reduce congestion), and accommodate more people by including additional destinations/routes. Those opposed to it, and some who were uncertain, suggested that a new system would serve a minority of the population and that it would be better to invest in improving the current system of public transportation instead of building a new one. Some participants said they remain undecided and would need more information before deciding whether this is a good idea or not.

When it came to who should be responsible for paying for a new transit system, most felt that the cost should be shared by the three levels of government (the city, the province, and the federal government).

Most important infrastructure project for Quebec City

Women pointed to the upkeep of existing bridges and road maintenance as the most important infrastructure projects for Quebec City. Men, on the other hand, pointed to a third bridge and an improved public transit system. Asked more specifically which infrastructure project would make the biggest difference to them personally, men were again divided between a third bridge and an improved public transit system, while most women pointed to road maintenance.

3. Local Issues (Ottawa)

Biggest challenges facing Ottawa

Participants in Ottawa identified various important local challenges facing the City of Ottawa right now. These included public transit in general and the Light rail train (LRT) system in particular, road conditions (e.g. pot holes), flooding, the use of opioids, homelessness, crime in the market/Rideau street area, lack of affordable housing, the development of Lebreton flats, finding a new police chief, the Ottawa police's faulty radio system, and the construction of a Salvation Army shelter in Vanier. Some francophone participants also identified lack of bilingual services as a challenge.

Impact of federal government on Ottawa

Participants were asked what, if anything, the federal government has done that has benefited the City of Ottawa in recent years as well as what, if anything, it has done that has hurt the City. Benefits identified included federal funding of the LRT system, the NCC's beautification of the city, events associated with celebration of Canada's 150th anniversary, maintenance of Gatineau park, and the fact that the federal government is a big local employer. Participants had difficulty identifying anything the federal government has done to hurt the city, the only things identified being possibly the Phoenix pay system (given the number of federal civil servants in the city) and inability to move things ahead in the development of Lebreton flats.

Ottawa's biggest infrastructure needs

According to participants in Ottawa, the city's biggest infrastructure needs include fixing roads, repairing and replacing water mains, cleaning/beautifying the city, affordable housing, and reducing the cost of using the public transit system.

Building another bridge between Ottawa and Gatineau

Participants described the idea of building a new bridge between Ottawa and Gatineau as one that has been talked about for years and is periodically revisited. Things they have heard about this included the question of its location, the argument that a new bridge is needed in order to redirect truck traffic away from the east end of the city, and the potential environmental impact of locating it at Petrie Island. Participants had no idea what the government of Canada has done or what its

position is regarding a new bridge. However, it was observed that the Government of Canada has recently revived the issue of a new bridge, suggesting perhaps that it might be willing to play a role in its construction.

Most participants said the construction of a new bridge has little or no personal importance to them, though it was noted that it would benefit the city by decongesting truck traffic in the east end. That said, a couple of participants said a new bridge would be personally important to them. One because of a spouse who works in Gatineau so that a new bridge would reduce transit time to and from the office. Another because of relatives who live in Gatineau so that that a new bridge would make it easier to visit them by reducing travel time.

Redevelopment of Lebreton Flats

While there was general awareness about plans to redevelop Lebreton flats, participants were unsure about the details regarding where things stand at present. Things they have heard about the redevelopment included the following:

- it is a work in progress, with no definite plans about what the redevelopment will look like;
- plans are starting over again after the previous partnership to develop the area fell through;
- it no longer seems to be viewed as a grand mega-project (i.e. development will proceed on a smaller scale);
- the new public library will be built there.

Participants were unsure what the government of Canada has done or what its position is regarding redevelopment of the area, apart from the impression that it wants the area developed and has put up the land to that end. Beyond that, participants do not know to what extent the government of Canada is involved in the project (i.e. is it leading or taking a hands-off approach).

Anglophone participants described the redevelopment as of little or no importance to them personally, while Francophone participants were divided. Half the francophone participants described it as personally important to them because they live in the area, or because it will improve the city in which they live, or because if a new hockey arena is built there it will make it easier to watch games live on location.

Ottawa's LRT system

When asked what they have heard about Ottawa's LRT system, participants referred to delays in the project, but also observed that things seem to be moving along (e.g. stations are ready and testing of trains is going on (regarding which it was observed that a derailment had occurred during testing). It was also observed that the trains may not be well adapted to Ottawa's weather conditions, especially snow. Regarding what the government of Canada has done or what its position is regarding the LRT, many participants were aware that it was financing phase 2 of the project. There was nothing beyond this however that they could identify.

Most anglophone participants described the LRT as of little or no importance to them personally but felt that it was good for the city in general. By contrast, most francophones described it as personally important to them for transportation purposes, with a few noting that it is particularly important for them because of anticipated cuts in bus routes.

Government of Canada's top priority when it comes to Ottawa

Participants offered different opinions on what should be the government of Canada's top priority when it comes to the city of Ottawa, but the most frequently identified priority was beautifying the city in general because it is the national capital. Other perceived priorities included job creation, affordable housing, creating more tourism/tourist attractions, maintaining heritage sites, improving the public transit system, and creating protected green spaces.

4. Environment

Things seen, read or heard lately about the environment

The price on pollution (which most referred to as a 'carbon tax') was most frequently mentioned when participants were asked what they recalled having seen, read or heard about the environment lately (including anything related specifically to the Government of Canada and the environment). A host of other issues were identified including the following:

- a report noting that global warming is proceeding faster in Canada than elsewhere;
- plastics pollution (i.e. packaging, plastics in the oceans, banning single-use plastics);
- issues related to pipeline construction;
- subsidies for electric vehicles;
- Canada being unlikely to meet its Paris Accord targets;
- garbage from Canada sent to the Philippines;
- rising ocean levels;
- flooding caused by rising water levels in rivers;
- an increase in the number of invasive species;
- a decline in the number of Atlantic whales;
- creation of a marine conservation area in the North;
- the effects of climate change on the North (i.e. melting glaciers, the impact on polar bears);
- a federal subsidy to Loblaws to purchase energy efficient refrigerators;
- creation of more green spaces and use of public transit to help the environment;
- warnings from a prominent American science commentator about global warming;
- contamination of ground water/water tables;
- debates over the development of the Alberta oil sands.

Issues identified in specific locations included waste in the St. Lawrence river (identified in Quebec City), the damage caused by clear-cutting and scallop dredging (identified in Saint John), forest fires (mentioned in Prince George and Calgary), and mountain caribou recovery (mentioned in Prince George).

Paris Agreement on climate change

Participants in all locations except Prince George were asked about the Paris Agreement on climate change. Most participants in each group said they had heard about the agreement, aside from the group of women in Saint John in which only a few participants said they were aware of it.

Asked how they would explain the agreement, participants routinely described it as an international agreement to deal with climate change or an international agreement to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Other points made about the agreement included the impression that it is driven by the G7 countries, that it involves targets for reducing GHG emissions, that many countries have signed the agreement but that few have ratified it, and that there are no sanctions for failing to meet the reduction targets. There was often uncertainty about whether certain countries were or were not part of the agreement³, and very few participants were aware of Canada's own target under the agreement.

After being informed that, under the Paris Agreement, Canada has committed to reducing its GHG emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030, participants were asked if they thought Canada would meet its target. In response, most participants said they were doubtful that Canada would reach this target, with the remainder either uncertain, or hopeful but not optimistic. Participants collectively identified a variety of factors that could impact whether or not Canada meets this target. They included the following:

- the economic costs required to meet the target (e.g. potential job losses in various sectors);
- the cost and availability of alternative sources of energy;
- general hesitation to pivot away from fossil fuels given Canada's abundance in this resource;
- the extent to which the biggest GHG emitters are regulated;
- the extent to which a coordinated nation-wide plan is in place;
- the need for increased education and awareness about the benefits of environmentally-friendly practices;
- political will;
- the need for more incentives to help Canadians transition to environmentally-friendly practices); and
- the extent to which transportation needs can be met through public transit systems.

Although most participants expressed doubt when asked if they think Canada will meet its target under the Paris Agreement, most said it is important for Canada to do so or at least try to do so. Reasons why this is considered important included the following:

- the gravity of climate change;
- the importance of working towards objectives (e.g. why set targets if you are going to ignore them?);
- the importance of leading by example even if other countries do not do their part;
- the impression that the longer we wait, the harder it will be to deal with climate change;
- the impression that there are many potential economic opportunities in a 'green' economy;
- the view that Canada's fossil fuel resources are not unlimited, making change inevitable at some point;
- concern about the legacy being left to future generations; and
- the potential health implications and costs associated with not reducing GHG emissions.

³ Almost everyone knew that the U.S. is not part of the agreement, but some speculated that other countries, such as Russia, China, and India, also are not part of the agreement.

Participants who felt it was not important for Canada to meet its targets provided the following reasons to explain why: climate change is not as serious a problem as it is often presented as being (e.g. climate change is cyclical); the impression that the impact of Canada meeting its target will be offset by other countries not doing their part; and the impression that there may be other approaches that are more effective at achieving meaningful action on climate change.

Limited awareness of Green New Deal

Asked if they had heard about the 'Green New Deal' in the United States, nearly all participants in Saint John, Quebec City, and Ottawa said they had not. The few who had heard about it knew very little about it except for an associated hash tag, or they linked it to the democratic party in general or a U.S. representative in particular (who had recently sponsored a resolution related to it).

Reaction to objectives the Government of Canada could strive towards on environment

Participants in Saint John, Quebec City, and Ottawa were given a handout identifying some broad objectives the Government of Canada could strive towards on the environment. They were asked to identify the item on the list that resonated the most with them. The list included the following names:

- Better Future Blueprint
- Canada's Clean Future
- Canadian Environmental Accord
- Clean Canada
- Clean Economy Plan
- Clean Growth Strategy
- Climate Action Plan
- Climate Change Framework
- Climate Emergency Response
- Green Plan
- Pollution Reduction Strategy
- Smart Prosperity Plan

While no name was preferred by a majority of participants, the one most likely to be preferred was 'Pollution Reduction Strategy', which was twice as likely to be chosen as its nearest competitor 'Climate Action Plan'. Reasons for liking 'Pollution Reduction Strategy' included impressions that the name is clear and action-focused, encompassing or comprehensive, and emphasises measurable/realizable goals.

Expressions that tended to be disliked or less liked included expressions described as vague, generic, or unclear. These included 'Better Future Blueprint', 'Canada's Clean Future', 'Clean Canada', and 'Smart Prosperity Plan'. The latter expression was also disliked by some because the word 'smart' seemed to suggest to them that the only alternative to such a plan was 'dumb'. The expression 'Green Plan' was also disliked or less liked by some because it suggested a plan by a specific political party, rather than a plan by the Government of Canada.

Participants were then asked if they see a difference between the terms 'clean' and 'green' used in these names. In response, participants routinely said that they do see a difference between them.

Specifically, the expression 'green' brings to mind images associated with nature, the environment, growth, ecology, and the organic. By contrast the expression 'clean' tends to bring to mind images that are the antithesis of 'dirty', including antiseptic and sanitized. For some, the expression clean is also associated with being drug-free or in addiction recovery.

Impressions of terms 'framework', 'plan', 'strategy', 'accord', 'blueprint'

There were differences of opinion when it came to which term gives participants the most confidence that government is doing something on the issue of the environment. That said, participants were more likely to identify the term 'strategy' than any of the others. Asked why, they said that it brings to mind a concrete and thought-out process that aligns means and ends (e.g. a goal or objective and a way or ways to achieve it backed up by statistics and/or facts).

Although the expressions 'framework', 'blueprint', and 'plan' were chosen less frequently than 'strategy', they tended to be chosen for similar reasons (i.e. they brought to mind an ordered process, with steps and structure, designed to realize a goal or objective). Some participants preferred the expression 'accord' because it brought to mind the idea of a broad consensus or agreement on what needs to be done. Some participants said they saw no real difference between these expressions in terms of generating confidence that government is doing something on the issue of the environment.

Preferences regarding government action on plastics

Participants in Saint John, Quebec City, and Ottawa were also asked if they had heard about the specific environmental issue around plastics and plastic pollution, and which of the following they would most like to see the government do about this issue:

- Reduce Plastic Pollution
- Ban Plastic Pollution
- Eliminate Plastic Pollution
- Ban Single Use Plastics

Virtually all participants said they were aware of the issue around plastics and plastic pollution. When it came to what they would most like to see government do, they were most likely to identify banning single use plastics, followed by eliminating plastic pollution and reducing plastic pollution (no one favoured banning plastic pollution). The starkest difference among participant preferences was between men and women in St. John where men unanimously preferred banning single use plastics and women unanimously preferred eliminating plastic pollution. Other differences included the following:

- Men and women in Quebec City were almost evenly divided between reducing plastic pollution and banning single use plastics.
- Anglophone participants in Ottawa were evenly divided between favouring the reduction of plastic pollution and favouring a ban on single use plastics, while most francophone participants favoured eliminating plastic pollution.

Single-use Plastics (Prince George)

In Prince George, everyone had heard something about plastic pollution, and some would support the Government of Canada taking steps to ban single-use plastics in order to reduce plastic pollution. Others said they would support this in principle provided viable alternatives are made available to consumers or noted that the transition away from single-use plastics should be gradual in implementation. A few participants suggested that incentivizing consumers and businesses to use alternatives to single-use plastics would help to support a ban on single-use plastics.

Participants believe it is important to ban single-use plastics for a variety of reasons, including the need to protect oceans, wildlife, and the environment from the effects of plastic pollution. When asked specifically about any drawbacks associated with banning single-use plastics, participants mentioned the perceived cost to affected businesses to comply with a ban (i.e., the cost to invest in alternative products), the potential for the cost of certain consumer goods to increase (as businesses have to offset the costs incurred to introduce alternatives to single-use plastics), and the perception that there are many other polluters that have a more significant impact on the environment than single-use plastics.

Turning to possible economic impacts of banning single-use plastics, participants pointed to both positive and negative effects. On the positive side, some participants noted the potential for new industries to emerge in response to a demand for alternatives to single-use plastics. This could have a positive effect on the national economy as well as on local economies, with job creation and increased employment in communities. When focusing on possible negative impacts, participants tended to mention the same things they offered when asked about the drawbacks of banning single-use plastics (i.e., the cost to businesses and the potential for job loss as businesses find ways to manage the cost of introducing alternative products).

When it comes to specific single-use products that should be banned, participants easily pointed to a variety of items: plastic cutlery, plastic packaging of consumer goods, in particular, children's toys, grocery store bags, plastic water bottles, plastic straws, fast food containers, and single-serve foods. There was no consensus, however, on which single-use plastics should be a priority for banning. For example, for some, plastic grocery store bags are reused in their home and therefore should not be a priority; for others, plastic grocery store bags have already been replaced with reusable bags and therefore this item should be prioritized for banning. Where there was consensus was plastic packaging. Everyone felt that the amount of plastic used to package consumer goods and single-use food items is excessive.

Environmental Assessment (Calgary)

In Calgary, participants were asked what they know about the environmental assessment process in Canada. No one claimed to know anything about this process, although several participants thought they might have heard something about changes to the rules or process, with a few individuals mentioning Bill C-69 (The modernization of the National Energy Board and Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency) and questioning what impact the legislation will have on pipeline development in Canada. Most shared the view that the environmental assessment process has the potential to strike a good balance between the environment and the economy, although some felt that these rules may impede business investment in pipelines.

Price on pollution⁴

All participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John, and most participants from Calgary, said they had heard about the Government of Canada's plan to put a price on pollution. Participants had heard a variety of things about this recently. This included:

- paying a higher price at the pump for gasoline;
- receiving an incentive (typically referred to as a "rebate" or "credit");
- that there will be a penalty for big emitters of greenhouse gases;
- that some provincial governments oppose it and have taken the Government of Canada to court;
- that it is aimed at businesses;
- that the government in Alberta may eliminate its pricing on pollution system; and
- that there is debate/criticism/disagreement about the Government of Canada's plan.

Awareness that revenues from the price on pollution are returned to individuals

Nearly all participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John said they were aware that revenues from the price on pollution are returned to individuals via an incentive, though knowledge of this was lower among the group of women in Etobicoke/Scarborough.

Understanding of federal plan to put a price on pollution

Overall, participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John expressed limited understanding about how the federal government plan to put a price on pollution works. Indeed, no more than a few participants in any group said this was clear to them. Attempts to explain the plan focussed on goals, purposes, or objectives of the plan, including taxing what causes emissions in order to discourage such behaviour, encouraging people to switch to alternative sources of energy, and reducing carbon emissions by focussing on the price of gas at the pump. The increased cost of gasoline and the incentive were the only specific elements of the plan identified (and understood) by participants with any frequency. Some specified that the incentive was designed to ease the financial burden imposed by the price on pollution, and a few added that fuel for business is exempted from the pricing system.

Limited understanding of the plan was further reflected by the following questions posed by participants: if individuals use their car for business purposes are they exempted from the price on pollution (and if so, how does this work?), how are companies (especially large ones) affected by the plan/why are they exempted from the carbon pricing measures or why do they receive breaks?, why does everyone receive an incentive?, how are the amounts of the incentive calculated?, what are the various parts of the plan and how do they interconnect (i.e. what is the big picture?), how will the effects of the plan be measured?

Impact of the federal price on pollution on costs of living

To date, the main impact of the federal price on pollution felt by participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John has been on the price of gasoline, though some think it has

⁴ All topics in this section were discussed with participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John and some topics also were discussed in Calgary.

also impacted food and heating prices. Looking ahead, participants expect to feel the impact in other areas:

- the cost of tourism/travel;
- the cost of utilities (e.g., home heating);
- the cost of public transit (identified by participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough);
- the cost of food and any other consumer goods transported over long distances;
- ferry service (identified in Saint John).

Impact of the federal price on pollution on gasoline

Participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John felt that the price of gasoline has increased as a result of the price on pollution. At least some participants have adjusted their driving habits as a result of higher gas prices. This included driving their more fuel-efficient vehicle (if a two-car household), being more strategic in planning errands (i.e. trying to reduce the number of errand-related outings), using public transit more often (identified by participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough), working from home when possible, walking to work when possible, carpooling, using ride services, no longer taking drives to the country, and no longer using a car at all.

In addition, at least a few participants who have not yet adjusted their driving think they will do so in the future as a result of the price on pollution. That said, a few participants from these cities said they will not adjust their driving habits, explaining that they have no option but to drive as much as they do.

Awareness of the Climate Action Incentive

Most participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough and Saint John had heard that they would receive the Climate Action Incentive beginning this year, though fewer women than men from Etobicoke/Scarborough were aware of this. Those who were aware of Climate Action Incentive also knew that they had to claim the incentive when filing their tax returns. Moreover, with the exception of the group of women from Etobicoke/Scarborough, most participants in each of these groups said they had claimed the incentive when filing their taxes.

Perceptions of the impact of the Climate Action Incentive

Most participants said the Climate Action Incentive they receive will be less than what they will pay in costs associated with the price on pollution. Impressions were not altered when participants were informed that the Parliamentary Budget Office estimates 80% of Canadian households will get more back than they will pay.

Perceptions of pricing pollution

With the exception of the group of men in Saint John, most participants in the groups held in the GTA and Saint John agreed with the idea of using a price on pollution as an approach to help reduce carbon emissions and combat climate change. Men in Saint John were divided on this question, while participants in other groups who were not in agreement with this approach were more likely to be unsure than opposed to it.

Impact of the federal carbon pollution pricing system (Calgary)

Participants in Calgary were asked what impact they thought the federal pollution pricing system will have on the environment, on the economy, and on them personally. Starting with the environment, most participants believe the approach will have little impact because Canada is not a large polluter. That said, some participants felt the proposed system could have a positive impact on the environment if implementation is done effectively.

Views on economic impacts tended to be divided. Some participants noted the potential for job losses as well as increased costs of consumer goods. These participants believed that companies will relocate their operations or reduce their workforce to avoid or offset paying a price on pollution. Others were more optimistic, suggesting that the pollution pricing system offers the opportunity for economic growth in new sectors. These participants felt that corporations may be motivated to explore energy efficient alternatives in order to reduce what they pay.

When asked what impact this approach will have on them personally, most participants felt that it would have some impact. Specifically, they think that it will result in increases to the cost of living, which will have a financial impact on their household. In addition, and related to the potential financial impact, several participants thought that they would have to pay closer attention to their household consumption of energy.

5. Pipelines

Awareness of Trans Mountain Expansion project

All participants in Calgary and Prince George had heard about the Trans Mountain Expansion (TMX) project and were able to point to various issues associated with the project. Things routinely mentioned about the project included the following:

- the project will ‘twin’ an existing pipeline;
- the pipeline will transport bitumen from Alberta to British Columbia;
- the pipeline is an alternative to truck and rail transport of oil;
- the project has not considered the environment and how to protect it;
- that a decision will be made about the pipeline on June 18, 2019; and
- there is a dispute between some First Nations and the federal government over land rights.

In Calgary, several participants described protests and their perception that views in the Greater Vancouver Area are divided between those who support the pipeline and those who do not want the pipeline to go ahead.

Most participants were aware the Government of Canada currently owns the TMX, with many saying it was necessary for the federal government to purchase the TMX. Specifically, they explained that the delays surrounding the approval of the project caused Kinder Morgan to decide not to proceed, leaving the Government of Canada no choice but to purchase the pipeline to ensure project completion. Most participants, in both locations, did not favour the decision to purchase the TMX (despite acknowledging that this may be the only course of action available to the federal government). The main reason offered to explain their position was the perception that

government should not own pipelines in general, and that in this particular case, it will not be cost-effective.

There was widespread awareness that the TMX project is on hold, although fewer participants had heard of the court ruling from fall 2018 requiring more consultation. Awareness of the Government of Canada's deadline of June 18th, 2019, to decide on whether or not to approve the TMX expansion was more limited.

Views of TMX

On balance, many participants would like to see the TMX expansion go ahead, although some said their support was conditional on appropriate safeguards being in place to protect the environment. Reasons offered to explain why the TMX expansion should go ahead focused on the potential economic impact and on the view that pipelines are a safer way to transport oil compared to other methods. Those who would prefer that the TMX expansion not go ahead pointed to their perception that environmental safety has not been given enough consideration and that oil is not a renewable source of energy so it should not be the focus of such investment.

Most participants expect the TMX expansion project will go ahead, but there was no strong sense of when this will happen, with some noting the actions taken by provincial governments could impact timelines. Those who do not think the expansion will happen pointed to the ongoing lack of consensus among interested parties and to potential First Nations court challenges and a possible appeal of the B.C. Court of Appeals decision. A few characterized the TMX debate as a national issue that is causing a serious chasm between different regions of the country.

Canada's energy and environment strategy

Participants were first read, and then asked to comment on, the following:

The Government of Canada's strategy for energy and the environment includes approval of some pipelines (such as TMX), a national price on carbon pollution, and improved protection for our oceans. Some have argued this strategy only works if all provinces are on board for all aspects of it – so even if the government of British Columbia doesn't want a pipeline approved or the government of Alberta doesn't want to put a price on carbon pollution, they need to be on board so that the entire strategy works.

Most participants agreed with this sentiment. They felt that Canada's energy and the environment strategy will only work if all provinces are on board, with some emphasizing the need for compromise. However, virtually everyone sees the approval of the TMX and the implementation of a price on pollution in Alberta as completely separate issues.

6. Steel

Issues in this section were explored with participants in all locations except Prince George, but questions asked in Ottawa and Calgary were revised following the U.S. government announcement that it would lift tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum. This section begins by reporting feedback

on this issue from groups in the GTA, Saint John, and Quebec City, followed by feedback from groups in Ottawa and Calgary.

Things seen, read or heard about Canada-U.S. relations

Participants collectively identified a variety of things they had seen, read, or heard about Canada-U.S. relations since a deal on a new free trade agreement was reached in the fall of 2018. Some observed in a general way that relations between the two countries were not as good as they have been historically, and specific things they have heard, read, or seen tended to serve as examples of the current state of Canada-U.S. relations. These things included the following:

- issues related to Canadian softwood lumber;
- U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminium;
- threats of U.S. tariffs on Canadian automobiles;
- difficulty crossing the border into the United States (e.g. delays at customs);
- disputes about fishing rights in coastal waters;
- U.S. milk producers' access to the Canadian market;
- the issue of the extradition of a Huawei executive;
- irregular border crossings from the U.S. into Canada; and
- strained relations between leaders of both countries.

Issues in Canada-U.S. relations to focus on over the next year

Participants identified a variety of things they believe the Canadian government should focus on over the next year in terms of Canada-U.S. relations⁵. These included the following, none of which dominated:

- advocating Canadian interests in general;
- purchase of fighter jets for Canadian Forces;
- U.S. auto makers closing plants in Canada;
- the Northwest passage/national security/sovereignty in the north;
- U.S. access to the Canadian dairy market;
- tariffs in general;
- construction of pipelines;
- safeguarding Canada's natural resources (e.g. water, lumber);
- border security/irregular crossings;
- relations with China as a result of the Huawei issue;
- climate change;
- issues related to cannabis users crossing into the U.S.;
- diversifying Canadian markets/not relying as much on exports to the U.S.;
- developing a common currency between Canada and the U.S.; and
- labelling products so as to know where they are produced.

⁵ Feedback on this issue includes feedback from participants in Ottawa and Calgary who were asked: *Moving forward, what are the top issues you think the Canadian government needs to work with the US government on, if any?*

Views on U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminium

There was widespread awareness in these locations that U.S. tariffs had been imposed on Canadian steel and aluminum. However, there was limited awareness of anything else beyond that fact. Impressions were that it is an important issue in Canada-U.S. relations, that it is having economic consequences in Canada, and that Canada is receiving some support for the removal of tariffs from various U.S. state-level governments.

There was critical reaction to the imposition of the tariffs, with participants routinely suggesting that the measures are not justified/unfair, go against the principles of free trade, reflect the protectionist views of the current U.S. administration, and result in a 'lose-lose' situation for both countries. Most participants from these locations assumed that this issue would not be resolved quickly (i.e. within the next few months). Instead, they suggested that a resolution might not occur until there is a new administration in the U.S.

After being informed of Canada's countermeasures and being asked what Canada should do, there was a near consensus that Canada should keep its countermeasures in place (but not increase them), and some also suggested that Canada should try to engage with different trading partners to be less reliant economically on the U.S.. When asked if Canada should refuse to ratify the new free trade agreement until the U.S. removes its tariffs, participants were divided between those who said yes (more common among the men) and those who said they did not know (more common among the women).

There was support in all these groups for Canada and the U.S. reaching a compromise whereby the tariffs would not be completely eliminated, but an agreement reached to lower them or change the way steel trade works between the countries to resolve some U.S. concerns. That said, support was based on the assumption that the compromise would not be to the detriment of Canada's interests but would be beneficial to both countries.

Participants from Etobicoke/Scarborough, Saint John, and Quebec City were asked which of the following opinions they would find most credible on this issue: Canadian media, U.S. media, Canadian steel companies, Canadian steel unions and workers, economists, Canadian government/officials, U.S. government/officials. Economists led the way, followed by Canadian steel unions and workers.

Compared to all the other issues facing Canada-U.S. relations, the steel tariff was described as important, primarily because it was seen as a microcosm of Canada-U.S. relations in general (i.e. an indication of the state of relations between the two countries). It was also seen as important because of the economic implications and consequences it was having and could have in the future for both countries.

Impressions of lifting of U.S. tariffs

Following the U.S. announcement that they were lifting tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum, at least a few participants in each group in Ottawa and Calgary were aware of this. Asked to provide the backstory about these tariffs (e.g. why they were put in place, what did the Canadian government do in response to them), participants tended to focus on the reasons they thought the tariffs were put in place. These included a perceived protectionist sentiment in the current U.S.

administration, a negotiating tactic used by the U.S. administration to influence free trade negotiations, and an approach used by the U.S. administration to prevent inexpensive steel from China entering the country through Canada. The Canadian response to the tariffs was described generally as a retaliatory measure (i.e. the U.S. government imposed tariffs on Canadian products, so Canada responded with countermeasures on U.S. products).

Participants' impressions as to why the U.S. agreed to lift the tariffs included the following: the U.S. administration wanting to deliver a new free trade agreement ahead of the next presidential election; growing opposition to the tariffs in a number of U.S. states; opposition and pressure from industry; a need for Canadian steel and aluminium; and, possibly, a goodwill gesture from the U.S. administration in response to Canada's arrest of a Huawei executive at the U.S.' request.

There was a virtual consensus that the lifting of these tariffs was good news for Canada, but there was also a widespread assumption that other issues will emerge on the Canada-U.S. relations front. Reasons given to explain this assessment included the perceived unpredictability of the U.S. administration and potential developments in the Huawei affair. In Calgary, the top issues participants think the Canadian government will need to work on with the U.S. government are pipelines, border security, immigration, fisheries and lumber, environmental issues, Arctic sovereignty, net neutrality, and the Huawei affair.

7. Fisheries

Issues in this section were explored with participants in all locations except Ottawa and Calgary.

Meaning of Indigenous priority access to the fishery

In the minds of participants, the expression 'Indigenous priority access to the fishery' was most often associated with advantageous access to the fishery. Examples of this included the following:

- the right to fish first or before other fishers;
- the right to fish longer than other fishers (e.g. yearlong or outside prescribed fishing seasons);
- the right to fish without restraints on catches (e.g. no quotas);
- not being subject to standard licensing requirements (e.g. ability to fish without a permit); and
- the right to sell fish commercially (e.g. beyond sustenance levels/personal needs).

For some participants, the expression brought to mind (or also brought to mind) ideas associated with the following:

- protection of Indigenous ways of life;
- recognition of traditional/ancestral rights;
- reconciliation with Indigenous peoples; and
- controlling commercial access to the fishery.

Reaction to ‘Indigenous priority access to the fishery’

After exploring in an open-ended way what participants’ associate with the expression, they were given the following description and asked for their reaction.

Indigenous ‘priority access to the fishery’ can be expressed in various ways, depending on the circumstances. For example, ‘priority’ could mean that Indigenous communities have the opportunity to fish first in their traditional territory to a certain allotted quota before commercial and other fish harvesters have access to a fishery; or that they are able to fish in a manner that reflects their traditional fishing practices, and is distinct from other fishers.

Most participants suggested that this was reasonable, or a good thing, given that Indigenous peoples were first occupants of the territory. Some added that such measures are important as a way to help achieve reconciliation with Indigenous peoples. Others acknowledged the importance of ‘priority access to the fishery’, but suggested the need for basic rules and regulations to ensure sound management of the fisheries (e.g. regulating stocks). Some participants (primarily those from Etobicoke/Scarborough) expressed no particular views on the subject, while others were of the opinion that the same rules and standards should apply to all fishers.

Benefits and concerns associated with Indigenous priority access to the fishery

Participants were asked how they think Indigenous priority access to the fishery could benefit Canada, as well as what concerns, if any, they may have. Perceived benefits included potentially contributing to reconciliation, improving management of the fisheries (based, in part, on the idea that environmentally-sound practices can be learned from Indigenous peoples), assisting Indigenous communities economically, and rejuvenating Indigenous culture.

Concerns about Indigenous priority access to the fishery related primarily to monitoring/managing priority access in order to prevent abuses, particularly overfishing for commercial purposes. Some participants said they have no concerns if there is oversight to prevent abuses and to assess environmental impacts. Related to this, some participants wanted to know whether Indigenous communities would provide oversight themselves or whether an external organization (e.g. the federal government) would be involved. Others expressed concern about perceived lack of fairness to other fishers by allowing priority access to Indigenous peoples.

Participants were then provided with following overview of Indigenous Rights:

The Constitution recognizes and affirms the Aboriginal and Treaty rights of Indigenous peoples. For the purposes of this conversation, we’ll call this: Indigenous Rights. Some Indigenous people have gone to court to assert their Indigenous Rights. Over time, the courts have given direction on the scope of various Indigenous Rights in relation to the fishery, including, for example, the right to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes and, in some cases, to sell fish. These rights are not unlimited: they are subject to limitations that serve important public interests, such as the conservation of the fish stock and measures necessary to protect public health and safety. The Government of Canada must work with Indigenous groups to ensure that the impact of any such limitations on Indigenous Rights is minimized. In this way, the priority of Indigenous Rights can be maintained, but reasonably balanced with other important public interests.

Participants' opinions regarding Indigenous priority access to the fishery did not change after they were provided with this information. Some, however, said they would like to have more information related to priority access to the fishery before forming a definite opinion. Such information included the following questions:

- if Indigenous people engage in commercial fishing must they pay taxes;
- are there any circumstances in which Indigenous fishers would be regulated similar to how other commercial fishers are regulated;
- are there any limits or caps on what Indigenous people fish;
- who will monitor stock levels where Indigenous peoples fish; and
- are there any limits on the ways in which Indigenous people can fish (e.g. restrictions on the size of nets used).

Co-management of fisheries

There was positive reaction to the idea of Indigenous communities sharing in the decision-making and management of fisheries in their traditional territories.

Participants were then provided with the following description of "co-management":

The Government of Canada has committed to reconciliation with Indigenous people in Canada. That can mean sharing the management and benefits derived from natural resources, such as fish. Under the Fisheries Act, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has the sole authority to make decisions about who can fish what species of fish and where. At the same time, section 35 of the Constitution protects Aboriginal rights to fish and places certain limits on DFO's ability to regulate those rights. In the spirit of reconciliation, in some areas, an Indigenous community or organization and the federal government share the management of a fishery; this is referred to as co-management.

Perceived benefits associated with 'co-management of fisheries' included better management of natural resources resulting from cooperation, benefiting from the knowledge of Indigenous peoples when it comes to fisheries, promotion of reconciliation, a model for managing relations with Indigenous peoples more generally (i.e. in other areas), and enhancing Canada's international reputation/image in terms of its relationship with its Indigenous peoples.

Concerns about this approach included the following: ensuring a balanced approach that takes into account the perspective of non-Indigenous fishers as well, maintaining transparency about the process of co-management, apprehensions that co-management will be understood as implying equality between partners (a sense that Canada should be the senior partner in the relationship), and apprehensions about non-Indigenous individuals potentially claiming indigenous status in order to claim benefits associated with co-management. In addition to these concerns, some participants questioned what would happen in the case of disagreements between co-managers (e.g. dispute resolution mechanisms).

A few participants suggested the federal government could mitigate these concerns by: consulting non-Indigenous fishers as well when it comes to sharing management of fisheries, respecting and listening to indigenous fishers while respecting the rights of other fishers, and being careful about taking hasty decisions they may have to subsequently reverse.

8. Vaccine Messages

Issues in this section were explored with participants in all locations except Calgary.

Importance of vaccines

There was virtual unanimity that vaccines are important in preventing diseases. The main reasons given to support this belief were the proven success of vaccination in preventing epidemics and controlling the spread of diseases like measles and polio, as well as the resurgence of such diseases when vaccination rates decline. Participants also routinely pointed to the importance of herd immunity in preventing the spread of diseases (i.e. getting vaccinated not only protects oneself but others who do not get vaccinated).

To the extent that there was any scepticism regarding the effectiveness of vaccines, it did not take the form of outright disbelief in their effectiveness. Instead, it expressed itself in specific doubts, concerns, or experiences, including the following:

- doubt about the necessity of vaccines for all people and all diseases (e.g. it is important for children and for preventing diseases like polio and measles, but not necessarily for preventing the flu);
- concern about injecting viruses or bacteria into one's body;
- concern about lack of information about the content/ingredients in some vaccines; and
- personal experience/anecdotal evidence regarding allergic reactions/illness caused by vaccines.

Reaction to handout on vaccines

Participants were given a handout with six different pieces of information about vaccines and asked to identify anything that reassured them, anything that did not, and anything they found confusing or unclear.

Overall reaction to the document ranged from positive to neutral, with participants routinely observing that it is clear and easy to understand. In terms of its impact, the most widespread effect it had on participants was to solidify or confirm their existing opinions about vaccines (which were overwhelmingly positive). The information did not tend to create new doubts or alleviate existing ones, nor did it tend to provide new information or influence decisions to vaccinate either positively or negatively.

Feedback on specific pieces of information is provided below.

- **Autism:** While most participants expressed no concerns about a link between autism and vaccines, some suspect such a connection may exist based on anecdotal evidence (e.g. stories about autism emerging/ diagnosed in children following vaccination, and therefore possibly because of vaccination).

Participants who suspect such a connection did not find their concerns assuaged by the information in this paragraph. Moreover, some participants with no doubts in their mind about such a connection indicated that the information provided would be unlikely to reassure people with doubts. Commentary focussed specifically on the reference to '*more than 50 studies ...*

since the 1990s' and the statement that *'this extensive research has shown that there is no causal link between autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and vaccines or vaccine ingredients'*. It was suggested that more than 50 studies since the 1990s does not qualify as 'extensive', with some adding that reference to the 1990s makes the research sound outdated. Some added that lack of reference to who completed the research will not alleviate doubts among those who entertain them.

- **Ingredients:** Reaction to this paragraph focused mainly on the last sentence: *Most of the ingredients in vaccines (including aluminum salts and formaldehyde) occur naturally in the environment around us in much higher quantities, including in breastmilk.* This sentence elicited mixed reactions. Some were reassured by the reference to ingredients occurring naturally in the environment, while others were not reassured because of the reference to **'most of the ingredients'** (i.e. not all of them), and the specific reference to 'formaldehyde' and 'aluminium', even if they are natural. For some the information raised additional questions such as 'how does formaldehyde get into breast milk?' A few participants also indicated that they felt reassured by the reference to *'Only the minimum amount of each ingredient' being used in each vaccine'*.
- **Safety:** Reaction to this information tended to be neutral, with participants routinely observing that they knew this already and therefore that this message would not influence their decision to vaccinate.
- **Reactions:** Participants routinely described the information about potential reactions to vaccines as clear, though a few added that, with the exception of statistics on the proportion of adverse reactions, it tends to be general information. Many reacted positively to the provision of statistics on the proportion of adverse reactions (i.e. 4 out of every 1 million doses). The information itself did not alleviate any specific concerns about vaccines, while the reference to *'waiting in the office 20 to 40 minutes after your child has received their vaccine to monitor for serious reactions'* elicited a few questions about the possibility of adverse reactions occurring after this period of time (i.e. after leaving the office).
- **Community:** Most of the information provided in this paragraph was described as already known (including community immunity). As a result, it did not tend to provide additional information to help participants understand why getting their vaccines helps others who cannot be vaccinated, nor did it influence the decision to vaccinate. Some participants did specify that pregnant women faced risks of miscarriage or still-birth if they catch serious vaccine-preventable diseases.

Sources of information about vaccines

Participants collectively identified various sources they would go to for information about vaccines. The most frequently identified source was a family physician or healthcare provider (with participants unanimous in the feeling that that they can ask questions to their healthcare provider about vaccines). Other sources of information included the following:

- Google
- Health Canada
- Canadian public health agencies at various levels of government

- Pharmacists
- Immunologists
- Mayo Clinic
- Web MD
- College of Naturopathic Medicine
- Canadian College of Physicians
- Product monographs
- Local Community Services Centres (CLSC) (identified in Quebec City)

Suggestions for encouraging Canadians to get vaccinated

Participants in Ottawa and Quebec City were asked about effective ways to encourage Canadians to get vaccinated. Suggestions included the following:

- publicity and education campaigns, with a focus on social responsibility, trying to target those opposed to vaccines with information, and targeting information to new Canadians who come from countries where vaccination programs may be less prevalent or non-existent;
- sending reminders/updates on importance of vaccination (e.g. during flu season);
- providing free vaccines or a tax break for getting vaccinated;
- facilitating the process (e.g. vaccination at workplace, easy access to clinics, work breaks to get vaccinated);
- providing data on adverse reaction tracking; and
- providing data on death rates attributable to preventable diseases.

Mixed views on penalties for not getting vaccinated

Participants in Ottawa and Quebec City expressed mixed views on the idea of imposing penalties for not getting vaccinated (i.e. some in favour, some against, some uncertain). Some in favour framed penalties as implementing consequences for not getting vaccinated (e.g. if you do not have your child vaccinated they cannot be sent to school/you must engage in home schooling, if you don't get vaccinated you must work from home). Some supported penalties only for people who work with vulnerable populations (e.g. the sick, elderly, children) and who choose not to be vaccinated. This would include, for example, people in front-line health care services, hospice workers, and teachers. Finally, some qualified that penalties should be based on the seriousness of the disease or illness (e.g. penalties for not getting vaccinated against polio or the measles but no penalty for refusing to get the flu vaccine).

Those unsure or against the idea of penalties tended to suggest that the focus should be on persuasion instead. It was also suggested that imposing penalties could result in legal challenges.

9. Seatbelts on school buses

Issues in this section were explored with participants in Calgary and Prince George.

Awareness and knowledge related to seatbelts on school buses

Almost everyone in Calgary, and a few participants in Prince George, said they had seen, read, or heard something about seatbelts on school buses. Last year's bus accident in Saskatchewan involving a hockey team was routinely mentioned when participants were asked what they recalled having heard. Most participants thought both the federal and provincial governments are responsible for regulations related to seatbelts on school buses, although no-one knew with any certainty how such powers are divided between the two levels of government. A few people speculated that the regulations might be made by the federal government, but that implementation and enforcement might fall within the provincial jurisdiction.

Views on outfitting school buses with seatbelts

Participants were unanimous in their view that outfitting school buses with seatbelts is a "good idea" and "long overdue". Views were divided on whether seatbelts should apply only to new school buses or to all existing school buses. Some felt that any safety regulations should apply only to new buses, while others felt that it should apply to all school buses. Those who favoured new school buses only tended to point to their perceptions of the cost associated with outfitting old school buses with seatbelts and that this cost likely would be prohibitive. Those who favoured all buses pointed to issues they felt might emerge if not all school buses were subject to the same seatbelt regulations (i.e., which schools have older buses without seatbelts and which schools have new buses with seatbelts).

Appendix

1. Recruitment Screener

Specifications

- Recruit 11 participants.
- Participants to be paid \$100.
- Groups to last 2 hours.
- Language:
 - Groups in Quebec City will be conducted in French
 - One group in Ottawa will be conducted in French and one in English
 - Groups in the other locations will be in English

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
Etobicoke / Scarborough	Etobicoke / Scarborough	Saint John, NB	Saint John, NB	Quebec City	Quebec City
May 8th 5:30 pm MALE	May 8th 7:30 pm FEMALE	May 14th 5:30 pm FEMALE	May 14th 7:30 pm MALE	May 15th 5:30 pm MALE	May 15th 7:30 pm FEMALE
Group 7	Group 8	Group 9	Group 10	Group 11	Group 12
Ottawa	Ottawa	Calgary	Calgary	Prince George	Prince George
May 21st 5:30 pm ENGLISH	May 21st 7:30 pm FRENCH	May 28th 5:30 pm FEMALE	May 28th 7:30 pm MALE	May 29th 5:30 pm MALE	May 29th 7:30 pm FEMALE

- In addition to segmenting the groups by gender (in all locations except Ottawa), all groups will include a mix of participants by age, gender, employment status and education.

Questionnaire

A. Introduction

Hello/Bonjour, my name is [INSERT]. Would you prefer to continue in English or French? / Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais?

I'm calling from CRC Research, a Canadian research firm. We're organizing a series of discussion groups on behalf of the Government of Canada to explore current issues of interest to Canadians. The groups will last up to two hours and people who take part will receive a cash gift to thank them for their time.

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: FOR ENGLISH GROUPS, IF PARTICIPANT WOULD PREFER TO CONTINUE IN FRENCH, PLEASE RESPOND WITH, « Malheureusement, nous recherchons des gens qui parlent anglais pour participer à ces groupes de discussion. Désirez-vous participer à la discussion en français? ». IF YES, CONTINUE. IF NO, TERMINATE AND SAY: « Nous vous remercions de votre

intérêt. » **FOR FRENCH GROUP, IF PARTICIPANT WOULD PREFER TO CONTINUE IN ENGLISH, PLEASE RESPOND WITH, “Unfortunately, we are looking for people who speak French to participate in this discussion group. Would you be willing to participate in the discussion in English? IF YES, CONTINUE. IF NO, TERMINATE AND SAY: We thank you for your interest.]**

Participation is completely voluntary. We are interested in your opinions. No attempt will be made to sell you anything or change your point of view. The format is a "round table" discussion led by a research professional with up to eight participants. All opinions will remain anonymous and will be used for research purposes only in accordance with laws designed to protect your privacy.

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF ASKED ABOUT PRIVACY LAWS, SAY: “The information collected through the research is subject to the provisions of the *Privacy Act*, legislation of the Government of Canada, and to the provisions of relevant provincial privacy legislation.”]

Before we invite you to attend, we need to ask you a few questions to ensure that we get a good mix of people in each of the groups. This will take 5 minutes. May I continue?

Yes	CONTINUE
No	THANK/DISCONTINUE

B. Qualification

1. Do you, or any member of your household or immediate family, work in any of the following fields?
READ LIST

Marketing research, public relations firm, or advertising agency
The media (i.e., radio, television, newspapers, magazines, etc.)
A federal or provincial government department or agency
A political party

Yes	THANK/DISCONTINUE
No	CONTINUE

2. Record gender by observation. **GROUPS TO BE SEGMENTED BY GENDER EVERYWHERE EXCEPT OTTAWA.**

Female
Male

3. Are you a Canadian citizen at least 18 years old who normally resides in the [INSERT CITY] area?

Yes	CONTINUE
No	ASK Q3b
Don't know/Refused	THANK/TERMINATE

- 3b. Is there someone else in the household who is at least 18 years of age?

Yes	ASK TO SPEAK WITH THEM; GO BACK TO INTRODUCTION
No	THANK/TERMINATE
Don't know/Refused	THANK/TERMINATE

4. How long have you lived in [INSERT CITY]?

Less than two years	THANK/TERMINATE
Two years or more	CONTINUE
Don't know/Refused	THANK/TERMINATE

5. We have been asked to speak to participants from all different ages. May I have your age please? **RECORD AND CLASSIFY**

Under 18	THANK/DISCONTINUE
18 to 24 years	
25 to 34 years	
35 to 44 years	
45 to 54 years	
55 to 64 years	
65 to 74 years	
75 years or older	THANK/DISCONTINUE

6. Including yourself, how many people 18 years of age and over are there in your household?

One	
Two	SKIP TO Q8
Three	SKIP TO Q8
Four or more	SKIP TO Q8

IF ONLY ONE PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD AT Q6, ASK:

7. Which of the following categories best corresponds to your total personal annual income, before taxes, for 2018? **GET MIX**

Under \$20,000
\$20,000 to just under \$40,000
\$40,000 to just under \$60,000
\$60,000 to just under \$75,000
\$75,000 to \$100,000
\$100,000 to \$150,000
More than \$150,000
REFUSE/DK

IF A MULTIPLE PERSON HOUSEHOLD AT Q6, ASK:

8. Which of the following categories best corresponds to the total annual income, before taxes, of all members of your household, for 2018? **GET MIX**

- Under \$20,000
- \$20,000 to just under \$40,000
- \$40,000 to just under \$60,000
- \$60,000 to just under \$75,000
- \$75,000 to \$100,000
- \$100,000 to \$150,000
- More than \$150,000
- REFUSE/DK

ASK ALL

9. Which of the following best describes your employment situation? **GET MIX**

- Working full time (35 hrs. +)
- Working part time (under 35 hrs.)
- Homemaker
- Student
- Retired
- Unemployed

10. What is your current occupation? **RECORD:**

Type of Job: _____
Type of Company: _____

11. Could you please tell me what is the last level of education that you completed? **GET MIX**

- Some High School only
- Completed High School
- Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma
- College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma
- University certificate or diploma below bachelor's level
- Bachelor's degree
- Post graduate degree above bachelor's level

12. Participants in group discussions are asked to voice their opinions and thoughts, how comfortable are you in voicing your opinions in front of others? Are you...

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Very comfortable | MINIMUM 5 PER GROUP |
| Fairly comfortable | |
| Not very comfortable | TERMINATE |
| Very uncomfortable | TERMINATE |

13. Have you ever attended a discussion group on any topic that was arranged in advance and for which you received money for your participation?

Yes

No **GO Q16**

14. When did you last attend one of these discussion groups?

Within the last 6 months **TERMINATE**
Over 6 months ago

15. How many discussion groups have you attended in the past 5 years?

Fewer than 5
5 or more **TERMINATE**

16. The discussion group will be audio/video-recorded. These recordings are used to help with analyzing the findings and writing the report. The results from the discussions will be grouped together in the research report, which means that individuals will not be identified in anyway. Neither your name nor your specific comments will appear in the research report. Is this acceptable?

Yes **CONTINUE**
No **THANK/TERMINATE**

17. There may be some people from the Government of Canada who have been involved in this project observing the session. They will not take part in the discussion and they will not know your full name, or your first name. Is this acceptable?

Yes **CONTINUE**
No **THANK/TERMINATE**

C. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

I would like to invite you to attend the focus group session where you will exchange your opinions in a moderated discussion with other Canadians from your community. The discussion will be led by a researcher from the national public opinion research firm, Phoenix SPI. The group will take place on **[DAY OF WEEK]**, **[DATE]**, at **[TIME]**. It will last two hours. People who attend will receive \$100 to thank them for their time. Would you be willing to attend?

Yes
No **TERMINATE**

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 **[INSERT FACILITY]**. I would like to remind you that the group is at **[TIME]** on **[DATE]**. We ask that you arrive 15 minutes early.

At the facility, you will be asked to produce photo identification, so please remember to bring something with you (for example, a driver's license). If you use glasses to read, please remember to bring them with you. Participants may be asked to review some materials in **[ENGLISH/FRENCH]** during the discussion.

As I mentioned, the session will be audio/video recorded for research purposes and representatives of the Government of Canada research team will be observing from an adjoining room. You will be asked to sign a waiver to acknowledge that you will be video recorded during the session. The recordings will be used only by the Phoenix SPI research team and will not be shared with others. All information collected in the group discussion will remain anonymous and be used for research purposes only in accordance with laws designed to protect your privacy.

As we are only inviting a small number of people to attend, your participation is very important to us. If for some reason you are unable to attend, please call us so that we can get someone to replace you. You can reach us at **[INSERT NUMBER]** at our office. Please ask **for [INSERT NAME]**.

Someone will call you the day before to remind you about the session.

So that we can call you to remind you about the focus group or contact you should there be any changes, can you please confirm your name and contact information for me?

First name: _____
Last Name: _____
Daytime phone number: _____
Evening phone number: _____

2. Moderator's Guide

INTRODUCTION (10 minutes)

GC NEWS (5 minutes; 10 minutes in Ottawa and Prince George)

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

ASK IN PRINCE GEORGE

- Has anyone heard anything about money laundering lately?
- Is this a problem in BC?
 - Explain the concept to me. What specifically is the problem with money laundering?
- How big a problem is this compared to other issues?
- Has the Government of Canada done anything on this issue?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

In the Government of Canada's budget this spring, they announced \$70 million to spend on anti-money laundering initiatives, including for the CRA and RCMP to investigate these crimes, especially in the housing sector.

- Is this too much, enough, or does the federal government need to do more?

STEEL (15 minutes) OTTAWA, CALGARY VERSION. DO NOT ASK IN PRINCE GEORGE

- Has anyone heard anything about Steel and aluminum tariffs lately? What have you heard?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

As you may have heard, the US government recently announced they will lift tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum which had been in place since last year

- Pretend I've been out of Canada for the last few years. Give me the full backstory about these tariffs. Why were they put in place, what did the Canadian government do in response to them?
- Why do you think the US government agreed to lift them?
- Is the lifting of these tariffs good news or bad news for Canada?
- With NAFTA and tariffs now resolved, do you expect things to be calm on the Canada-US trade front over the next year, or do you expect there to be other issues that come up?
- Moving forward, what are the top issues you think the Canadian government needs to work with the US government on, if any?

LOCAL ISSUES (25 minutes) ASK IN OTTAWA ONLY

- What are the biggest local challenges facing the City of Ottawa right now?
- What, if anything, has the federal government done that has benefited the City of Ottawa in recent years?
- What, if anything, has the federal government done that has hurt the City of Ottawa in recent years?
- What are the biggest local infrastructure needs in Ottawa?
- (Read the following local issues one by one and ask what people have heard about them. Do they know what the government of Canada has done or what its position is? How important is this issue to you personally?)
 - Building another bridge between Ottawa and Gatineau
 - Redevelopment of Lebreton Flats
 - Ottawa's light rail transit (LRT) system
- Now that we've talked about local issues for a bit, what do you think the Government of Canada's top priority should be when it comes to Ottawa and people who live here? Why do you say that?

ENVIRONMENT (15 minutes) QUEBEC, SAINT JOHN AND OTTAWA VERSION

- What have you seen, read or heard about the environment lately?
 - And have you seen, read or heard about anything related to the Government of Canada and the environment recently?
- Has anyone heard about the "Green New Deal" in the United States? What is this?
 - (if familiar) Is this the sort of thing Canada should do?

HANDOUT

I've got a handout with some broad objectives the Government of Canada could strive towards on the environment. I want you to circle the top 2 or 3 on this list that resonate the most with you. I know the names are similar and fairly broad, but I want to know which ones grab you the most and prompt you to think "yes, this is something the government should do, I want to find out more about this". If none of them speak to you, then don't circle anything. If you would prefer a variation of any of these or have another idea, write it at the bottom.

Better Future Blueprint
Canada's Clean Future
Canadian Environmental Accord
Clean Canada

Clean Economy Plan
Clean Growth Strategy
Climate Action Plan
Climate Change Framework
Climate Emergency Response
Green Plan
Pollution Reduction Strategy
Smart Prosperity Plan

- You may have circled a couple, but I want everyone to pick your favourite on this list, and then tell me why you choose it? What specific words grabbed you? What imagine did it convey to you?
- Were there any names you didn't like here?
- A few of these used the word "clean", some said "green". Do you see a difference between these terms?
- How do people feel about using terms like "framework", "plan", "strategy", "accord", "blueprint" – which of these gives you most confidence that government is doing something on the issue?
- One specific issue is around plastics and plastic pollution. Has anyone heard of this?
- Which of the following would you most like to see the government do:
 - Reducing Plastic Pollution
 - Banning Plastic Pollution
 - Eliminating Plastic Pollution
 - Banning Single Use Plastics

ENVIRONMENT (15 minutes) PRINCE GEORGE VERSION

- What have people heard about the environment lately?
 - Has anyone heard anything specifically about plastic pollution?
- How would you feel about the government of Canada taking steps to ban single-use plastics, in order to reduce plastic pollution?
 - Why is this important?
 - What are the drawbacks?
 - What are some possible economic positives or negatives from this?
- What comes to mind when you think of single use plastics that should be banned?
 - Some types of single use plastics that are often mentioned are plastic bags, water bottles, coffee cup lids, packaging for snacks, straws, single serve baby formula packaging, stir sticks.
 - From this list, are there types of things you think we should prioritize banning?

- Are there any things (on this list or otherwise) that shouldn't be banned?

PARIS AGREEMENT (5 minutes) DO NOT ASK IN PRINCE GEORGE

- Has anyone heard of the Paris Agreement on climate change? How would you explain it?
 - Which countries are part of the agreement? (or which are not?)
 - Do you know what Canada's target is?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

Under the Paris Agreement, Canada has committed to reducing its GHG emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030.

- Do you think Canada will meet this target?
 - What are factors that could impact whether or not Canada meets this target?
- Do you think it's important for Canada meet its target, or not? Why/why not?

PRICE ON POLLUTION (30 minutes) ASK IN ETOBICOKE/SCARBOROUGH, SAINT JOHN & CALGARY

- What have you seen, read or heard about the environment lately?
 - And have you seen, read or heard about anything related to the Government of Canada and the environment recently?
- (IF PRICE ON POLLUTION NOT MENTIONED: Have you heard; IF MENTIONED: How many of you have heard) of the Government of Canada's plan to put a price on pollution? (show of hands)
 - PROBE: What have you heard recently?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

In 2016 the Government of Canada announced a plan to put a price on pollution across the country, instructing each province to come up with their own plans before the end of 2018. The federal government has announced that they will apply a price on pollution in the four provinces that still do not have a system in place: Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and New Brunswick.

READ FOR ETOBICOKE/SCARBOROUGH, OTTAWA AND SAINT JOHN

Under this system, what people and businesses pay will be based on the amount of carbon emissions they produce. All revenue collected in [PROVINCE] will stay in [PROVINCE] – 90% will be given directly to residents in the form of an incentive, with the average household receiving about (ON: \$300; Saint John: \$250). 10% will go to small businesses, hospitals, and schools.

READ FOR CALGARY

If Alberta ends its pollution pricing policies, then the Government of Canada will apply a price on pollution in Alberta as well.

Under this system, what businesses pay will be based on the amount of carbon emissions they produce. All revenue collected in Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, and potentially Alberta (if it ends its pollution pricing policies), will stay in each of these provinces – 90% will be given directly to residents in the form of an incentive. In Saskatchewan for example, the average household will receive about \$600. 10% will go to small businesses, hospitals, and schools.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE MODERATOR:

➤ The federal carbon pollution pricing system puts a price on every tonne of carbon dioxide equivalents produced, and is made of two parts:

1. a trading system for large industry, known as the output-based pricing system;
and
2. a regulatory charge on fuel

➤ The government expects that although the price on pollution does not apply directly to individuals, some costs will be passed on to consumers through things like increases in the price of heating or electricity.

➤ For most families (in these 4 provinces), the value of the incentive will be higher than the costs associated with the price on pollution

ASK THIS SECTION IN SAINT JOHN, ETOBICOKE/SCARBOROUGH

- Were you aware that the revenues from the price on pollution are returned to individuals via an incentive?
- Is this system clear – i.e. do you feel you understand how the federal government’s plan to put a price on pollution works? (show of hands)
 - How would you explain this plan?
 - What parts of the plan do you feel you understand?
 - What parts are unclear?
- As far as you can tell, have you felt any impacts of the federal price on pollution on your overall cost of living? How so?
 - PROMPT AS NECESSARY: What specific items has it had an impact on?
 - If you haven’t felt any impacts yet, do you think you will? How so?
- Has the federal price on pollution affected the price of gasoline here? How so?
 - IF PRICE INCREASE: About how much has the price increased?
 - IF PRICE DECREASE: About how much has the price decreased?
 - Have you adjusted your driving habits as a result?
 - IF NO: do you think you will adjust your driving habits?

Now I’d like to talk about the Climate Action Incentive...

- Had you previously heard you would receive a Climate Action Incentive beginning this year?
- Do you know how you will receive the incentive?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

You can claim the Climate Action Incentive payment when you file your income tax and benefit return.

- Did any of you claim it when you filed your taxes this year? (show of hands)
 - Did you note the amount you will receive for the Climate Action Incentive payment?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

Climate Action Incentive payments in [PROVINCE] are as follows for 2019:

- (NB:\$128; ON: \$154) for a single adult or the first adult in a couple
- (NB:\$64; ON: \$77) for the second adult in a couple. Single parents will receive this amount for their first child
- (NB: \$32; ON: 38) for each child in the family (starting with the second child for single parents)

Under this proposal a [PROVINCE] family of four will receive (NB: \$256; ON: \$307) in 2019. The average household in [PROVINCE] will receive (NB: \$248; ON: \$300), taking into account the various family sizes and circumstances.

- Do you think this payment will be more, less or roughly the same as what you will pay in costs associated with the price on pollution?
- The parliamentary budget office estimates that 80% of Canadian households will get more back from the Climate Action Incentive payment than they will pay in costs associated with the price on pollution; in other words, only the wealthiest households will pay more than they get back. Does this change your perception?

Now thinking more broadly...

- In general, how do you feel about the idea of using a price on pollution as an approach to help reduce carbon emissions and combat climate change?

ASK THIS SECTION IN CALGARY

- What do you like about this proposed system?
- What do you dislike about this proposed system?
- What impact do you think this will have on the environment?
- What impact do you think this will have on the economy?
- What impact do you think this will have on you personally?

PIPELINES (20 minutes) ASK IN CALGARY AND PRINCE GEORGE ONLY

- Who has heard of the Trans-Mountain Expansion (or TMX) pipeline?
- Pretend I've been out of the country for the past few years. Explain to me what has been going on with this project.

- (IF NO ONE KNOWS) The existing pipeline moves a mix of oil products from Edmonton to a terminal in Burnaby, B.C. where it is exported to markets overseas. The expansion project will “twin” the pipeline to increase capacity.
- Who currently owns TMX?
 - (IF NO ONE KNOWS) Does anyone remember the Government of Canada purchasing this pipeline last year?
 - What was their reason for doing this?
 - How do you feel about their decision to purchase it?
- What is the status of this project?
 - PROBE: Did anyone hear of a court ruling last fall requiring more consultation?
 - PROBE: Is anyone aware that the Government of Canada has set a deadline of June 18th to make a decision on whether or not to approve the TMX expansion?
- On balance, how do you feel about this project?
 - Would you rather it go ahead, or not? Why/Why not?
 - Do you expect this project will happen or not? Why/why not?
- The Government of Canada’s strategy for energy and the environment includes approval of some pipelines (such as TMX), a national price on carbon pollution, and improved protection for our oceans. Some have argued this strategy only works if all provinces are on board for all aspects of it – so even if the government of BC doesn’t want a pipeline approved or the government of Alberta doesn’t want to put a price on carbon pollution, they need to be on board so that the entire strategy works.
 - Do you agree with this sentiment?
 - Do you think the approval of TMX should depend on whether or not the government of Alberta has a price on pollution, or do you see these are two completely separate issues?
 - (FOR PARTICIPANTS OPPOSED TO TMX) Would you feel better about TMX if you knew the government of Alberta continued to put a price on pollution to reduce emissions, or would that not change the way you feel about this pipeline?

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (10 minutes) ASK IN CALGARY

- What do you know about the environmental assessment process in Canada?
 - Have you heard about any changes to the rules or process?
 - IF YES: what have you heard?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED:

Environmental assessment is the process where the environmental impact of major projects is studied, and then a decision is made to either approve or reject them. The Government of Canada indicated it would review environmental and regulatory processes to address concerns about

previous reforms. The government put in place interim principles for project reviews in January 2016 and has introduced legislation that would put in new rules to protect Canada's environment and grow the economy

- What do you think of the environmental assessment process?
 - Do you think new rules are needed?
 - Do you think the rules favour the economy more, favour the environment more or do you think they strike a good balance?
 - What do you think the new rules will mean for business investment and pipeline development?

STEEL (20 minutes) ETOBICOKE/SCARBOROUGH, SAINT JOHN, QUEBEC VERSION

- As you may have seen, NAFTA negotiations were big in the news last year, and a deal on a new agreement was reached in the fall. I want to know what, if anything, you've heard about Canada-US relations since then.
- When it comes to Canada-US relations, what are the big issues the Canadian government should focus on over the next year?
 - If the Canadian government could deliver one message to the US government about something they should do or work on - what should it be?
- Who has heard about US tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum? What have you heard?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

In May 2018, the United States announced that tariffs of 25% on imports of Canadian steel and 10% on imports of Canadian aluminum would take effect on June 1, 2018.

In response, Canada announced surtaxes or similar trade-restrictive countermeasures on imports of steel, aluminum and other products from the United States, representing the value of 2017 Canadian exports affected by the U.S. measures.

- How do you feel about the U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum?
- Do you expect there to be a solution to this issue in the next few months?
 - IF NO - how long do you think it will take to resolve?
- What should Canada do?
 - PROBE: Drop its countermeasures? Keep them in place? Increase them? Something else?
- Canada has not ratified the new trade agreement yet. Do you think Canada should refuse to ratify until the U.S. removes its tariffs, or do you think that would create more problems?

- How would you feel about Canada and the U.S. reaching a compromise where the tariffs aren't completely eliminated, but an agreement is reached to lower them or change the way steel trade works between the countries to resolve some the U.S. concerns?
 - (If they say it depends on deal): assuming you're not an expert in international trade, how would you judge if it's a good deal or not?
 - Which of the following opinions would you find most credible: Canadian media, U.S. media, Canadian steel companies, Canadian steel unions and workers, economists, Canadian government/officials, U.S. government/officials?
- Compared to all the other issues facing Canada-U.S. relations, how important is the steel tariff issue?

LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE QUEBEC (15 minutes) ASK IN QUEBEC ONLY

- What local infrastructure project in Quebec City are most in need of funding? (write them on white board)

Prompt on the following (regardless of whether or not they are brought up)

- Has anyone heard anything about the Quebec City CN bridge needing to be re-painted?
 - What have you heard about this?
 - Is this a good idea? Is it needed?
 - The cost of repainting this bridge has been estimated at \$400 million. Does this change the way you feel about the need to repaint it?
 - Who do you think should be responsible for paying for painting it?
 - How important is this? Why?
- Has anyone heard talk about building a third bridge in Quebec City?
 - What have you heard about this?
 - Is this a good idea? Is it needed?
 - Who do you think should be responsible for paying for this?
 - How important is this? Why?
- Has anyone heard talk about plans for new public transit in Quebec City?
 - What have you heard about this?
 - Is this a good idea? Is it needed?
 - Who do you think should be responsible for paying for this?
 - How important is this? Why?
- Of all the infrastructure projects we've talked about (either prompted by moderator or suggested by people), which do you think is most important to Quebec City? Which would make the biggest difference to you personally?

FISHERIES (20 minutes) DO NOT ASK IN OTTAWA AND CALGARY

- What do you think Indigenous “priority access to the fishery” means? What comes to mind?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

Fish are a wild resource; sometimes there is a lot of fish available and sometimes there is not. Indigenous “priority access to the fishery” can be expressed in various ways, depending on the circumstances. For example, “priority” could mean that Indigenous communities have the opportunity to fish first in their traditional territory to a certain allotted quota before commercial and other fish harvesters have access to a fishery; or that they are able to fish in a manner that reflects their traditional fishing practices, and is distinct from other fishers.

- How do you react to this?
- How do you think Indigenous priority access to the fishery could benefit Canada?
- What concerns, if any, do you have about Indigenous communities having priority access to the fishery?

The Constitution recognizes and affirms the Aboriginal and Treaty rights of Indigenous peoples. For the purposes of this conversation, we’ll call this: Indigenous Rights. Some Indigenous people have gone to court to assert their Indigenous Rights. Over time, the courts have given direction on the scope of various Indigenous Rights in relation to the fishery, including, for example, the right to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes and, in some cases, to sell fish. These rights are not unlimited: they are subject to limitations that serve important public interests, such as the conservation of the fish stock and measures necessary to protect public health and safety. The Government of Canada must work with Indigenous groups to ensure that the impact of any such limitations on Indigenous Rights is minimized. In this way, the priority of Indigenous Rights can be maintained, but reasonably balanced with other important public interests.

- Does this additional information change the way you feel about Indigenous “priority access to the fishery”?
 - IF YES: How so?

IF PARTICIPANTS FEEL THEY CANNOT PROVIDE AN OPINION ON PRIORITY ACCESS:

- What additional information would you need in order to have an opinion on this?
- In Canada, Indigenous peoples have fished since before there was a Canada, and they still fish. How do you react to the idea of Indigenous communities sharing in the decision-making and management of fisheries in their traditional territories?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

The Government of Canada has committed to reconciliation with Indigenous people in Canada. That can mean sharing the management and benefits derived from natural resources, such as fish. Under the Fisheries Act, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has the sole authority to make decisions about who can fish what species of fish and where. At the same time, section 35 of the Constitution

protects Aboriginal rights to fish and places certain limits on DFO's ability to regulate those rights. In the spirit of reconciliation, in some areas, an Indigenous community or organization and the federal government share the management of a fishery; this is referred to as co-management.

- Now that I've described "co-management" – i.e. that Indigenous communities and the federal government share the management of a fishery – how do you think sharing the management of fishery could benefit Canada?
- What concerns, if any, do you have about Indigenous communities and the federal government sharing the management of a fishery?
 - In regard to those concerns, what advice would you give to the federal government about this?

IF PARTICIPANTS FEEL THEY CANNOT PROVIDE AN OPINION ON CO-MANAGEMENT:

- What additional information would you need in order to have an opinion on this?

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF NECESSARY FOR THE MODERATOR:

- Section 35 of the Constitution Act protects Aboriginal rights to fish and places certain limits on DFO's ability to regulate those rights. The courts have established that a number of Indigenous communities have the right to fish in certain waters. The Constitution also says that the federal government has jurisdiction over the management of coastal and inland fisheries. (Some provinces and territories manage certain aspects of fisheries on behalf the federal government through various agreements.)

SEATBELTS ON SCHOOL BUSES (20 minutes) ASK IN CALGARY AND PRINCE GEORGE

- Have you seen, read or heard anything about seatbelts on school buses? What have you heard?
- Which level(s) of government do you think is responsible for regulations related to seatbelts on school buses?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED

Recently, the Government of Canada announced the creation of a task force to look into the possibility of outfitting school buses with seatbelts.

- What do you think of outfitting school buses with seatbelts?
 - Do you think it's safer to have seatbelts on school buses or do you think school buses are safer without them?
 - Given other costs facing schools, do you think this is a good use of funds?

Let's say the decision is made to add seatbelts to school buses...

- Do you think the seatbelt rule should apply to all school buses, or do you think it depends on what a school bus is used for? For example, do you think it makes a difference if a school bus

is used for regular transit, like transporting children to and from school, vs. school buses used for travelling between cities?

- Do you think seatbelts should apply to new buses only, or do you think all existing school buses should be retrofitted as well?
 - What do you think the benefits are to only adding seatbelts to new buses?
 - What do you think the downsides are to only adding seatbelts to new buses?
 - What do you think the difference in cost would be for retrofitting all existing buses vs. only adding seatbelts to new buses (e.g. a lot more expensive? a little bit?)

VACCINE MESSAGES (30 minutes) DO NOT ASK IN CALGARY

- Do you believe that vaccines are important in preventing disease? Why/why not?

HANDOUT

- I'm going to give you a handout with 6 different pieces of information about vaccines. I want you to highlight in **green** anything that reassures you, highlight in **red** anything that doesn't, and highlight in **yellow** anything you find confusing or unclear. If you understand a point but don't feel strongly about it, you don't need to mark anything.

ALL LOCATIONS EXCEPT SAINT JOHN AND PRINCE GEORGE

Now I'd like to get your feedback for each of these messages:

Autism

- Did the message leave any doubt in your mind about vaccines and autism?
- Would this message likely influence your decision to vaccinate?

Ingredients

- Would this message influence your decision to vaccinate?
- Did this message alleviate any concerns about the ingredients in vaccines?

Safety

- Would this message influence your decision to vaccinate?
- Did this message help explain how vaccines work in the body?

Reactions

- Did this message alleviate any concerns about vaccines?
- Did this message provide you with clear information on potential reactions to vaccines?

Community

- Did the message help you understand why getting your vaccines helps others who cannot be vaccinated?
- Would this message influence your decision to vaccinate?

- Have you heard of community immunity before?

Lack of trust

- Where would you go for information about vaccines?
- Do you feel that you can ask questions to your healthcare provider about vaccines?

- What do you think would be an effective way to encourage Canadians to get vaccinated?
 - Do you think there should be some kind of incentive to encourage people to vaccinate?
 - What about people who do not get vaccinated – should there be some kind of penalty?

SAINT JOHN AND PRINCE GEORGE

AS TIME ALLOWS:

- Did these messages alleviate any concerns about vaccines? Which ones?
- Did these messages provide clear information vaccines? Which ones?
- Would these messages influence your decision to vaccinate? Which ones?
- Where would you go for information about vaccines?

Conclusion (5 minutes)

Vaccine Hesitancy Messages for Focus Testing

Autism:

The medical and scientific communities have taken the concerns of parents to heart and have conducted more than 50 studies, involving hundreds of thousands of children since the 1990s. This extensive research has shown that there is no causal link between autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and vaccines or vaccine ingredients.

Ingredients:

Vaccines are designed to provide maximum protection with minimum risk. Only the minimum amount of each ingredient is used in each vaccine. Vaccines, and their ingredients, work with the body's natural immune system. Most of the ingredients in vaccines (including aluminum salts and formaldehyde) occur naturally in the environment around us in much higher quantities, including in breastmilk.

Safety

When children are exposed to wild viruses or bacteria, they can multiply quickly in their bodies and overwhelm the immune system, possibly causing permanent damage. Vaccines give your child a head start by teaching your child's immune system how to fight off the viruses or bacteria, so their immune system won't be overwhelmed.

Reactions

Vaccine reactions do happen, but most are minor and include redness or tenderness at the injection site, a mild rash or a moderate fever. Your primary healthcare provider will ask you and your child to wait in the office 20 to 40 minutes after your child has received their vaccine to monitor for serious reactions. Serious adverse reactions have been reported in 4 out of every 1 million doses. If your child experiences a serious adverse reaction, your healthcare provider has tools and a plan in place to immediately respond.

Community

We all have a responsibility to protect the most vulnerable in our community from the consequences of these diseases. People at higher risk of catching or developing complications from vaccine-preventable diseases include Canadians over the age of 65, infants and toddlers, pregnant women, people with certain medical conditions, including those undergoing chemotherapy for cancer. These people face real risks if they catch serious vaccine-preventable diseases, including a significant worsening of their condition, death or, in the case of pregnant women, miscarriage or still-birth.

Lack of trust

It can be hard to know who to trust, especially when it comes to the health and safety of our children. When making your decision to vaccinate, reach out to your trusted healthcare provider or local public health agency to get answers to your questions. There are also a number of online resources for parents who may not be comfortable discussing vaccination with their primary healthcare provider. These include the [Canadian Paediatric Society](#), the [Canadian Public Health Association](#) and [CANImmunize](#).