Government of Canada / Gouvernement du Canada

Continuous Qualitative Data Collection of Canadians' Views – February 2020

Final Report

Prepared for the Privy Council Office
Supplier name: The Strategic Counsel
Contract number: 35035-182346/001/CY
Contract value: $808,684.50
Award date: June 27, 2019
Delivery date: March 10, 2020

Registration number: POR-005-19
For more information on this report, please email por-rop@pco-bcp.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

Canada

Continuous Qualitative Data Collection of Canadians' Views

Final Report

Prepared for the Privy Council Office
Supplier Name: The Strategic Counsel
February 2020

This public opinion research report presents the results of a series of focus groups conducted by The Strategic Counsel on behalf of the Privy Council Office. The fifth cycle of the study included a total of twelve focus groups with Canadian adults (18 years of age and older) between February 11th and 24rd, 2020.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : Rapport final - Collecte continue de données qualitatives sur les opinions des canadiens – février 2020.

 For more information on this report, please contact the Privy Council Office at: por-rop@pco-bcp.ca or at:

Privy Council Office
Blackburn Building
85 Sparks Street, Room 228
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A3

Catalogue Number:
CP22-185/5-2020E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN):
978-0-660-34439-3

Related publications (registration number: POR-005-19):
Catalogue Number: CP22-185/5-2020F-PDF (Final Report, French)
ISBN: 978-0-660-34440-9

Political Neutrality Certification

I hereby certify as a Senior Officer of The Strategic Counsel that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity and the Directive on the Management of Communications – Appendix C – Mandatory Procedures for Public Opinion Research.

Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed: _____ Date: March 10, 2020

Donna Nixon, Partner
The Strategic Counsel

THE STRATEGIC COUNSEL 25

Table of Contents

THE STRATEGIC COUNSEL 25

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Communications and Consultation Secretariat of the Privy Council Office (PCO) commissioned The Strategic Counsel (TSC) to conduct continuous cycles of focus group research across the country with members of the public on key national issues, events, and policy initiatives related to the Government of Canada.

The broad purpose of this ongoing qualitative research program is three-fold: to explore the dimensions and drivers of public opinion on the most important issues facing the country; to assess perceptions and expectations of the federal government's actions and priorities, and; to inform the development of Government of Canada communications so that they continue to be aligned with the perspectives and information needs of Canadians, while remaining both clear and easy-to-understand.

The research is intended to be used by the Communications and Consultation Secretariat within PCO in order to fulfill its mandate of supporting the Prime Minister's Office in coordinating government communications. Specifically, the research will ensure that PCO has an ongoing understanding of Canadians' opinions on macro-level issues of interest to the government, as well as emerging trends.

This report includes findings from 12 in-person focus groups which were conducted between February 11th and 24th, 2020 in six locations across the country including in New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and the Yukon. Details concerning the locations, recruitment, and composition of the groups are shown in the section below.

Among the specific objectives for this cycle of focus groups, the research explored awareness and perceptions of a wide range of issues, many of them in-depth, including recent Government of Canada stories in the news, the upcoming federal budget, and specific initiatives and issues related to the environment. Issues related to the Wet'suwet'en protests, coronavirus, and the Canada Student Loans Program were tested in certain locations. In addition, the research explored issues of local or regional concern in Whitehorse and Regina.

A series of exercises were also completed by participants, depending on the location and topic being discussed. In various locations, participants were asked to complete exercises intended to identify priority themes for the budget, environmental initiatives for the federal government, conditions for approving the Frontier Mine, or possible names for the Canada Student Loan Program. Participants' responses to these exercises were formally captured and recorded, as were the ensuing discussions exploring these topics in more detail.

As a note of caution when interpreting the results from this study, findings of qualitative research are directional in nature only and cannot be attributed quantitatively to the overall population under study with any degree of confidence.

Methodology

Overview of Groups

Target audience

- Canadian residents, 18 and older
- Groups were split primarily by gender

Detailed approach

- 12 in-person focus groups across 6 Canadian cities
- Two groups conducted per location, in North York, Ontario (Feb. 11th), Montreal, Quebec (Feb. 12th), Moncton, New Brunswick (Feb. 13th), Nanaimo, British Columbia (Feb. 18th), Whitehorse, Yukon (Feb. 20th), and Regina, Saskatchewan (Feb. 24th)
- Groups in Montreal, Quebec were conducted in French, while all others were conducted in English
- A total of 10 participants were recruited for each group, assuming 8 to 10 participants would attend
- Each participant received an $90 honorarium in respect of their time
- Across all locations, 106 participants attended, in total. Details on attendance numbers by group can be found below.

Group Locations and Composition

LOCATION	GROUP	LANGUAGE	DATE	TIME	GROUP COMPOSITION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
York Region, ON	1	English	Feb. 11, 2020	5:30-7:30	Women	9
	2			8:00-10:00	Men	8
Montreal, QC	3	French	Feb. 12, 2020	5:30-7:30	Women	9
	4			7:45-9:45	Men	10
Moncton, NB	5	English	Feb. 13, 2020	5:30-7:30	Women	10
	6			7:45-9:45	Men	10
Nanaimo, BC	7	English	Feb. 18, 2020	5:00-7:00	Women	9
	8			7:30-9:30	Men	8
Whitehorse, YT	9	English	Feb. 20, 2020	5:00-7:00	Women	8
	10			7:30-9:30	Men	6
Regina, SK	11	English	Feb. 24, 2020	5:30-7:30	Women	8
	12			8:00-10:00	Men	11
				Total number of participants		**106**

Key Findings

The following outlines a summary of the key findings from each topic discussed during the cycle of focus groups undertaken in February, 2020. Unless otherwise noted, topics were explored in all locations.

Government of Canada News

Overall, it was difficult for respondents to recall any recent news related to the Government of Canada without prompting. However, ideas could be brought out through discussion.

The blockades across the country related to the construction of the Coastal Gaslink pipeline through Wet'suwet'en territory in Northern British Columbia were widely top of mind among participants. They increasingly dominated mentions in the groups over the course of the month, as protests and disruptions across the country intensified.

Among the other stories mentioned, the Prime Minister's trip to Africa in early February was referred to in the York and Moncton groups. Immigration was mentioned in Nanaimo and Regina. And while references to coronavirus were not especially prominent, they came up unaided in a few of the groups (please note the date of these groups as being mid-February).

Wet'suwet'en Protests (Whitehorse, Regina)

Awareness and understanding

A number of participants commented on the extensive media coverage of events, and most were following the story to some degree, if only in the headlines.

Most had only a rudimentary understanding of what they viewed as a complex issue, and many felt that they did not have all the facts. Regardless of their level of information or engagement, however, most viewed the story in similar ways. Participants focused on the barricades and disruptions around rail lines, and their effects on transportation, economic activity, and livelihoods. Most felt that the issue was an urgent and challenging problem to be solved. And most associated current events with Indigenous issues and pipelines, and what they saw as long-standing challenges in these areas.

Views of the federal government's response

Asked for their assessment of the federal government's response to date, opinions were mixed. A number of participants said they did not know enough to judge. Others felt that the federal government was making good efforts or doing what it could to try to peacefully de-escalate the situation.

Among the positive steps mentioned, participants said they had heard about the government reaching out to the Wet'suwet'en, that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) had stepped back to allow for negotiations, and that the Prime Minister had cancelled a trip abroad to manage the issue. On the other hand, many were at least somewhat critical, given the persistence of the problem. Some felt the government needed to be "more forceful," while others felt that more needed to be done to resolve the underlying issue with the Wet'suwet'en. Most agreed that the federal government should move forward on all fronts to peacefully resolve the protests and disruptions as quickly as possible.

Teck Frontier Mine Project (Regina)

Only a few participants were aware of this project and most knew that it had been cancelled. Opinions ranged from viewing that decision as a good one, to emphasizing the loss of jobs, to linking it to the Wet'suwet'en protests and a possible chill around new oil and gas projects. Participants were not sure what this cancellation meant for the future of the oil industry.

Federal Budget (Moncton, Montreal, York Region, Regina, Nanaimo)

Awareness and preferences

There was very low awareness of the upcoming Budget. When asked about it, participants said they both expected and wanted to see a focus on health care, cost of living, and also the environment. Presented with a list of potential themes for the federal Budget, participants most widely chose *a Health Care Budget* as their clear number-one priority, followed by *A Budget to Make Life More Affordable* and a *Climate Budget*.

Climate versus environment budget

Asked what kind of spending and policies they would expect to see in a climate budget, participants most commonly identified the development of green energy and innovations and technology to assist with the transition to a low-carbon economy. Many also said they would expect to see financial incentives for businesses and households to assist them in reducing greenhouse gas pollution and investing in energy efficiency. Investments in electric vehicle uptake, public transit, and recycling programs were other common mentions, as were initiatives to reduce or ban plastics.

Most preferred the idea of an 'environment' budget to a 'climate' one and felt it would be broader in scope, more inclusive of other important environmental priorities and allow for more efforts and accomplishments over a shorter period of time. Some felt that an environment budget sounded more appealing to the public compared to what some viewed as a more abstract sounding 'climate budget'. Those who preferred a climate budget, on the other hand, felt that it would bring focus to an urgent issue.

A budget to improve quality of life

When asked to suggest what kind of spending and policies they would expect to see in a budget focused on "improving quality of life", participants responded with a view that was far-ranging. It encompassed initiatives in education, health and jobs, and addressing the high cost of living.

Specific elements were mentioned. These included pension issues, long-term care, homecare and support for vulnerable populations such as people with disabilities or living in poverty. Other issues raised included a four-day work week, family leave and options for paying for all of the above (either tax increases or increased deficit spending).

Northern Issues (Whitehorse)

Local challenges

Three main challenges were identified in Whitehorse. The first was housing. Participants described overall shortages, a lack of availability and choice, and extremely high prices. The second was healthcare, specifically a lack of doctors and services, long waits, overcrowding, and the need to travel to other cities for diagnosis and treatment. The third was public transit, as the local system was viewed as insufficient, forcing people to drive.

Local impact of federal government initiatives

There was some sense of the federal government having an impact on Whitehorse, although not in relation to the big issues of local concern. Positive mentions included perceived investments in a post-secondary school, a science building, and a power plant, as well as financial assistance through the child tax credit or transfer payments. Negative mentions included a "carbon tax" which some felt had resulted in increased costs, exacerbating already high prices.

Asked what the city needed in terms of infrastructure investment, public transit was mentioned most commonly, followed by low income or seniors' housing, and improvements to a local power plant.

A few had heard of the Atlin Hydro expansion, and some felt that the federal government could be doing more to support the hydroelectric industry in the Yukon. But others were hesitant, concerned about environmental issues or changes to water levels associated with hydroelectric projects.

Canada's Arctic and Northern Policy Framework

Few had heard of this initiative. Provided with some background and asked what a "more integrated decision-making process" between federal, territorial and Indigenous partners might look like, some were not sure or found the question hard to answer. Others focussed mostly on the need for this kind of initiative and felt that First Nations communities, as well as cities and mayors, needed to have more input into decision-making to produce better outcomes.

Travel deduction

Some were aware of the travel deduction program, but only vaguely. Most focussed on the employment benefits portion and felt that it was restrictive, not always offered by employers, and provided too small of a reimbursement. There was confusion regarding the deduction overall, including who qualifies, how much it amounts to, and how it is claimed.

Reconciliation

Most had heard about federal government initiatives associated with reconciliation, especially compensation for survivors of the "Sixties scoop" or residential schools, and local events that had benefitted tourism and boosted the number of cultural and social activities. Areas for future focus included more investments in trauma counselling for families, greater investments in Indigenous youth, and more public education.

Immigration policies in the north

There was low awareness of policies related to immigration in the North. Some were aware of a foreign worker's program and had heard some mixed reviews. Many felt that immigration services in Whitehorse were limited, requiring travel to other cities as part of the process for permanent residency or citizenship.

Investments in post-secondary education

Some had heard, vaguely, about investments in post-secondary education or training by the federal government, and a number of participants felt the Government of Canada had something to do with Yukon College becoming a university. Most indicated that more investment was needed in post-secondary education, in order to support economic development, create jobs, and build a skilled local labour force.

Firearms restrictions

Most had heard about plans to restrict access to certain types of firearms. Few had clarity and many were resistant to the idea of restrictions on gun ownership or the federal government implementing a buy-back program for assault rifles.

Environment

Awareness of environmental news

The environmental issues that were top of mind included climate change, greenhouse gas reductions, and events such as forest fires and warming temperatures in the North. Participants also commonly mentioned pipelines and related controversies, including the Wet'suwet'en protests. Some commented on pollution from the oil and gas industry or stories about accidents, leaks and spills. Issues related to plastics in oceans, recycling, landfill, and waste were also commonly mentioned.

There was very low awareness of Government of Canada news related to the environment. The most common mentions were thematic ones focused on pipelines, climate change, and emissions reductions. A few participants mentioned or alluded to carbon pricing.

Environmental priorities

Participants were provided with a list of environmental initiatives and asked to identify the ones that would make the greatest positive difference. Differences were not especially striking, however. Most initiatives on the list were viewed as only marginally better or worse than others. The exception was the national price on carbon, which had very little support overall.

Carbon pricing

Participants were presented with information on the carbon pricing rates in place for the next two years and told that the federal government would make a decision in 2022 about whether to continue to increase the price on carbon, freeze it, lower it, or eliminate it entirely.

Asked for their recommendations, participants had mixed views. The most common recommendation, overall, by a small margin, was to freeze the rate at $50 per tonne. This was a prevalent response among participants who felt ambivalent about the program or wanted the government to re-evaluate and make sure that it was working as planned, without negative effects on the economy, jobs, or consumer costs.

Most other participants were about equally split between recommending that the federal government eliminate the program or increase the rate. Those who recommended a rate increase supported the goals of the program and felt that the price had to be high enough to induce behaviour change. Those who recommended eliminating the program tended to think about it as a tax and added cost to them. There were also a number of participants who recommended that the federal government lower the rate in 2022. These participants were concerned about negative impacts of the carbon pricing on costs for consumers and businesses, as well as jobs and the economy, overall.

The decisive factor for many who recommended freezing, lowering or eliminating the carbon price was their lack of information or awareness about whether or not the initiative was working to reduce emissions or having a negative impact on consumer costs and the economy.

Reducing personal emissions

Most said that they were making personal efforts to reduce their emissions, which included better transportation choices, recycling, waste reduction, and lowering household energy consumption. Most also admitted to gaps in their knowledge about their own personal footprint and ways to reduce it. Despite this, not all saw the value of greater public education or the usefulness of tools such as an online carbon calculator.

Meanwhile, some felt that public education could be effective in changing people's behaviour and contributing to emissions reduction. These participants wanted to know more themselves. Others felt that resistance, costs, and inconvenience were bigger barriers to behaviour change than a lack of information. Many of these participants did not want to learn or do more about their carbon footprint for the reasons they described. Many were also skeptical that personal emissions reductions would make a big difference. When asked, more participants felt that a few big polluters changing in major ways would have the biggest impact, compared to a large number of Canadians making small changes. Many others were not sure or felt that everyone had a role to play in the effort to reduce emissions.

Among the tips that participants said might be useful to them, many wanted to know what the benchmarks were for responsible energy use, and how their usage compared to others. Participants wanted to know what the big culprits were for personal or household emissions, where the greatest and easiest improvements could be made, and how various options compared, in terms of costs, benefits, and reductions to their footprint. Many also expressed interest in knowing how their city or province fared against others or how Canada compared to the rest of the world.

Western Issues (Regina)

The federal-provincial relationship

Asked to describe the relationship between Saskatchewan and the federal government, most felt that their province was neglected or overlooked in favour of others in central Canada. Participants commonly described Saskatchewan as forgotten, irrelevant or disrespected, and some described the relationship with the federal government as strained, or lacking in cooperation.

Many felt that there had been a lack of investment and support for Saskatchewan's economy and industries and wanted to see more equal treatment and more investment.

TMX Pipeline

Only a few participants in these groups had heard about the pipeline and most had superficial knowledge of the project. Among those with an opinion, the consensus was that the pipeline would likely not be built on schedule, given the kinds of delays and opposition it had already encountered.

Equalization payments

Many were unfamiliar with the term 'equalization payments', especially in the women's group, and most had only a superficial understanding of the system. Participants described it as a pool of provincial contributions that gets redistributed based on GDP. A few felt that the system should be changed to benefit Saskatchewan more, and was currently unfair, but no one had any concrete suggestions for how it might be improved.

China's boycott of the Canadian canola industry

There was mixed awareness of this issue in these groups. Most did not know any details. Asked if the federal government should make concessions to China, retaliate with sanctions, or continue to financially support farmers while trying to negotiate a solution, most participants chose the latter. This was widely felt to be the safest and most constructive option.

Top federal priority for Saskatchewan

Of the various issues above discussed with these groups, participants were asked to select one as their top priority for the Government of Canada. Despite many having little previous awareness of the program, most chose equalization payments, based on their sense that Saskatchewan was not getting enough support overall or in comparison to other provinces.

Frontier Mines (Montreal, York Region, Moncton)

On February 23, 2020, Teck Resources made the decision to withdraw its application for the Frontier oilsands mine. This decision came after the focus groups in Montreal, York Region and Moncton had been held.

Most had not previously heard of the Frontier Mines. Asked for their opinion, there was widespread opposition among participants in Montreal, most in York felt that the government should approve the project with environmental commitments in place, and participants in Moncton were split between those two choices.

Economic benefits, job creation and the need for oil were the main reasons given by those who sided with approval for the project, in addition to believing that economic and environmental concerns could be balanced. Among those who opposed the project, most felt that such a large mine and the emissions it was expected to produce were a move in the wrong direction, and at odds with the federal government's commitment to reduce greenhouse gases and be a global leader on the environment.

Some said they would be more supportive of the project if the company pledged to offset emissions to net-zero by 2050, but the concept of net-zero first needed to be explained to most participants, and some felt that this date was too far off.

Negotiating a deal with Alberta

Asked to consider the possibility of the federal government negotiating with Alberta to establish acceptable conditions for going forward with the project, some supported the idea and others did not.

Whether they supported this approach or not, most felt that the conditions on the list were not strong enough. Participants wanted to see firm, legally-binding commitments to meet environmental standards that included enforcement and penalties. They tended to dislike *promises* or what they viewed as vague or ambiguous language. The year 2050 felt far off for many, as well, and most did not like references to carbon pricing.

Canada Student Loans (Moncton, Nanaimo)

Most had heard of this program and said they were familiar with some of its features. Top of mind, many had negative comments about the debt associated with the program. Beyond that, participants described the program as a loan to help cover the costs of post-secondary education, tied to financial need, and, some assumed, paid back on good terms with a grace period on interest and better rates overall. Some also felt that the repayment schedule was also tied to income. Many did not know if the program offered grants. Despite some frustration about the debt, many felt that the program was valuable.

Asked to consider a list of possible new names for the program, the top two choices were *Canada Student Grants and Loans* and *Canada Student Financial Assistance*. The first was seen as a good description, especially since some had not known whether grants were provided. Many liked the phrase 'financial assistance' in the second name. But few felt that any of the new names offered a significant improvement on the current one.

Coronavirus (Montréal, York Region, Regina, Nanaimo)

Awareness

All participants were aware of the coronavirus and attuned to media coverage and new developments. They tended to have a lot of information and details about the evolving story, and a number of questions, too. Most acknowledged the many unknowns associated with the new virus and its status as an evolving public health threat. And many thought that the information they were getting could be confusing or unreliable at times. That said, most felt that they had a good enough understanding of what was known to-date about the virus, especially in relation to key issues, such as spread, threat, risk, transmission, and prevention.

Perceived risk

Most felt that their personal risk was low, and that the situation was not serious in Canada at the time of these groups. There was general awareness of confirmed cases in the country, but most understood the numbers to be low. And most participants said they had confidence in the handling of the virus by

public health officials and governments in Canada. They felt that the country was fairly well prepared, taking the threat seriously, and putting screening, testing and quarantines in place to contain the virus and its spread. Some were concerned that the spread of the virus and its effects in Canada could or would get worse, but most said they were not too concerned at the moment.

Federal government response

Some felt that the federal government may have been a bit slow to respond initially, or could be implementing stricter measures such as restricting incoming travel and tightening up the border. Participants generally felt that the Canadian government was being measured and prudent in its response, neither over- nor under-reacting to the threat. Many were aware that the federal government had brought Canadians home from Asia and tended to view this as a positive response, given that it involved screening and quarantines.

Information seeking

Participants had a lot of questions about the virus, especially related to its severity and origins, and whether there was additional information available about transmission. Few felt that they faced serious or urgent information gaps, however, given their perception of a low level of personal risk.

That said, everyone understood the issue to be a major public health concern and one that was evolving. Most wanted to be up-to-date on key information, especially regarding spread, any increased threat to Canada and themselves, and the public health response and actions being undertaken by government.

Most were following the story, and many were actively seeking out information. The sources of information being relied on were broad, including traditional media in Canada and abroad (accessed both online and offline), social media from various sources, word of mouth, employers, schools, and health care professionals, as well as official sources, such as the World Health Organization, governments, and public health officials in Canada and beyond. Health Canada was mentioned as a go-to source of information by some.

MORE INFORMATION

The Strategic Counsel
Contract number: 35035-182346/001/CY
Contract award date: June 27, 2019
Contract value: $808,684.50

Detailed Findings

Government of Canada News (Moncton, Montreal, York, Regina, Whitehorse, Nanaimo)

Overall

The blockades related to the construction of the Coastal Gaslink pipeline through Wet'suwet'en territory in Northern British Columbia were top of mind among participants by a wide margin. They increasingly dominated mentions in the groups over the course of the month, as protests and disruptions across the country intensified.

In all groups and locations, the protests were cited as a federal government story. But in the York, Montreal, and Moncton groups, which were held during the first and second week of February, the issue received only general mention from a few participants and was not a strong focal point of discussion. In the Nanaimo, Whitehorse and Regina groups, by contrast, which were held closer to the end of the month, the issue was very much top of mind for most and generated considerable discussion, as described in more detail in the next section.

Among the other stories, the Prime Minister's trip to Africa in early February was mentioned by participants in the York and Moncton groups. A few said that they had read or heard that the trip was related to the United Nations (UN) or Canada's bid for a seat on the UN Security Council.

Immigration was mentioned in the Nanaimo and Regina groups, where some participants said they had heard recent news about an increase in immigration or "express entry". Some also said that they had heard about expanded supports and programs for newcomers. The majority of comments were positive.

Top of mind references to the coronavirus/COVID-19 were not especially prominent but came up in a few of the groups. Specific mentions were related to the federal government efforts to get Canadians home from Asia, and to the quarantine of returnees. "A Canadian Forces base" (presumably CFB Trenton) and how it was affected by housing those in quarantine was also mentioned. There were also a few unprompted comments about the federal government either handling the issue well overall, or being somewhat slow to respond initially.

Wet'suwet'en Protests (Whitehorse, Regina)

Awareness and Understanding

There was widespread awareness of the Wet'suwet'en protests in Whitehorse and Regina, which were held closer to the end of the month. A number of participants commented on the extensive media coverage of events, and most were following the story to some degree, if only through the headlines.

Some were familiar with specific details and were up-to-date on new developments, especially in Nanaimo, where the topic came up unprompted when asked what they had heard from the federal government lately. But most had only a rudimentary understanding of what they viewed as a complex issue. Many felt that they did not have all the facts.

Regardless of their varying degrees of engagement and information, participants tended to view the story in similar ways. They focused on the barricades and disruptions around rail lines and their effects on transportation, economic activity, and livelihoods. Most felt that the issue was an urgent and difficult problem to be solved. Some framed the disruptions and barricades as a law and order issue to be dealt with, but most associated current events with pipelines and Indigenous issues more broadly, and placed them within the context of what they saw as long-standing challenges in these areas as the underlying issue.

Opinions

There were some mixed views about the issues most urgently at stake in these events. Many, especially in Regina, focused primarily on the transportation disruptions, characterizing them as divisive and damaging to the economy. Some questioned the motivation of the protesters and felt that the majority were not, in their view, Indigenous people but members of other groups using the underlying issue to protest pipelines in general, advance environmental agendas, or air other grievances. A few stressed that approval from the Wet'suwet'en had already been given for the project, questioning the

rationale for the protests. And some felt that attempting to negotiate with this broader group of protesters would not be constructive and that a firmer response was warranted. Participants were not specific about the type of firmer action they would like to see, however, and most were cautious about escalating a standoff.

On the other hand, especially among the women in Whitehorse, many associated the issue with what they saw as legitimate underlying concerns about consultations with Indigenous communities on pipeline projects. Some referred to what they viewed as poor treatment of Indigenous people by governments in Canada, and the importance of respecting Indigenous rights, treaties, and sovereignty. A few felt that governments had contributed to the problem by pushing too hard and fast to get pipeline projects built. Some questioned whether adequate consultation for this project had taken place with the Wet'suwet'en and if the Nation's territorial rights were being honoured.

Views of the federal government's response

Asked for their assessment of the federal government's response to date, opinions were mixed. A number of participants indicated that they had not seen, read or heard much about it and did not know enough to judge. Others were of the opinion that the federal government was doing what it could to try to peacefully de-escalate the situation, and some praised the government's efforts so far. But many were at least somewhat critical of the government's response and felt that it had been insufficient, in their opinion, given the persistence of the problem.

Positive assessments of the government's response were focused on a few key areas. Many felt that the Government of Canada was – wisely, in their view – working with the Government of British Columbia and attempting to hold meetings with the Wet'suwet'en chiefs or community. A number of participants said that they had heard that the RCMP had been asked, or decided, to step back and stop making arrests to allow those negotiations to take place. A few noted that they had read about the Prime Minister cancelling a trip abroad in order to deal with the issue here at home. These were all viewed as constructive steps by many participants.

On the other hand, many felt that more needed to be done to get the blockades of transportation corridors removed. To that end, some said that the federal government should be "more forceful" in restoring law and order to protect the interests of the majority, while others said that more should be done with respect to outreach with the Wet'suwet'en to resolve the underlying issue. There were few suggestions for how to be more forceful, but a number of participants felt that improving relationships with Indigenous communities, especially in regard to consultations and approvals for pipeline projects, would be constructive steps in resolving the current problem and avoiding similar ones in the future. A few also felt that the federal government should be more transparent with the Canadian public about these particular consultations and others related to large pipeline projects generally.

Asked what else the Government of Canada should be doing, many felt that it should move forward on all the fronts available to it to peacefully resolve the protests and disruptions as quickly as possible. Some thought that the Prime Minister, in particular, should take a more high-profile role in communicating with the Wet'suwet'en, Indigenous communities, and the public. Participants were not forthcoming with specific suggestions about what else the Government of Canada could do. The

discussion yielded more general recommendations, including taking stronger action to limit the impact of the protests and to consult more actively with Indigenous stakeholders.

Teck Frontier Mine Project (Regina)

In the Regina groups alone, participants were prompted for what they knew about the Teck Frontier Mine project due to the timing of Teck Resources Limited's announcement to cancel the project.

Only a few participants, among the women, were aware of this project. Most of them knew that the project had been cancelled. Opinions ranged from viewing that decision as a good one, overall, to emphasizing the loss of jobs, to linking it to the Wet'suwet'en protests and an assumption that Teck had decided that the project represented too much of a risk. Among the few comments participants had about what the cancellation of the project might mean to the future of the oil industry, one participant felt that its decline was inevitable and the country should be transitioning to low carbon energy. Another was concerned about the future of the industry and others, like agriculture that depend on oil.

Federal Budget (Moncton, Montreal, York Region, Regina, Nanaimo)

Awareness and Expectations of the Upcoming Federal Budget

There was very low awareness among participants of the upcoming federal Budget. Only a few in the Western groups said that they had read or heard something about it. These participants variously mentioned hearing about the deficit going up, that more investments were planned for Indigenous peoples and Northern residents, about public costs associated with security for the Royals, and that western Canada was being overlooked in favour of eastern Canada.

When asked what they might expect from the federal Budget based on what they knew about the government's priorities, participants gave a wide range of responses but many said they did not have a clear idea.

The most common mentions included expectations that the government would focus on healthcare, the environment, immigration, and affordability issues. These latter issues were variously defined as housing affordability, cost of living, income disparity, and tax relief for the middle class. Some said they expected measures to reduce the deficit, such as spending and service cuts. Others anticipated tax increases for corporations or the closing of business tax loopholes.

Topics of Focus for the Federal Budget

When asked what they would like the federal government to focus on, responses were similar. Participants most commonly cited health care, generally, as their priority, with some specific mention of mental health care, more family doctors, better access, reduced wait times, and improved quality of care. The environment was also mentioned by a number of participants, especially in regard to the oil and gas industry, pipelines, and pollution. Some said that they wanted to see subsidies for fossil fuel companies reduced and more invested in sustainable energy and the green economy/jobs.

There was also some mention of stimulating the economy, jobs, and growth in other areas. These areas included a focus on small businesses, trucking, technology exports, and developing Canada's natural resources, broadly speaking.

There were a few mentions across locations related to education, including investments in retraining and student loans programs. In Nanaimo, many wanted to see the federal government do something about issues related to affordability and basic quality of life, including affordable and low-income housing, pensions, poverty, addictions and mental health. A few participants across locations mentioned infrastructure investments as a general area of focus, as well.

Asked to identify a potential theme for the Budget, participants did not have a lot of suggestions, and very few in common. Some in the Nanaimo and Regina groups felt there should be a focus on quality of life and basics like affordability, incomes and housing. There were also a few common mentions across locations of climate change and sustainability.

Exercise: Budget Theme

Participants in all groups were given a list of possible themes for the federal government's upcoming Budget. They were asked to rank the top two they would most like to see the government adopt, as well as identify any they felt would be a bad theme for a Budget. The list included the following choices:

- A Climate Budget
- A Budget to Grow the Middle Class
- A Budget to Make Life More Affordable
- A Healthcare Budget
- A Well-Being Budget
- A Budget for Living Within our Means
- An Innovation Budget
- A Budget for Improving Quality of Life

Results below are rank ordered based on the number of people who selected these themes as their first choice. Overall, *A Health Care Budget* was the strong first choice among participants, followed by *A Budget to Make Life More Affordable* and a *Climate Budget*.

A Healthcare Budget

This was a strong first choice, equally among men and women, with twice as many participants selecting it as their number one theme for the Budget as the next top choices overall. Participants explained their selection by emphasising the importance of health care to all Canadians, and to themselves, their families and communities. Some in York and Nanaimo noted that their provincial governments needed more support and funding for healthcare from the federal government in their view. Participants spoke about a need for more family doctors and health care workers, as well as better access to care, shorter wait times, and improvements in preventative care. In Moncton, where no other budget theme came close to healthcare as the top choice, participants pointed to hospital closures, crowding, and restricted emergency care as problems in their community. In Nanaimo and Regina, a number of participants identified out-of-pocket expenses, both dental and optical, as health care-related costs that they would like to see the government help cover.

A Budget to Make Life More Affordable

While trailing health care by a significant margin as the top choice, this theme was chosen by a large number of participants as one they liked the most. Men were more likely than women to select this as their top choice. There were regional variations including Nanaimo, where this was a strong top choice ahead of health care, and Montreal, where no one chose it as their desired theme for the federal Budget. Those who selected this theme were motivated by concerns about the cost of living and incomes not keeping pace with inflation, in their view. Many referenced their own struggles to get by, with regard to housing in particular, especially in Nanaimo. Most felt that too many today were struggling in Canada to afford the basics, spend time with family, and enjoy a good quality of life. Students, seniors, and those on fixed incomes were mentioned as being especially hard hit by rising costs. A number of participants referenced income disparity, poverty and inequality as central issues and growing problems, in their view, either in Canada overall or within their specific communities.

A Climate Budget

Nearly as many participants chose this as their preferred theme as chose affordability. In contrast, however, a significant number of participants identified this theme as a bad idea for the upcoming federal Budget, especially in Regina. Those who did not like this theme tended to associate it with a price on pollution or a "carbon tax", which they felt would be costly for consumers and the economy. Among those who selected it as a top choice, women were more likely than men to favour A Climate budget, as were the participants in the Montreal and York groups, where it was a strong second choice after health care. Those who liked this theme described climate change as a pressing issue with far-reaching implications not just for the environment, but also for the economy, human health, and future generations. Many referenced occurrences such as mild winters, melting polar ice caps, and high

temperatures in the Antarctic, as well as forest fires and species extinctions as examples of climate change's effects.

A Budget for Improving Quality of Life

While relatively few chose this as their number one choice, compared to the themes above, quite a few identified it as their second choice. Those who liked it felt that it was broad in scope and would likely cover a wide range of important core issues and concerns, such as education and health, cost of living, jobs, incomes, social services, housing, and supports for vulnerable populations. Some felt it was similar in some respects to either growing the middle class or making life more affordable, but more inclusive.

A Budget to Grow the Middle Class

Relatively few chose this theme as their first or second choice, and about as many as were positive said it was a bad idea for the federal Budget. Those who liked this theme felt that it would cover policies to address what they viewed as a decline in quality of life for most Canadians, especially younger generations, due to the rising cost of living and of housing, in particular. Participants said they hoped that this budget would address income disparity or their sense that the middle class was getting "squeezed" and overtaxed. Some said that a focus on the middle class would be good for the economy, overall. A number of participants felt that income tax cuts would be part of this kind of budget. Those who did not like this theme generally felt that it was exclusive and disregarded the needs of the lower income Canadians and households. Some felt that they would be left out, personally. Others were opposed to the idea of a "class-based' theme in principle and were concerned about whether the needs of Canada's most vulnerable groups would be addressed in this kind of budget.

An Innovation Budget

This theme was selected by very few as a number one or two choice from the list. More said they disliked it. For many, 'innovation' sounded vague and disconnected from the most important underlying issues, in their view, such as health, education, affordability or the environment. Some said that they expected the federal government to be supporting innovation already as a guiding principle. Some wanted to know what the innovation was for, specifically. The few who liked this theme felt that the future of the country and its economy depended on advances in technology and innovation. Some felt that there was an innovation gap to close in Canada. In Regina, a few participants spoke about the need for their province, in their view, to catch up with other parts of the country in developing its technology sector.

A Budget for Living within our Means

More participants disliked this theme than any other on the list, and very few placed it in their top two. Various reasons were given. Some were confused about who was meant to be living within their means in this budget – the government, citizens, or both. Some felt that this kind of budget sounded paternalistic, as though the government would either try to dictate changes to personal spending behaviour or impose some top-down austerity measures. A number of participants expressed concern

that cuts to programs and services would be included. Some emphasized the need, in their opinion, for the government to invest in citizens through deficit financing. While some said they liked the idea of government living within its means and reducing deficits, they felt this outcome would be unlikely.

A Well-Being Budget

Very few liked this theme and far more disliked it. Most felt that it sounded too broad or vague and beyond the scope of government. Many viewed the concept of 'well-being' as personal to some degree, and more about individual behaviour and choice than government spending and policies. Participants tended to question whether the federal government could legitimately pursue or hope to achieve well-being on citizens' behalf. Some felt it sounded like a buzzword or platitude. The few who selected this theme as a top choice liked that it was comprehensive and felt that it would likely cover the core responsibilities of government, including health care, affordable living, access to employment, and growing the middle class. For some it meant ensuring that all Canadians had access to a decent standard of life and signalled that the budget would be focussed on people, their lives as a whole, and what matters to them.

A Climate Budget

Participants were asked what type of spending and policies they would expect to see in a "climate budget", if the federal government were to move forward with that theme. A lengthy list of ideas was generated in most groups. Most commonly, participants said that they would expect to see investment in the development of more renewable, sustainable and low-emission forms of energy, as well as research, innovation and technology to assist with the transition to a low-carbon economy. Many said they would expect to see investment in electric cars, whether through subsidies for the industry, rebates for consumers, or the expansion of charging stations across the country. A number of participants said that they would expect to see financial incentives for business and households to promote behaviour change and help them reduce greenhouse gas pollution and invest in energy efficiency.

Among other expectations, many put infrastructure investment on the list, especially with regard to expanding public transit and making it less polluting and more energy efficient. Recycling and plastic reductions or bans commonly came up. Some felt that the federal government could promote tree planting, the greening of cities, or the protection of waterways and oceans in relation to climate change issues. Some mentioned the oil and gas industry specifically, and policies to reduce emissions through stricter targets, enforcement, and penalties. Some suggested that subsidies for oil and gas companies might be shifted to the green energy and technology sectors. A few felt that big industrial polluters in general should be asked to pay for their pollution and that carbon pricing would likely be included in a climate budget.

Asked if they perceived a difference between a "climate budget" and an "environment budget", most said that they did. While the two themes were widely viewed as similar and interrelated, most felt that an environment budget would cover a wider range of issues and initiatives, and that a climate budget would be more focussed on climate change, greenhouse gas reductions, and related issues.

Participants described a climate budget as broad in scope, but they described an environmental budget as all-encompassing. They associated the latter with protection of forests, water, land, and wildlife from all threats and forms of pollution. It included climate issues and others, such as pesticides in agriculture, mine tailings, and the management of fisheries, and natural resources.

Asked if they preferred a climate or environment budget, most chose an environment budget. These participants felt that more could be undertaken and achieved in the short term with this broader focus, and that climate change would be included without excluding other important environmental issues. Some felt that an environment budget might be more palatable for the public either because of the language or the kinds of initiatives and issues it covered, which some felt were more tangible, personal, and local, as well easier to implement. Some were of the opinion that a climate budget and a focus on carbon emission reduction, by contrast, were more abstract or nebulous and that the language of 'climate' could be divisive or off putting.

Many of those who preferred a climate budget said the deciding factor was the urgency of climate change, in their view, which requires focus. Some felt that focus, in general, was a better strategy than taking a broad approach, and in this instance would help galvanize the resources, efforts and public support needed to address the challenge of reducing emissions and stopping climate change. In the women's group in York, some who had previously selected an environment budget changed their minds after hearing arguments in favour of a climate budget from others in their group.

A Budget to Improve Quality of Life

Participants were asked what type of spending and policies they would expect to see if the federal government were to move forward with a budget focused on "improving quality of life". They came up with a long list of ideas and commonly felt that such budget would be broad in scope, in keeping with the multifaceted nature of 'quality of life'.

Many felt that this budget would include spending and policies related to education, including student loans, grants and debt forgiveness, as well as investments in trades and retraining. Health and health care were widely mentioned, with specific reference to more doctors, shorter wait times, dental and vision coverage, investments in mental health, and more research and development. Some felt that this type of budget would promote or assist with the adoption of healthy lifestyles, as well, such as diet, physical fitness or smoking cessation. In Regina and Nanaimo, participants felt that the federal government might invest in sports and recreation and promote outdoor activities by eliminating fees associated with camping, hunting, and access to national parks.

Many felt that financial issues would also be a core part of this type of budget, with a focus on jobs, as well as income disparity, low wages, poverty, and what many viewed as an increasing gap between incomes and the cost of living for most people. Affordability issues were top of mind especially related to housing. A few mentioned tax breaks and leaving more money in Canadians' pockets. Some felt that seniors' issues related to pensions, long term care, and homecare would be included, as well as policies and investments to support other vulnerable populations such as people with disabilities or those living in poverty. Some felt that this kind of budget might include support for a four-day work week

and more time spent with family. A few wondered if it might include a tax increase or involve an increased deficit to pay for the kinds of investments in programs and services suggested by a budget focussed on improving quality of life.

Northern Issues (Whitehorse)

Most Important Local Issues

Housing and healthcare were the two big issues identified in Whitehorse, followed by public transit.

Participants said that housing in their city was unaffordable and hard to come by, especially with regard to rentals. This was viewed as a major challenge for residents, especially those with lower incomes, larger families, specific needs, or less than ideal situations for landlords. Participants said that Whitehorse needed more housing in general, specifically rental, affordable, and smaller units, as well as both low income and seniors housing.

Some spoke about the high cost of purchasing homes, as well. A few mentioned "subsidies" for housing as a good idea, though others disagreed and felt that better borrowing terms for mortgages, such as lower rates and easier qualifications, would be a better idea. Some in the men's group felt that onerous conditions were being placed on developers by the city that were hampering housing development in Whitehorse and that better policies were needed.

Healthcare was the other big issue. Participants identified fundamental shortcomings across the board in the local healthcare system. They felt that there was not enough accessible health care in Whitehorse, overall. Specific mentions included a lack of doctors, long waits, too few hospitals and specialist services, overcrowding, line ups, and insufficient equipment for diagnostics and treatment. A number of participants said that locals have to travel to other cities for health care.

Mental healthcare was a particular area of concern for many. A number of participants commented on a lack of services, treatments, and supports for those with addictions and mental health issues in the area. Some in the women's group felt that people with mental health issues were ending up in the criminal justice system instead of getting the health care and supports they needed.

A number of participants identified addiction as a growing concern, and many said that treatment and support programs, to the extent that they existed, were difficult to get into, had long wait times and limited spaces, and did not offer the ongoing care needed. A lack of suicide prevention services was also mentioned.

Public transit was a common complaint. Participants cited the recent loss of Greyhound bus services, expensive and limited options, a lack of services on Sunday, and long waits in cold weather in winter. Many felt that residents could not rely on public transit to get around or outside the city easily and that they needed cars.

On another note, some had a sense that violent and drug-related crime was going up in the city or felt that the criminal justice system as a whole needed to be looked at and improved. The need for more jobs and employment support were mentioned. And poor telecommunication and internet services were identified as a major inconvenience and impediment to the economy.

Local Impact of the Federal Government

Asked to think about everything the federal government had done in the past year and identify what, if anything, had the most positive impact on Whitehorse, participants came up with a few mentions. Some identified investments in infrastructure, generally, or specifically related to a new science building, a local power plant and the upgrade of a local college to a university. A few of the women mentioned either the Canada child benefit or transfer payments to the territory from the federal government. Reconciliation came up, associated with an increase in local cultural events, celebrations and workshops, which a few participants said had boosted tourism and things to do in the community. There were also a few comments about environmental initiatives related to power in the Yukon, including assisting with the reduction of diesel.

Asked to consider any negative impacts on Whitehorse resulting from federal government actions over the past year, participants most commonly identified a "carbon tax". Nearly everyone in the men's group agreed that this initiative, in their view, had increased prices. A few in the women's group shared this sentiment. Many felt that gasoline prices, in particular, had gone up as a result, which participants said was particularly hard on people living in smaller northern cities, where driving was nearly essential because of the weather, distances and a poor public transit system. Some felt that the costs of electricity and groceries were going up, as well, and that Whitehorse residents were particularly hard hit given the already high prices and the lack of alternative energy sources.

Infrastructure

Asked what the city needs most in terms of infrastructure investment, public transit was identified as a critical issue. Participants identified an overall lack of service, including not enough routes, low frequency, restricted hours, and a lack of Sunday service, as problems. This meant everyone, in their view, who could afford it used a car to get around or had to rely on taxis. Some felt that more was needed to develop the local power plant and energy options including alternatives to diesel fuel. More low-income or seniors' housing was also mentioned.

Other individual mentions included investing in the sewage system or improvement of local roads. A few felt that more investment was needed in the development of local attractions, entertainment facilities, and shops, in order to increase the number of things to do for locals and visitors. There was also mention of the need to invest in better telecommunications infrastructure and Internet services.

Hydroelectric Power

Participants were asked if they had heard about the Atlin Hydro expansion. Only a few had. Most of this limited awareness was vague at best. No one could describe the project beyond saying they understood it was happening or "in the works".

Asked if the federal government could be doing more to support the hydroelectric industry in the Yukon, some said yes and others seemed a bit hesitant. Those who felt it was a good idea said it that greater development was needed to meet energy demands and eliminate the use of back up diesel. A few were concerned about environmental issues or changes to water levels associated with hydroelectric projects and felt that this would have to be addressed and managed.

Housing Challenges in Whitehorse

Asked to identify the biggest housing challenges in Whitehorse, participants tended to focus on the needs of vulnerable populations, including low income individuals and households, seniors, and the homeless. Most felt there were not enough housing options, in general, for everyone, including affordable ones, but especially for these individuals and groups, in particular.

Most were not sure if the federal government had done anything to improve housing conditions in Whitehorse in the past few years. A few felt that this was not, in their view, a federal government issue so much as a territorial one. A few wondered whether the federal government might have affected the regulation of landlords and prices but were not sure.

Asked what more the federal government should be doing to help address local housing issues, most were unsure. Some suggested more investment and support for the development of low income and affordable housing. There were some suggestions about doing more to work with or support private developers to address the housing shortage. A number of participants suggested stimulating the local economy and supporting the growth of employment, skills, and incomes as a longer-term solution to address economic activity and incomes that could support more housing and affordability.

Canada's Arctic and Northern Policy Framework (ANPF)

Few had heard of this initiative. At most, a few participants thought the name sounded familiar. No one could describe the policy but a few felt it might have something to do with the environment, ice melting in the Arctic, or climate change.

The following description was provided as clarification in both groups:
"The Arctic and Northern Policy Framework is a new Government of Canada vision that will help make sure Canada's national and international priorities fit with the priorities of Indigenous peoples and Northern residents. Essentially, decisions that affect the Northern communities will include federal, territorial and Indigenous partners so that decisions are made in a more shared way. This is sometimes referred to as an integrated decision-making process."

Participants were asked what they thought this "more integrated decision-making process" should look like. While some said they were not sure, or found the question hard to answer, others came up with some ideas. Primarily, comments focussed on the need for more consultation with and inclusion of Indigenous communities and northern residents in the process of decision-making.

There was a lot of focus on First Nations communities, in particular, being included as equal partners, ensuring that chiefs and other leaders of these communities are fully engaged from the beginning. But participants also stressed the need for more consultation with and involvement by municipalities and mayors generally, and by the Territorial Government in particular. Some emphasized the need, in their view, for greater local knowledge and perspectives to be part of the decision-making process. A few pointed to controversies around pipeline projects and the creation of a "carbon tax" as two examples of the federal government not listening to local people's concerns. Some felt that the federal government was not doing enough for reconciliation, power sharing, listening, consulting, honouring commitments, or addressing socio-economic disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

Other Federal Government Initiatives

Participants were asked about their awareness and perceptions of a range of federal government initiatives, including:

- A travel deduction for northern residents
- Reconciliation effort
- Immigration policies in the North
- Investments in post-secondary education
- Firearms restrictions

Travel deduction

There was mixed awareness of the travel deduction for Northern residents. Some had heard of it and others had not. A few said they had either claimed it or looked at claiming it. Many had only a vague understanding of how it worked, and many had questions.

A number of participants commented that the deduction was too restrictive and not available to everyone. Many focused on the employment benefits portion of the deduction and felt that employers needed to support this for residents to claim anything and that not all employers did or that the approved amounts might be limited. Some felt that the claim amount on their tax forms was too low and only covered a portion of travel benefits. There was a fair bit of confusion regarding the deduction overall, who qualifies, how much it amounts to and how it is claimed.

Reconciliation

Most had heard about federal government initiatives associated with reconciliation, though few were able to provide much detail. Most commonly, participants said they were aware of compensation being provided for survivors of the "Sixties Scoop" or residential schools. Some had applied themselves or knew others that had. There were mixed views about this initiative. One said she had yet to hear back, and some had heard that it was a difficult process for applicants, especially with regard to documenting claims. There was also some general mention of land settlements and actions related to Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls as examples of federal government initiatives.

Asked what else the federal government might be doing to support reconciliation, a number of participants focussed on the need for more public education to raise awareness of reconciliation and why it is important. Some also felt that education initiatives are needed for younger generations of First Nations people to better understand what members of their families went through.

A number of participants felt that more investments were needed in mental health services in the community for individuals and families dealing with intergenerational trauma, including treatment, counselling and other supports and services. Some focussed on the need to invest in the health, welfare, education and opportunities for Indigenous youth. One felt that more education, support and protections were needed to address domestic assault and violence against women in isolated communities.

Immigration policies in the North

There was low awareness of policies related to immigration in the North. A few participants said they were somewhat familiar with a foreign worker's program and had heard, variously, that Whitehorse was a northern hub for this program, that it was difficult for employers to find workers through this program, or that foreign workers who used it tended to be underemployed and underpaid. In regard to other immigration services, many felt that there were a lack of them in Whitehorse, requiring those who wished to gain permanent residence or citizenship, for example, to travel to other cities in the south, like Vancouver, Calgary or Toronto. A few said they had heard that the process was very onerous for people in Whitehorse.

Investments in post-secondary education

Some had heard, vaguely, about investment in post-secondary education or training, and a number of participants commented on the upgrade of Yukon College to a university. A few noted that more investment was needed in the institution, including the creation of some satellite schools.

Most felt that more investments were needed in post-secondary education, overall, to help support economic development, create jobs, build a skilled local labour force, and support the growth of business and incomes.

Asked what else the federal government should be doing, some specific ideas included investing more in telecommunications and Internet technology to support distance learning, in particular. Some also felt that there should be more opportunities for hands-on experience, such as internships, or more investment in the trades and other skills needed by local industries.

Firearms restrictions

Most had heard about plans to restrict access to certain types of firearms. Few were clear on what, exactly, was to be covered by the ban but most had heard something about rifles, assault weapons, or either automatic or semi-automatic weapons. Few expressed support for this initiative and many had questions or concerns about how it would be applied and implemented.

Told that the federal government has proposed a ban on assault rifles in Canada, participants were asked whether Canadians, in their view, should have access to assault rifles. Some wanted to know more about what kind of guns would be included in that definition, or felt that the definition was vague or could be too broad. Others were critical of banning or restricting gun ownership, in general, and restricting the rights and freedoms of law-abiding citizens to have access to guns for hunting and protection. A few commented that the focus should be on criminals.

Asked if they would support a program in which the federal government bought back all assault rifles currently owned by Canadians to remove them from circulation, most said no or were unsure. Some felt that this was akin to seizing private property and felt this was overreach. A few characterized it as the government trying to take away their rights. Some felt a ban was unnecessary either because legal assault rifles in the hands of law-abiding citizens were not a problem, in their view, or because adequate screening and regulations already existed to ensure that legal firearms purchasers were meeting requirements. A number of participants did not like the idea of the federal government creating a database on, or collecting personal information from, gun owners. A few in these groups seemed to be more open to these kinds of initiatives to restrict certain kinds of weapons, but in light of the opposition of others were tentative in expressing them.

Environment (Moncton, Montreal, York Region, Regina, Whitehorse, Nanaimo)

Awareness of Environmental News

Some groups were engaged with environmental issues and stories, such as the women's group in Nanaimo and the men's group in Montreal, while others were either less engaged or not engaged at all. Among the issues that were most top of mind, climate change was a common mention. A few participants said that they had heard news about recent reports showcasing the increased urgency of climate change. Some said that they had seen recent stories related to greenhouse gas reductions. A

number of participants cited events that they linked to climate change, such as forest fires, especially in Australia, as well as acidification of the oceans, melting ice caps, and warming temperatures in the Arctic and Antarctic.

Pipelines were also top of mind for many and received a number of general mentions, as well as specific ones related to controversies and tensions surrounding pipeline projects, including the Wet'suwet'en protests and blockades. Some commented on pollution from the oil and gas industry or said they had seen recent stories about accidents, leaks and spills, as well as fracking and tailings ponds.

Issues related to plastics in oceans, recycling, landfill, and waste were also commonly mentioned across groups and locations, with many concerned about the environmental challenges posed by these issues. Various issues related to wildlife, fisheries and natural resource management were also mentioned.

Awareness of Government of Canada Related Issues

There was very low awareness of Government of Canada news related to the environment. In a number of groups participants struggled to identify a federal story. Among the more common mentions, participants referenced pipelines, including the federal government's purchase of the Trans Mountain pipeline project, current protests and blockades, and pipeline projects getting either started or stalled. Some felt that the federal government was committed to taking action to mitigate the environmental impact of pipelines and the oil and gas industry, while others, especially in Regina, were concerned that the government was not doing enough to support industry, businesses and jobs because of environmental concerns. Climate change and greenhouse gas emissions were also viewed as two areas of priority for the federal government. Some said that they had not seen much from the Government of Canada recently on these issues. Others pointed to pricing carbon pollution and described it positively or neutrally, in some instances, as a new price on pollution for companies, or more negatively as a new cost for consumers. A few participants referenced the Paris Agreement saying they had read something about Canada either reiterating its commitment to the Paris targets or not being on track to meeting them.

Exercise: Priorities

Participants in all groups were provided with a list of environmental initiatives and asked to identify three that would make the greatest positive difference, in their view, including their number one priority for government. The list included the following:

- Banning all single-use plastics in Canada
- Conserving and protecting 25% of Canada's land and 25% of Canada's oceans
- Educating Canadians on actions they can take to reduce their own carbon footprint

- Financially supporting a transition to more energy efficient cars and trucks
- Funding companies with innovative green technology projects
- Implementing an Oceans Protection Plan to protect and clean up Canada's coastlines
- Introducing a national price on carbon pollution, also known as a carbon tax
- Phasing out all use of coal for electricity
- Planting 2 billion new trees
- Regulating the oil and gas sector to reduce the amount of emissions by the industry
- Taking leadership on international climate change agreements with other countries.

The results below are rank-ordered based on the number of participants identifying each initiative as their top priority. On that basis, funding companies with green technology projects was the top choice, by a small margin, with a second tier of 4 priorities with similar results, including banning all single-use plastics, supporting more energy efficient cars and trucks, regulating the oil and gas sector, and conserving 25% of Canada's lands and oceans.

Relatively few identified the other priorities as their top priority for government, but quite a few placed them in their top three. Differences in results, overall, in fact, were not especially striking. Most initiatives were viewed as only marginally better or worse than others. The exception was the national price on carbon, which had very little support overall and was at the bottom of the list.

Higher priorities

Funding companies with innovative green technology projects

Many participants identified this as among their top three choices, and more identified it as their top priority than any other initiative. In explaining their selection, participants stressed the importance of technology, in their view, in reducing emissions and transitioning to more sustainable energy sources and production processes. They felt that green technology was the key to more energy efficient industrial processes, forms of transportation, and consumer goods and appliances. While some did not like the idea of government subsidizing businesses in any way, many felt that companies needed incentives and assistance from government to make investments in the public interest that might otherwise be too costly or risky. Some liked the positive nature of this initiative and the win-win approach of supporting market-based solutions that could create opportunities for new sectors, businesses and technologies, make Canada more competitive in the process, and contribute to job creation and economic growth.

Banning all single-use plastics in Canada

This initiative was most widely placed among the top three by participants, overall, though fewer identified it as their top choice compared to investing in green technology projects. Those who liked this initiative felt that plastic pollution was a significant issue, negatively affecting oceans, marine life, the food supply, fisheries, and human health. Some also felt that this kind of initiative could make a dramatic difference and be easier to implement, as well as less costly to consumers and government, compared to some of the other options on the list. Some also liked the initiative because they felt it would widely engage the public and force people to make a behavioural change that, in their view, they already widely supported but needed a push to adopt. A few did not like this initiative, and felt that it was punitive or redundant and could be costly for businesses and consumers.

Financially supporting a transition to more energy efficient cars and trucks

This was also placed in the top three priorities by a relatively large number of participants, and selected as the number one choice by a considerable number, especially in York where it was the most popular initiative on the list. Those who made this selection felt that pollution from gas-powered vehicles was a big problem and that incentives needed to be offered to the public to get Canadians to switch to more energy efficient vehicles with a higher upfront cost. Some liked what they viewed as the positive nature of this initiative. They felt that consumers would be rewarded for taking positive steps that would save them money in the long run, while also reducing emissions, and that it made sense for government to play a role in the uptake of electric vehicles, in particular, to promote greater adoption. Some referenced job creation as a likely benefit, as well. A few did not like this initiative, on the other hand, and felt that government should not get involved in what they viewed as the role of private industry to sell products and set prices in a free market.

Regulating the oil and gas sector to reduce the amount of emissions by the industry

This initiative was also placed in the top three and number one priority spots by a relatively large number of participants, especially among women and participants in both Montreal and Nanaimo. Many felt that the oil and gas sector in Alberta, in particular, was one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions in the country. Some referenced the sector's connections to additional pollution from using fossil fuels – from heating oil and gas to gasoline and plastics – as a compounding problem. Those who were opposed to this initiative felt that it was redundant and already being addressed by the industry itself or were concerned about negative impacts on the economy, jobs and consumer prices, as well as the perceived lack of alternative energy sources.

Conserving and protecting 25% of Canada's land and 25% of Canada's oceans

While few placed this in their top three compared to some of the other initiatives, a relatively large number identified this as their top priority for government, especially in Moncton. Participants felt that conservation was important for Canada, given its wealth of natural resources and their importance to the country's economy. In Moncton, participants emphasized their reliance on the fisheries for their local economy and way of life, and some wanted to see an even greater conservation effort than 25%. A few participants wanted to know how this would get calculated or what was already being done. Among the few who said they did not like this initiative, participants felt like this might be redundant, that it would be difficult to accomplish or would be hard to calculate.

Lower priorities

Implementing an Oceans Protection Plan to protect and clean up Canada's coastlines

Relatively few identified this as their number one priority for government, but quite a few placed it in their top three priorities, especially in Moncton and Nanaimo. Comments tended to focus on how important oceans were to the country's economy, food supply, way of life, and climate. Many were concerned, in particular, about the accumulation of plastic garbage in the oceans and its effects on marine life and coastlines.

Taking leadership on international climate change agreements with other countries

Quite a few participants placed this among their top three, as well, especially among men overall and the participants in York, Montreal and Whitehorse. Participants who liked this initiative emphasized the global nature of the climate challenge and the need for countries to work together. Some felt that Canada was in a good position to take a leadership role and needed to work with other countries to put more pressure on the US and China, in particular, as the big global emitters.

Phasing out all use of coal for electricity

A fair number of participants placed this in their top three priorities. Among those who did, coal burning was seen as a particularly polluting and harmful form of energy. A number of participants described it as "the worst". These participants felt that it would make a big difference for the environment and human health to phase out the use of coal and shift energy production to virtually any other source, but especially more renewable and sustainable ones like hydroelectric, wind, and solar.

Planting 2 billion new trees

Relatively few selected this initiative as their top three or number one choices. Those who did emphasized the many benefits of trees, not just their ability to clean the air and function as a carbon sink but to support wildlife, protect against soil erosion and floods, beautify nature and cities, and cool buildings. Men were more likely than women to place this on their list.

Educating Canadians on actions they can take to reduce their own carbon footprint

This was not popular overall, but women were more likely than men to place this in their top three and say that educating the public is a critical part of reducing carbon pollution. Some felt that all Canadians, including themselves, needed more information and reminders about how to reduce their carbon footprint. Others said that particular groups, in their view, might especially benefit from more education or information, including children in school and lower income or new immigrant households. Some commented that the information provided needed to be simple, accessible, and personalized as much as possible in order to reach and persuade members of the public. Some were more critical of this approach and felt that the focus should be on corporations and big polluters, as the main cause of the problem, in their view, and not on citizens who they viewed as small polluters.

Introducing a national price on carbon pollution, also known as a carbon tax

Very few placed this on their list as an effective environmental action or top priority for the federal government. Most who commented had negative views. Many participants saw carbon pricing as a tax and increased cost for consumers. Some felt that it was hurting people like them who were already struggling with the cost of living, or others who could least afford it. Some felt that the program had created political division and controversy and that there were better ways to pursue emissions reductions, though no examples were given. Some felt that the program either did not work or would not work, in their view. Many others, however, said that they were uncertain about the program's effectiveness or impact and wanted more information before deciding whether to support it as an effective climate change solution. The few who did like this policy felt that putting a price on carbon was necessary to force companies to reduce their emissions and operate in a more environmentally-friendly manner, and some were aware of the rebates and revenue-neutral approach, which they cited as positive features of the program. Very few others were aware of the rebate.

Additional ideas

Participants were asked if any other initiatives, in their view, should be on the list. The most common suggestions focused on investments in public transit and more measures and regulations to reduce waste, including more recycling, more waste reduction by manufacturers, less consumer packaging, and greater production and consumption of more durable goods versus cheap, throw-away products. Some also mentioned stricter environmental regulations for industries such as mining and agriculture.

Carbon Pricing Rates

Participants in all groups were provided with some background on the Government of Canada's carbon pricing program, including the rate per tonne of carbon emissions. All groups were told that the rate was currently at $20 per tonne and would gradually increase to $50 in 2022, at which point the federal government would have to decide whether to continue to increase the price on carbon, freeze it at $50, lower it, or eliminate it entirely.

Asked for their recommendations, participants had mixed views about what the federal government should do. Irrespective of their opinions, however, most participants emphasized their lack of information about the effectiveness of the program. Most wanted to know if the program was working to reduce emissions and to what extent, if any, it was having negative impacts on consumer costs, businesses, jobs and the economy. This perceived lack of knowledge, and the many questions that participants had about the program, appeared to be decisive factors for most in recommending that the government either eliminate, freeze or lower the rates.

The most common recommendation, overall, by a small margin, was to freeze the rate at $50 per tonne. This was a prevalent response among participants, especially in Moncton and Regina, who felt ambivalent about the program and/or wanted the government to re-evaluate at this point to ensure that the price on carbon was working as planned. Some were hopeful that consumers, companies and the Canadian economy would adapt to the carbon pricing, and that the program would be successful

at raising awareness, changing behaviour, and reducing emissions. But they were not sure. And many were concerned about potential negative effects on the economy, jobs, or consumer costs. Most of these participants did not want to recommend eliminating the program or lowering the price, but they did not want to recommend increasing the price, either, just in case there were issues. Most felt that freezing the rate was a good compromise or short-term solution that would allow for a fact-based assessment of the program. Most of these participants wanted to see some evidence of outcomes before deciding whether changes should be made.

Most other participants were about equally split between recommending that the federal government eliminate the program or increase the rate. Those who recommended a rate increase were primarily in Nanaimo, Montreal and, to a lesser extent, Regina. They supported the goals of the program and felt that the price had to be high enough to induce behaviour change by making pollution unaffordable and creating an incentive for people and companies to change their behaviour. Some said they assumed that the money collected would go towards further efforts to reduce emissions, which they supported, and that the pricing mechanism would shift investments toward new energy alternatives and efficiencies by making better choices more attractive. A few felt that the current rate was likely a minimum of what was required and had to be increased to work, if only to keep pace with inflation.

Those who recommended eliminating the program tended to think about it as a tax and added cost to them, which they opposed. Some felt that the program was not a good or workable idea, in principle, either because affordable oil and gas was needed, in their view, or because the program's effectiveness would be hard to measure or could not rival the benefits of having more net personal income. Many others, however, said they were uncertain of the program's impact and effectiveness. Over the course of the discussion, a number of these participants indicated that they might be more open to keeping the program if they knew that it worked, how well it worked, and where the money was going.

There were also a number of participants who recommended that the government lower the rate in 2022. These participants were concerned about negative impacts of the carbon pricing on costs for consumers and businesses, as well as jobs and the economy, overall. They felt it would be a good idea for the federal government to ease up on the rates and give consumers, in particular, a break. Like those who recommended freezing the rates, these participants felt that the government should re-evaluate the program's effectiveness.

Personal Actions to Reduce Emissions

Most participants said that they were making efforts to reduce their emissions and had changed their behaviours to some extent in support of that goal. The most common mentions focussed on efforts to improve transportation choices, recycle, and make choices and purchases to reduce waste and lower household energy consumption.

Many said that they were driving less and either taking public transportation more or choosing to walk and bike instead. Some referenced carpooling, living closer to work, or teleworking. A few mentioned purchasing smaller and more gas-efficient vehicles or getting rid of second cars.

Recycling was also a very common mention, along with other measures to reduce waste, such as buying in bulk, purchasing more durable goods, buying used versus new, and avoiding single use plastics. Many participants indicated that they were avoiding plastic bottles and shopping bags, in particular, and had found alternatives. A few participants also indicated that they had reduced their consumption overall.

A wide number of participants indicated that they were doing more to reduce energy use in their homes or increase their household energy efficiency. Most were general mentions or included references to using less heat, hydro and air conditioning. Specific actions, cited less frequently, included putting the thermostat on a timer, using electricity at off-peak hours, purchasing LED light bulbs, and improving insulation. Only a few mentioned initiatives such as purchasing solar panels or a high-performance furnace.

Public Education to Reduce Carbon Footprint

Participants were quite split in their views about the value of public education efforts aimed at them or as part of a strategy to get Canadians to reduce their own carbon footprint. Some were interested in these kinds of efforts and felt that they would be useful and effective in changing people's behaviour, including their own, if designed properly. These participants felt that public behaviour change could, in turn, have a significant positive impact on the environment and efforts to reduce emissions. Others did not share that view. They felt that a lack of knowledge and education was not necessarily the issue, and that other barriers existed to behaviour change among the public, including psychological ones like resistance, denial or habit, or more practical ones like cost and convenience.

Asked if they had a good idea of what their own carbon footprint was, most admitted that they did not know enough (or anything) about their own carbon emissions. Some identified this as a gap and expressed unprompted interest in finding out more in order to assist with their efforts to reduce their footprint. Others felt that they had enough of an idea of where they stood, based on their energy use and behaviours. Others said that they did not want to know because they felt that they were already doing what they could and were unprepared, unwilling, or unable to do more.

Similarly, when asked, participants had mixed reactions to the idea of using an online calculator to measure their own emissions and access tips for how to reduce them. Some felt it was probably a good idea and that they might use this kind of resource. Others were strongly receptive and felt this could be an interesting and useful tool for them and others to raise their awareness and prime them to do more, while helping them save money. Quite a few participants, however, were at least somewhat resistant to the idea of using an online calculator for various reasons. Some felt this kind of resource was already available to those who were interested. Others were skeptical that it would be reliable or accurate, and some were of the opinion that it would be too complicated or time consuming. Some reiterated that they did not want or need this kind of resource, either because they were already making responsible choices, in their view, or were averse to making additional changes that might be inconvenient or reduce their quality of life.

That said, a number of participants who were initially resistant to the idea of an online carbon calculator grew more receptive to the idea over the course of the discussion, as others expressed enthusiasm for it. Quite a few participants had unprompted suggestions that included developing a mobile app, creating social media components so people could share and compare their results, and making the calculator visual, engaging, and fun.

Some who were resistant to the idea of using an online carbon calculator were more receptive to the idea of being able to access tips online for reducing their carbon emissions. A number of participants seemed to like the idea of a simple, well-designed, and easy-to-use online resource offering this kind of information. Across groups, participants came up with a broad range of ideas for what to include. Among them, participants wanted to know what they should be aiming for and what the benchmarks were for responsible energy use based on variables like family size, dwelling, and location. They wanted to know what the big culprits were for personal or household emissions, where the greatest and easiest improvements could be made, how various options compared, in terms of costs and benefits, and how much each step would contribute to reducing their footprint.

Some wanted to know, for instance, how much of a difference it would make the over the course of a year if they used an electric vehicle versus a gas-powered one, or took public transit instead of driving, washed dishes by hand instead of using the dishwasher, or bought local versus imported products. Some wanted to know how different environmentally conscious choices compared to one another, such as an electric car versus a fuel efficient one, or how quickly investments in more energy efficient products, appliances, and vehicles would pay for themselves. A number of participants had questions about household heating, in particular, and wanted to know the most efficient and cost-effective options suited to their location and climate. In Whitehorse, in particular, some wanted to know about the best choice for their climate and location, and how a furnace or wood burning stove might compare.

Many participants expressed interest in being able to get comparative data, and not just with regard to the various choices and products available to them to reduce their carbon footprint. Many wanted to know how their personal carbon footprint might compare with others. A number of participants expressed interest in finding out how their city and province compared with others, or how Canada compared to the rest of the world.

Asked directly if they thought that a strategy to educate Canadians about how to reduce their footprint would be an effective way to reduce overall carbon emissions in Canada, responses remained mixed. Many thought that it would be helpful, at least, to not only improve awareness and understanding but to remind people of the role they can play and keep that top of mind. While some offered, unprompted, that large industrial polluters, in their view, were the real problem, they also felt that it was necessary for individuals to do their part to create the kind of social shift needed. Some felt that it was important to focus on small, achievable steps to keep people motivated and engaged. A few said it was important to get the campaign into schools to inculcate younger generations and promote long-term shifts in attitudes and behaviours.

Others were less enthusiastic about the value of this type of campaign. They felt that the information was already out there and that most people either already knew the basics or had easy access to that information. They felt that the bigger problem was mindset and resistance to change, which would not necessarily be affected through a public education campaign, in their view. Some felt that people either lacked the intrinsic motivation to make the changes necessary, or faced other barriers like cost and inconvenience.

Asked to consider whether a large number of average Canadians changing their behaviours in small ways or a small number of big polluters changing their behaviours in major ways would do more to help the environment, participants, again, had mixed views. Overall, more participants felt that few big polluters changing in major ways would have the biggest impact, compared to a large number of Canadians making small changes. But a significant number of participants had the opposite view.

Those who felt that large polluters could have the greatest impact tended to view them as the main source of emissions and biggest problem. Many also felt that it was easier and faster for government to attempt to change the behaviour of a small group of large players than that of millions of people. Some also said that large companies, in their view, had the capacity to find innovative ways of making changes quickly, and were uniquely positioned to stop pollution at the source, cut off supply, and force the market place to shift. Many of these participants said they had limited faith in either the willingness or ability of the public to make the changes required as quickly or readily as needed.

Those who felt that average Canadians could have a greater impact by undertaking small measures en masse, characterised individual behaviours as adding up to either considerable pollution or potential reductions, depending on the direction of the effort. Most of these participants felt that there was significant room for changes to be made by most Canadians and that shifting attitudes and mindsets of individuals would cause a more fundamental shift in the culture and create a virtuous cycle that would lead to greater public acceptance and change, and compel companies to follow suit and align their practices with a stronger public ethos.

Western Issues (Regina)

Exercise: Relationship between Government of Canada and Saskatchewan

Participants in the Regina groups were asked to write down on a sheet of paper words that they would use to describe the relationship between the Government of Canada and their province.

Most felt that Saskatchewan was neglected or overlooked by the federal government in favour of other provinces, especially Ontario and Quebec, where the majority of Canada's population was located. Many commented on a "disconnect" or distance between their province and the federal government in Ottawa. Participants commonly described Saskatchewan as forgotten, ignored,

irrelevant or disrespected, and some described the relationship with the federal government as strained, contentious, or lacking in cooperation.

When asked, most said that their province was treated unfairly by the federal government in their view. Participants pointed to a perceived lack of investment and support for Saskatchewan's economy and industries, preferential treatment for central Canada, and an anti-Western bias, symbolized by transfer payments that in their view unfairly benefitted Ontario and Quebec.

When asked what the federal government could do to demonstrate that they were in touch with the concerns of their province, participants in Regina said they wanted what they described as more equal treatment, based on a sense that Saskatchewan did not receive the same kind of investment and support as other provinces. They also wanted to see more interaction and collaboration between the Saskatchewan and federal governments.

TMX Pipeline

In addition to the relationship between the Government of Canada and their province, the Regina groups included discussion of a set of specific issues affecting Western Canada, the Trans Mountain Expansion (TMX) Pipeline being one of them.

Only a few participants in these groups had heard about the pipeline. Most of these participants had very superficial knowledge of the project and some were familiar just with the name. The few who knew something about the project felt that the pipeline would likely not be built on schedule, given the kinds of delays and opposition it had already encountered.

Equalization Payments

Most of the men were familiar with the term 'equalization payments', but only a few of the women said they were aware of the program. Among those who knew about it, few felt they could describe how it worked with much confidence or accuracy. Most of the explanations provided were general, focussed on pooling provincial contributions based on income or GDP and taking money from the 'have' provinces and giving it to 'have nots'. A few felt that the system should be changed based on a sense that Saskatchewan was not benefiting from this arrangement or getting the same kind of investment as other provinces. Due to their lack of knowledge about how the system of equalization payments worked, no one had any concrete suggestions for how it might be changed or improved.

China's Boycott of the Canadian Canola Industry

There was mixed awareness of this issue in Regina, with participants split between those who had heard something and those who had heard nothing about the issue. Most did not know any of the details beyond headlines they had seen in the media, but a few felt it was part of a larger diplomatic dispute between Canada and China that was related to the house arrest of a Chinese business executive. A couple of participants said they had heard something about China raising issues with the

quality of Canada's product as well. Few were aware of the regional impact the boycott was having or what the federal government had been doing in response to the issue, either with respect to support for farmers or its relationship with China.

Participants were provided with some background on the issue, for clarity, and then asked for their opinion about what the Government of Canada should do. They were given three options to consider:

- Make concessions so that China will buy our canola again;
- Retaliate against China by imposing our own sanctions on their products; or
- Continue to financially support farmers while trying to negotiate a solution with China that does not involve concessions or retaliation.

Most felt that Canada should choose the last option, and continue to negotiate with China, without retaliation or concessions, while continuing to support farmers, which they widely felt to be the safest and most constructive option.

With respect to making concessions, a couple of participants said that this might be the pragmatic option, given the size of the Chinese market and the country's importance to Canada as a trading partner. But most felt that it was simply a bad idea that would hurt Canadian interests and embolden China to exploit Canada's willingness to capitulate. A couple of participants opted for retaliation, but most felt this would be counterproductive, given Canada's size, serving only to escalate the dispute and lead to further retaliation from China.

Top Federal Priority for Saskatchewan

Of the various issues discussed with these groups that specifically affect Western Canada – the TMX pipeline, equalization payments, and China's boycott of Canola – participants were asked to select one of them as their top priority for the Government of Canada.

Despite many having little previous awareness or understanding of the program, most chose equalization payments. The rationale given was the feeling that Saskatchewan was not getting enough support, in general, for its economy and industries from the federal government or, in the view of some, as much as other provinces. A few selected the TMX pipeline, feeling that the oil sector was important to livelihoods in the province. And a few selected Canola negotiations as an important for agriculture, the economy, and trade with China.

Frontier Mine (Moncton, Montreal, York Region)

A more in-depth discussion of the Frontier Mine project was conducted in York Region, Moncton and Montreal. Note that on February 23, 2020, Teck Resources made the decision to withdraw its

application for the Frontier oilsands mine. This decision came after the focus groups in these locations had been held.

Most of the participants had not previously heard of the Frontier Mine. Participants were provided with the following description before being asked their opinions about it:

"The Frontier Mine, which was first proposed in 2011, would be the largest oil sands mine in history if approved by the federal government. This project could create as many as 7,500 new construction jobs in Alberta, but it would also be a major source of greenhouse gas emissions and could jeopardize Canada's ability to meet international commitments to reduce pollution."

Views on Approving/Rejecting the Teck Frontier Mine

Based on the description above, participants were asked if the federal government should approve the project, reject the project, or approve it only if there were commitments made by the company to ensure the environmental impact was limited.

Response was mixed. There was widespread opposition in Montreal, while in York most felt that the federal government should approve the project with commitments in place. In Moncton, participants were split between those two choices.

Economic benefits, job creation and the need for oil were the main reasons given by those who sided with approval for the project. Most were concerned about the emissions, and Canada's efforts to meet its targets, but felt that a balance between economic and environmental interests could be achieved with sufficient effort and oversight.

Among those who opposed the project, most felt that such a large mine and the emissions it was expected to produce were a move in the wrong direction and at odds with the federal government's commitment to reduce greenhouse gases and be a global leader on the environment. Some felt that 7500 jobs were not enough to justify the costs to the environment. Many said that if jobs were the issue, it would be far better to create them by investing in sustainable industries and technology that provide solutions to pollution, instead of adding to the problem. A number of participants in Moncton said they had little faith in commitments from companies, especially in the oil and gas sector.

Participants were asked what kinds of conditions they would like to see the company meet before proceeding with the project. Many were unsure, especially in York and Moncton, where very few ideas were offered. Most felt that keeping emissions down was imperative but only a few had suggestions, which included investing in technology to reduce emissions or in green initiatives such as tree planting to offset pollution. In Montreal, participants suggested a wider range of measures, including a monetary security deposit against commitments, careful regulatory monitoring and enforcement, independent evaluations of performance, limiting the scope of the mine and its activities, and ensuring that the company restored nature to its previous state.

Asked if a company pledge to off-set emissions to net-zero by 2050 would change how they felt about the project, a few participants said it would. In most cases, those who had already supported approval

of the mine said they felt better about that choice. A few women in Montreal who had previously recommended that the mine be rejected said they would change their mind if net zero could be achieved, given that we still need oil and are in the midst of a transition. Most others, however, said their views were unchanged. Some were confused about what net-zero meant and how it would be achieved or calculated, while others were more concerned about the timeline and felt that 30 years was simply too far away and that for a net-zero commitment to be persuasive to them it would have to happen sooner.

Negotiating a Deal with Alberta

Participants were told that another option for the federal government might be to negotiate with the Province of Alberta to find a compromise that would allow the province to get the economic boost of the new mine in exchange for participation in national programs to combat climate change. Participants were shown the following list:

- A commitment that Alberta set an ambitious limit on the amount of emissions the province can produce that would decrease over time
- A promise that Alberta would reach net-zero carbon emissions by 2050
- A promise that Albertan oil companies reach net-zero carbon emissions by 2050
- A commitment that Alberta won't oppose the national price on carbon pollution
- A commitment that Alberta plant 1 billion trees to offset emissions from the project
- An agreement to put in place an enforcement mechanism that would penalize Alberta or any companies that fail to meet these commitments

Participants were asked if they would support the federal government approving the Frontier Mine in exchange for a deal with Alberta that contained most or all of the elements above. Some said they would support this deal, but mostly those who previously supported approval of the mine with conditions. They felt this latest scenario was a good approach, or at least good enough. A number of participants in the women's group in Montreal, who previously opposed the mine (and had already changed their minds in regard to a net-zero pledge by 2050), said they would support the deal with these conditions with Alberta, as well. In the other groups, none who had opposed the project previously changed their minds when considering these new conditions. The primary issue for most was what they felt were vague promises or half measures on a number of key points, instead of firm, legally-binding commitments. A number of participants conveyed skepticism about follow through or outcomes under these terms. Even among those who said they would support this deal, there was a desire to see stronger environmental commitments from Alberta and the industry.

Exercise: Conditions

From the list of above, participants were asked to select and rank their top two conditions for a deal with Alberta on the Frontier Mine. They were also asked to select their bottom two choices and explain their selections.

Results below are rank ordered based on the number of people who selected each condition as their top choice. Overall, participants liked the priorities that included *commitments* to emissions reductions, as well as references to enforcement and penalties. They tended to dislike *promises* or what they viewed as vague or ambiguous language. The year 2050 felt far off for many, and most did not like references to carbon pricing.

- **An agreement to put in place an enforcement mechanism that would strictly penalize Alberta or any companies that fail to meet these commitments.** This was the top choice among the most participants and was liked for its decisiveness and focus on enforcement and penalties. Many stressed the importance of including these elements in conditions for the project. They liked the accountability and implied transparency, which they felt were important features and provided some sense of assurances that there would be follow-through. Some wanted penalties to be tough, and most felt that penalties and an overall enforcement mechanism were important parts of guaranteeing any deal.

- **A commitment that Alberta set an ambitious limit on the amount of emissions the province can produce that would decrease over time.** Participants also placed this condition at the top of their priorities. They liked the language of "commitment" in relation to the agreement on emissions reductions. Some liked the setting of an "ambitious" limit on emissions. Some liked that the province of Alberta was making the commitment, and not industry. Others felt that the term "ambitious" was vague and its meaning open to interpretation. Most wanted to see a sense of firmer commitments being made on emissions reductions. Many were concerned about follow-through and accountability.

- **A promise that Alberta would reach net-zero carbon emissions by 2050:** Responses to this condition were more mixed, and fewer placed it in their top two choices than the others above. Some did not understand what "net-zero" meant, which hampered their initial understanding of this commitment. But many liked the idea as it was discussed by other participants explaining why they had placed this condition in their top two. Some liked that this condition was specific, included a target, and was moving in the right direction. A number of participants liked that the province as a whole was making this commitment, but they did not like the language of "promises" which they felt was too soft or vague. A number of participants also had concerns with the time horizon and felt that 2050 was too far off.

- **A promise that Albertan oil companies reach net-zero carbon emissions by 2050.** Even fewer participants selected this one in their top two. Some placed it at the bottom. Again, "net-zero" was not immediately understood, and while participants liked the idea once they had a definition, they had mixed views about whether oil companies and not government

should be the ones making the commitments. Some thought it made more sense for the companies producing the emissions to be the ones accountable for reducing them, being transparent, and paying penalties. Others liked the authority and weight of making the provincial government of Alberta the party to the deal. The same issue with the language choice of "promise" versus "commitment" came up in relation to this condition, as did the long-time horizon for meeting goals.

- **A commitment that Alberta won't oppose the national price on carbon pollution:** Participants were somewhat split on this condition. Some liked it and felt that it was important to have the Province of Alberta and Government of Canada working together on emissions reductions strategies and targets. Some did not like the reference to carbon pricing and a program that they felt was contentious or possibly ineffective.

- **A commitment that Alberta plant 1 billion trees to offset emissions from the project**: Very few selected this among their top or bottom picks. Those who felt it was important commented on the immediacy of tree planting, and on the tangible, specific, and verifiable nature of the undertaking. They liked that it could be done right away and was something positive. They also understood the role that trees play in removing carbon dioxide from the air. Most of these participants were in York. Others were not sure how effective this kind of initiative would be. They did not find it contentious or objectionable in any respect, it just had less salience and appeal for those in Moncton and Montreal.

Canada Student Loans (Moncton, Nanaimo)

Awareness and Understanding of Canada Student Loans

There was strong awareness of this program by name among participants in both locations. Most had heard of it and were at least somewhat familiar with the program and its features. Top of mind, however, most associated the program with debt and a large financial burden carried over many years that could be difficult to pay off. Negative comments were the first response participants tended to give in these groups. Beyond that, most described the program as a loan to help cover the costs of post-secondary education, tied to financial need, and determined either by student income, parental income or both. Most said that they had a fairly good idea of what the program entailed, although there was some confusion about whether the program offered grants as well as loans. Some described the loans as being interest-free while students were enrolled in school, followed by a grace period post-graduation and, many felt, a better rate of interest than would be offered on a regular loan. Some said, in their understanding, that the rate of interest and repayment schedule would be tied to income and ability to pay. Other than some frustration about the need to assume and carry debt, many felt that the program was valuable, and some commented that it was fair, in their view, or better than in the US.

Exercise: Naming

Participants were told that the Government of Canada was considering changing the name of the program. All participants were provided with the following list of potential names:

- Canada Student Grants and Loans (Subventions et prêts canadiens d'études)
- Canada Student Support (Soutien aux étudiants canadiens)
- Canada Student Assistance (Aide canadienne aux études)
- Canada Student Financial Assistance (Aide canadienne au financement des études)

From the list above, participants were asked to identify their first and second choice as well as any names they disliked for the program. The following results are rank-ordered based on number one selections by the largest groups of participants. They are accompanied by explanations provided by those who placed them in the top spot and also include comments regarding dislikes.

Canada Student Grants and Loans (Subventions et prêts canadiens d'études)

This was the top pick by the most participants who liked this name for its simplicity and clear description of the program. Some liked the fact that grants were referenced, and that they were offered through the program, as they were previously unsure about that and felt this was a good idea. Among the few who disliked this name there was some comment that adding the new reference to grants might be misleading, as they assumed that very few would qualify for a grant and that most of the financial support offered through the program would be in the form of a loan. Consistent with some of the earlier frustration expressed about debt, some felt that the loans portion should be eliminated from the program (and the name), and that all the financial support offered should be in the form of a grant.

Canada Student Financial Assistance (Aide canadienne au financement des études)

This was a close second. Participants liked that this name was short and to the point, in their view. They liked the phrase and focus on "financial assistance". On the other hand, the few who disliked this name felt that the phrase might be interpreted as including money or support beyond just grants and loans, which, in their view, might be confusing or misleading.

Canada Student Assistance (Aide canadienne aux études)

Very few selected this as their top or second choice. Most felt that the reference to "assistance" was vague and made the name seem incomplete, confusing or imprecise. Many more disliked this name than placed it in to their top two.

Canada Student Support (Soutien aux étudiants canadiens)

This name received the same kind of scores and comments as the one above, with many saying that "support" was even more imprecise and confusing. Some felt that this implied an offer of social assistance or employment and job search support.

Asked to provide any suggested changes or improvements to the names above, most participants commented on the plan to change the name instead, saying that they did not support it. Many agreed that the name change was unnecessary, in their view. They felt that the current name was fine and that none of the new options significantly improved on it to justify a project that they felt would involve a great deal of cost, time and effort by government.

Coronavirus (Montreal, York Region, Regina, Nanaimo)

Awareness and Understanding of the Coronavirus

All participants had heard about the coronavirus. Most were highly attuned to the issue and had been following it in the media to some extent. Quite a few said they had actively sought out information.

While the degree of information or engagement varied, most were aware of key details and had a basic understanding of the story and set of issues related to the virus. These included its lack of available treatment, its potential threat, its country of origin, spread, and main methods of transmission and prevention.

Specifically, most participants generally understood that this was a respiratory illness similar in transmission and symptoms to a cold or flu, for which there was no treatment or vaccine at present. They knew it had started in China before spreading to other countries and eventually arriving in Canada. Most knew it was being monitored and prepared for by governments and health organizations in Canada and around the world as a potentially major public health threat. Most also knew that there were growing cases and fatalities around the world.

Participants had heard about Canadians being affected, including travellers abroad, some of whom had been brought home on a charter flight by the federal government. They knew about a number of cases being confirmed in Canada, and about measures like screening and quarantines being put in place to help identify and contain the virus.

In terms of transmission and prevention, most were aware that hand washing, not touching your face, and staying away from people with signs of illness had been identified as key measure that individuals should employ to reduce the risk of contracting and spreading the virus.

Confusion and Questions

Not all of the information participants had was consistent, certain or accurate. Many had questions and knowledge gaps on at least some issues, or spoke about sensational or unreliable media coverage. But while most acknowledged some confusion no one expressed an urgent need for clarity or information,

in the absence of news, in light of what they felt was a low level of risk to them personally or Canada as a whole.

Many said that they wanted to be aware of any changes to the status of the virus, its spread, and risk to Canada, themselves and their families. Some wanted to know more about the risks associated with travel, or if there were updates to information about transmission, prevention, or treatment. Some were curious about the origin of the virus and heard that it was associated with a live animal market and/or the consumption of animals like snakes or bats. In light of this, a few wondered about transmission from animals, food, or pets.

There was some question among participants about how fatal the virus was. Some questioned whether the virus was more or less fatal than SARS or the flu. A few said they did not trust information coming out of China and wondered if the severity and risks were being under reported.

Asked directly what kind of additional information they would like to know about, participants mostly said they wanted to be up to date and aware of any changes and new information concerning spread, severity, risks, prevention, and treatment.

Sources of Information

Participants were hearing about the coronavirus from a wide range of sources. This included traditional media such as CBC, CTV, Global, and CP24, as well as other mainstream national and international outlets accessed via social media postings, and new aggregators like Google and Apple. Many mentioned word of mouth with family, friends and colleagues, as well as communications some were receiving from schools and employers. Sources also included social media posts directly from health care professionals, commentators, officials and organizations, as well as government leaders.

At least a few participants in each group said they had sought out information about the coronavirus, with numbers highest in Nanaimo. In most cases participants said they were looking for basic information about symptoms, transmission and ways to be safe as well as updates on current cases in China, Canada and other countries. Some were interested in fatalities or updates from the World Health Organization, governments and others on the latest developments and assessments of the virus as well as preparedness and containment strategies. Some were looking for information on treatments and causes.

With regard to sources of information used for proactive searches, some mentioned mainstream media outlets, such as CBC and CTV, the World Health Organization, social media and Google searches, but many could not recall the source. Some felt that they were getting information from a range of national and international sources, most of them authoritative media or official organizations.

Asked where they would look for information to stay up to date on news regarding spread, severity, risks, prevention, and treatment, participants mentioned mainstream media and Google, as well as the World Health Organization, the Government of Canada in general, and Health Canada specifically.

Seriousness in Canada

Most felt that coronavirus was an issue to be taken seriously but not a particularly serious issue in Canada. Participants pointed to a low incidence of cases, mostly among travellers from Asia, and felt the issue was being managed fairly well by government and health officials. Only a few were concerned that it might get worse and pose a greater risk to Canadians. Most, however, had the sense that the virus was plateauing or contained, overall, and would not affect Canada or Canadians in a serious way.

Similarly, asked how personally concerned they were about the virus, most participants said they were not very concerned. Some admitted to some heightened worry and interest in the news about the virus, but those who were most worried were focused on the prospect that the virus could get worse, potentially, and at that point start to pose a real concern.

Many were confident that, even if the virus did get worse, governments and public health officials had measures in place to respond effectively, including public communications, screening and quarantines. And many felt that the illness was mostly not severe. Some had questions about travel to Canada from affected regions and whether that constituted a concern and should be restricted. A number of people associated heightened personal risk with travel, airports and airplanes, especially in regard to trips to affected regions.

While few said they were concerned about the risks to themselves, a number of participants said they had changed their behaviours to help avoid it, especially in York, Montreal and Nanaimo. Among most, this entailed more frequent hand washing and sanitizing, primarily, as well as wiping down surfaces, such as office desks and grocery cart handles, and avoiding handrails or door knobs in public. A few mentioned having worn a mask and some said they were more conscious of risks and taking precautions while travelling. A few admitted that they had avoided or kept a distance from Chinese people, and some mentioned anti-Chinese racism as a concern. Many said they were not making any changes to their behaviour and did not feel at risk, or were being only slightly more conscious of already established behaviours to avoid flus and colds.

Government of Canada Response

Most said that the Government of Canada was doing a good job at informing and protecting Canadians with regards to the coronavirus. While some felt they were a bit slow to respond initially, especially with regard to arrivals of travellers from China, most agreed that the federal government had been prudent and measured in its response overall. Most trusted the ability of the Canadian government, public health officials, and health care professionals to manage and monitor the issue effectively. Many felt that the government was being transparent and reacting appropriately. Some thought it was too early to evaluate the government response and said they had to wait and see.

Asked what more the Government of Canada could do in their opinion, participants wanted officials to keep the public informed and continue to monitor and manage the threats and contribute to the effort to develop a vaccine. Some mentioned measures like quarantines being implemented, as needed, and

a few felt that that the government should look at restricting incoming travel, from China, in particular, and closing the borders if necessary.

Appendix A – Recruiting Scripts

THE STRATEGIC COUNSEL 25

Privy Council Office
Recruiting Script – February 2020
(Feb. 6, 2020)

Recruitment Specifications Summary

- Total of 12 groups
- Each group is expected to last for two hours
- Recruit 10 participants for 8 to show
- Incentives will be $90 per person
- Groups split by gender. Ensure good mix by age (all 18+), marital status, education and income.

Specifications for the focus groups are as follows:

GROUP	LOCATION		LANG.	DATE	TIME	COMPOSITION	MODERATOR
1	York Region	**Novotel North York** 3 Park Home Ave North York, ON M2N 6L3	English	Tues. Feb. 11th	5:30-7:30	Women	T. Woolstencroft
2					8:00-10:00	Men	
3	Montreal	**MBA Recherche** 1470 Peel St, Suite 800 Montreal, QC H3A 1T1	French	Wed. Feb. 12th	5:30-7:30	Women	M. Proulx
4					7:45-9:45	Men	
5	Moncton	**Narrative Research** 68 Highfield St, Suite 101 Moncton, NB E1C 5N3	English	Thurs. Feb. 13th	5:30-7:30	Women	T. Woolstencroft
6					7:45-9:45	Men	
7	Nanaimo	**Vancouver Island Conference Centre** 101 Gordon Street Nanaimo, BC V9R 5J8	English	Tues. Feb. 18th	5:00-7:00	Women	D. Nixon
8					7:30-9:30	Men	
9	Whitehorse	**Coast High Country Inn** 4051-4th Ave Whitehorse, YT Y1A 1H1	English	Thurs. Feb. 20th	5:00-7:00	Women	D. Nixon
10					7:30-9:30	Men	
11	Regina	**Meetings by Tangerine** 2230 14th Avenue Regina, SK S4P 0X8	English	Mon. Feb. 24th	5:30-7:30	Women	D. Nixon
12					8:00-10:00	Men	

THE STRATEGIC COUNSEL 25

Recruiting Script

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is **[RECRUITER NAME]**. I'm calling from The Strategic Counsel, a national public opinion research firm, on behalf of the Government of Canada/Bonjour, je m'appelle **[NOM DU RECRUTEUR].** Je vous téléphone du Strategic Counsel, une entreprise nationale de recherche sur l'opinion publique, pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada.

Would you prefer to continue in English or French?/Préfériez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais?
[CONTINUE IN LANGUAGE OF PREFERENCE]

RECORD LANGUAGE AND CONTINUE

English
French **GROUP 3 OR 4 ONLY IN MONTREAL**

On behalf of the Government of Canada, we're organizing a series of focus group discussions to explore current issues of interest to Canadians.

The format is a "round table" discussion, led by an experienced moderator. Participants will be given a cash honorarium in appreciation of their time.

Your participation is completely voluntary and all your answers will be kept confidential. We are only interested in hearing your opinions - no attempt will be made to sell or market you anything. The report that is produced from the series of discussion groups we are holding will not contain comments that are attributed to specific individuals.

But before we invite you to attend, we need to ask you a few questions to ensure that we get a good mix/variety of people in each of the groups. May I ask you a few questions?

Yes **CONTINUE**
No **THANK AND END**

SCREENING QUESTIONS

1. Have you, or has anyone in your household, worked for any of the following types of organizations in the last 5 years?

A market research firm	**THANK AND END**
A marketing, branding or advertising agency	**THANK AND END**
A magazine or newspaper	**THANK AND END**
A federal/provincial/territorial government department or agency	**THANK AND END**
A political party	**THANK AND END**
In public/media relations	**THANK AND END**
In radio/television	**THANK AND END**

No, none of the above **CONTINUE**

1a. **IN ALL LOCATIONS:** Are you a retired Government of Canada employee?

Yes **THANK AND END**
No **CONTINUE**

2. Gender: **DO NOT ASK. RECORD BY OBSERVATION.**

Male	**CONTINUE GROUP 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12**
Female	**CONTINUE GROUP 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11**

3. In which City do you reside?

Vaughan, Markham, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, King, Aurora, East Gwillimbury, Georgina	**+ FEMALE = GROUP 1** **+ MALE = GROUP 2**
Montreal	**+FRENCH + FEMALE = GROUP 3** **+FRENCH + MALE = GROUP 4**
Moncton	**+ FEMALE = GROUP 5** **+ MALE = GROUP 6**
Nanaimo (or surrounding area)	**+ FEMALE = GROUP 7** **+ MALE = GROUP 8**
Whitehorse (or surrounding area)	**+ FEMALE = GROUP 9** **+ MALE = GROUP 10**
Regina	**+ FEMALE = GROUP 11** **+ MALE = GROUP 12**
Other	**THANK AND END**
VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer	**THANK AND END**

PARTICIPANTS SHOULD RESIDE IN THE ABOVE-NOTED CENTERS PROPER.

3a. How long have you lived in [INSERT CITY]?

Less than two years	**THANK AND END**
Two years or more	**CONTINUE**
Don't know/Prefer not to answer	**THANK AND END**

4. Would you be willing to tell me in which of the following age categories you belong?

Under 18 years of age	**IF POSSIBLE, ASK FOR SOMEONE OVER 18 AND REINTRODUCE. OTHERWISE THANK AND END.**
18-24	**RECORD AND CONTINUE**

25-34	
35-44	
45-54	
55+	
VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer	**THANK AND END**

ENSURE A GOOD MIX OF AGES WITHIN EACH SUBGROUP.

5. Are you familiar with the concept of a focus group?

   Yes **CONTINUE**
   No **EXPLAIN THE FOLLOWING** "*a focus group consists of eight to ten participants and one moderator. During a two-hour session, participants are asked to discuss a wide range of issues related to the topic being examined.*"

6. How comfortable are you in expressing your views in public, reading written materials or looking at images projected onto a screen?

   Very Comfortable
   Somewhat Comfortable
   Somewhat Uncomfortable **THANK AND END**
   Very Uncomfortable **THANK AND END**

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

   Yes **CONTINUE**
   No **SKIP TO Q.11**

8. How long ago was the last focus group you attended?

   Less than 6 months ago **THANK AND END**
   More than 6 months ago **CONTINUE**

9. How many focus group discussions have you attended in the past 5 years?

   0-4 groups **CONTINUE**
   5 or more groups **THANK AND END**

10. And on what topics were they?
    TERMINATE IF ANY ON SIMILAR/SAME TOPIC

ADDITIONAL RECRUITING CRITERIA

Now we have just a few final questions before we give you the details of the focus group, including the time, date, and location.

11. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

    Grade 8 or less
    Some high school
    High school diploma or equivalent
    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
    VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer
    ENSURE A GOOD MIX.

12. Which of the following categories best describes your total household income? That is, the total income of all persons in your household combined, before taxes?

    Under $20,000
    $20,000 to just under $40,000
    $40,000 to just under $60,000
    $60,000 to just under $80,000
    $80,000 to just under $100,000
    $100,000 to just under $150,000
    $150,000 and above
    VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer
    ENSURE A GOOD MIX.

13. During the discussion, you could be asked to look at materials that are pinned up on a wall and to read handouts or other materials in print. You will also be asked to actively participate in a conversation about these materials. Can you think of any reason why you may have difficulty reading the materials or participating in the discussion? You may also be asked to write down a few thoughts on paper. Are you comfortable writing in (English/French)?
    TERMINATE IF RESPONDENT OFFERS ANY REASON SUCH AS SIGHT OR HEARING PROBLEM, A WRITTEN OR VERBAL LANGUAGE PROBLEM, A CONCERN WITH NOT BEING ABLE TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY OR IF YOU AS THE INTERVIEWER HAVE A CONCERN ABOUT THE PARTICIPANT'S ABILITY TO PARTICIPATE EFFECTIVELY.

14. The focus group discussion will be audio-taped and video-taped for research purposes only. The taping is conducted to assist our researchers in writing their report. Do you consent to being audio-taped and video-taped?
    Yes
    No **THANK AND END**

INVITATION

I would like to invite you to this focus group discussion, which will take place the evening of [INSERT DATE/TIME BASED ON GROUP # IN CHART ON PAGE 1]. The group will be two hours in length and you will receive $90 for

your participation. Please note that there may be observers from the Government of Canada at the group and that the discussion will be videotaped. By agreeing to participate, you have given your consent to these procedures. We will ask you to proide your explicit consent by signing a note to this effect when you arrive at the group.

Would you be willing to attend?

Yes	**CONTINUE**
No	**THANK AND END**

The group will be held at: [INSERT LOCATION]

We will be calling you back to verify the information given and will confirm this appointment the day before. May I please have your full name, a telephone number that is best to reach you at as well as your e-mail address if you have one so that I can send you the details for the group?

Name:
Telephone Number:
E-mail Address:

This is a firm commitment. If you anticipate anything preventing you from attending (either home or work-related), please let me know now and we will keep your name for a future study. If for any reason you are unable to attend, please let us know as soon as possible at [1-800-xxx-xxxx] so we can find a replacement.

We ask that you arrive 10-15 minutes prior to the beginning of the session and identify yourself to our staff who will gladly welcome you. Please bring photo identification with you, so that we make sure only people who have been invited participate in the group. You may be required to view some material during the course of the discussion. If you require glasses to do so, please be sure to have them handy at the time of the group.

Thank you very much for your time.

RECRUITED BY: _____
DATE RECRUITED: _____

THE STRATEGIC COUNSEL 25

Bureau du Conseil privé
Questionnaire de recrutement – février 2020
(6 février 2020)

Résumé des consignes de recrutement

- Total de 12 groupes.
- Durée prévue de chaque rencontre : deux heures.
- Recrutement de dix participants pour assurer la présence d'au moins huit personnes.
- L'incitatif sera de 90 $ par personne.
- Groupes distincts pour les hommes et les femmes. Groupes diversifiés en fonction de l'âge (18 ans et plus), de l'état matrimonial, de l'éducation et du revenu.

N^{O} DU GROUPE	LIEU		LANGUE	DATE	HEURE	COMPOSITION DU GROUPE	MODÉRATEUR
1	Région de York	**Novotel North York** 3 Park Home Ave North York, ON M2N 6L3	Anglais	Mercredi 8 février	5:30-7:30	Femmes	T. Woolstencroft
2					8:00-10:00	Hommes	
3	Montréal	**MBA Recherche** 1470 Peel St, Suite 800 Montreal, QC H3A 1T1	Français	Jeudi 9 février	5:30-7:30	Femmes	M. Proulx
4					7:45-9:45	Hommes	
5	Moncton	**Narrative Research** 68 Highfield St, Suite 101 Moncton, NB E1C 5N3	Anglais	Mardi 14 février	5:30-7:30	Femmes	T. Woolstencroft
6					7:45-9:45	Hommes	
7	Nanaimo	**Vancouver Island Conference Centre** 101 Gordon Street Nanaimo, BC V9R 5J8	Anglais	Lundi 20 février	5:00-7:00	Femmes	D. Nixon
8					7:30-9:30	Hommes	
9	Whitehorse	**Coast High Country Inn** 4051-4th Ave Whitehorse, YT Y1A 1H1	Anglais	Mercredi 22 février	5:00-7:00	Femmes	D. Nixon
10					7:30-9:30	Hommes	
11	Regina	**Meetings by Tangerine** 2230 14th Avenue Regina, SK S4P 0X8	Anglais	Jeudi 23 février	5:30-7:00	Femmes	D. Nixon
12					8:00-10:00	Hommes	

Questionnaire de recrutement

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is **[RECRUITER NAME]**. I'm calling from The Strategic Counsel, a national public opinion research firm, on behalf of the Government of Canada/Bonjour, mon nom est **[NOM DU RECRUTEUR].** Je vous appelle du Strategic Counsel, une entreprise nationale de recherche sur l'opinion publique, pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada.

Would you prefer to continue in English or French?/Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais ?
[CONTINUER DANS LA LANGUE PRÉFÉRÉE]

NOTER LA LANGUE ET CONTINUER

Anglais
Français **GROUPE 3 OU 4 SEULEMENT À MONTRÉAL**

Nous organisons, pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada, une série de groupes de discussion en vue d'explorer des questions d'actualité qui intéressent les Canadiens.

La rencontre prendra la forme d'une table ronde animée par un modérateur expérimenté. Les participants recevront un montant d'argent en remerciement de leur temps.

Votre participation est entièrement volontaire et toutes vos réponses seront confidentielles. Nous aimerions simplement connaître vos opinions : personne n'essaiera de vous vendre quoi que ce soit ou de promouvoir des produits. Notre rapport sur cette série de groupes de discussion n'attribuera aucun commentaire à une personne en particulier.

Avant de vous inviter à participer, je dois vous poser quelques questions qui nous permettront de former des groupes suffisamment diversifiés. Puis-je vous poser quelques questions ?

Oui **CONTINUER**
Non **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

QUESTIONS DE SÉLECTION

1. Est-ce que vous ou une personne de votre ménage avez travaillé pour l'un des types d'organisations suivants au cours des cinq dernières années ?

   Une société d'études de marché **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
   Une agence de commercialisation, de marque ou de publicité **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
   Un magazine ou un journal **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

Un ministère ou un organisme gouvernemental fédéral, provincial ou territorial	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Un parti politique	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Dans les relations publiques ou les relations avec les médias	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Dans le milieu de la radio ou de la télévision	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Non, aucune de ces réponses	**CONTINUER**

1a. **POUR TOUS LES LIEUX :** Êtes-vous un ou une employé(e) retraité(e) du gouvernement du Canada ?

Oui **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Non **CONTINUER**

2. Sexe : **NE PAS DEMANDER. NOTER SELON VOTRE OBSERVATION.**

Homme	**CONTINUER GROUPES 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12**
Femme	**CONTINUER GROUPES 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11**

3. Dans quelle ville habitez-vous ?

Vaughan, Markham, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, King, Aurora, East Gwillimbury, Georgina	**+ FEMME = GROUPE 1** **+ HOMME = GROUPE 2**
Montréal	**+ FRANÇAIS + FEMME = GROUPE 3** **+ FRANÇAIS + HOMME = GROUPE 4**
Moncton	**+ FEMME = GROUPE 5** **+ HOMME = GROUPE 6**
Nanaimo (ou les environs)	**+ FEMME = GROUPE 7** **+ HOMME = GROUPE 8**
Whitehorse (ou les environs)	**+ FEMME = GROUPE 9** **+ HOMME = GROUPE 10**
Regina	**+ FEMME = GROUPE 11** **+ HOMME = GROUPE 12**
Other	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Préfère ne pas répondre	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

LES PARTICIPANTS DOIVENT RÉSIDER DANS LESDITS CENTRES.

3a. Depuis combien de temps habitez-vous à [INSÉRER LE NOM DE LA VILLE] ?

Moins de deux ans	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Deux ans ou plus	**CONTINUER**
Ne sais pas/Préfère ne pas répondre	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

4. Seriez-vous prêt/prête à m'indiquer votre tranche d'âge dans la liste suivante ?

Moins de 18 ans	**SI POSSIBLE, DEMANDER À PARLER À UNE PERSONNE DE 18 ANS OU PLUS ET REFAIRE L'INTRODUCTION. SINON, REMERCIER ET CONCLURE.**
18 à 24 ans	**NOTER L'ÂGE ET CONTINUER**
25 à 34 ans	
35 à 44 ans	
45 à 54 ans	
55 ans ou plus	
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Préfère ne pas répondre	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

ASSURER UNE BONNE REPRÉSENTATION DES ÂGES DANS CHAQUE SOUS-GROUPE

5. Est-ce que vous connaissez le concept du « groupe de discussion » ?

   Oui **CONTINUER**
   Non **EXPLIQUER QUE** : *« un groupe de discussion se compose de huit à dix participants et d'un modérateur. Au cours d'une période de deux heures, les participants sont invités à discuter d'un éventail de questions reliées au sujet abordé ».*

6. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous à l'aise pour exprimer votre opinion en public, lire des documents, ou regarder des images projetées sur un écran ?

   Très à l'aise
   Assez à l'aise
   Assez mal à l'aise **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
   Très mal à l'aise **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

7. Avez-vous déjà participé à un groupe de discussion, à une entrevue ou à un sondage organisé à l'avance en contrepartie d'une somme d'argent ?

   Oui **CONTINUER**
   Non **PASSER À LA Q.11**

8. À quand remonte le dernier groupe de discussion auquel vous avez participé ?

   À moins de six mois, **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
   À plus de six mois, **CONTINUER**

9. À combien de groupes de discussion avez-vous participé au cours des cinq dernières années ?

0 à 4 groupes, **CONTINUER**
5 groupes ou plus **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

10. Et sur quels sujets portaient-ils ?
METTRE FIN À L'ENTRETIEN SI LES SUJETS ÉTAIENT LES MÊMES OU SEMBLABLES

CRITÈRES DE RECRUTEMENT SUPPLÉMENTAIRES :

Il me reste quelques dernières questions avant de vous donner les détails du groupe de discussion, comme l'heure, la date et le lieu.

11. Quel est le niveau de scolarité le plus élevé que vous avez atteint ?

École primaire
Études secondaires partielles
Diplôme d'études secondaires ou l'équivalent
Certificat ou diplôme d'apprenti inscrit ou d'une école de métiers
Certificat ou diplôme d'un collège, cégep ou autre établissement non universitaire
Certificat ou diplôme universitaire inférieur au baccalauréat
Baccalauréat
Diplôme d'études supérieur au baccalauréat
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE : Préfère ne pas répondre
ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE.

12. Laquelle des catégories suivantes décrit le mieux le revenu annuel total de votre ménage — c'est-à-dire le revenu cumulatif de l'ensemble des membres de votre ménage avant impôt ?

Moins de 20 000 $
20 000 $ à moins de 40 000 $
40 000 $ à moins de 60 000 $
60 000 $ à moins de 80 000 $
80 000 $ à moins de 100 000 $
100 000 $ à moins de 150 000 $
150 000 $ ou plus
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE : Préfère ne pas répondre
ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE.

13. Au cours de la discussion, vous pourriez devoir examiner du matériel affiché au mur et lire de la documentation imprimée. On vous demandera également de participer activement aux discussions portant sur ce matériel. Pensez-vous avoir de la difficulté, pour une raison ou une autre, à lire les documents ou à participer à la discussion ? On pourrait aussi vous demander de noter quelques réflexions sur papier. Êtes-vous à l'aise pour écrire (en français/en anglais) ?
CONCLURE L'ENTRETIEN SI LE RÉPONDANT SIGNALE UN PROBLÈME DE VISION OU D'AUDITION, UN PROBLÈME DE LANGUE PARLÉE OU ÉCRITE, S'IL CRAINT DE NE POUVOIR COMMUNIQUER

EFFICACEMENT, OU SI VOUS, EN TANT QU'INTERVIEWEUR, AVEZ DES DOUTES QUANT À SA CAPACITÉ DE PARTICIPER EFFICACEMENT AUX DISCUSSIONS.

14. La discussion sera enregistrée sur bandes audio et vidéo, strictement aux fins de la recherche. Les enregistrements aideront nos chercheurs à rédiger leur rapport. Est-ce que vous consentez à ce qu'on vous enregistre sur bandes audio et vidéo ?
    Oui
    Non **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

INVITATION

J'aimerais vous inviter à ce groupe de discussion, qui aura lieu le [DONNER LA DATE ET L'HEURE EN FONCTION DU N^{O} DE GROUPE INDIQUÉ DANS LE TABLEAU, PAGE 1]. La rencontre durera deux heures et vous recevrez 90 $ pour votre participation. Veuillez noter que des observateurs du gouvernement du Canada pourraient être présents au groupe et que la discussion sera enregistrée sur bande vidéo. En acceptant de participer, vous avez donné votre consentement à ces modalités. Nous vous demanderons de nous donner votre consentement explicite en signant une confirmation à cet effet à votre arrivée dans le groupe.

Est-ce que vous accepteriez de participer ?

Oui	**CONTINUER**
Non	**REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

Le groupe de discussion aura lieu à : [DONNER L'ADRESSE]

Nous vous rappellerons la veille de la rencontre pour confirmer le rendez-vous et les renseignements fournis. Puis-je avoir votre nom complet, le numéro de téléphone où vous êtes le plus facile à joindre et votre adresse électronique, si vous en avez une, pour vous envoyer les détails ?

Nom :
Numéro de téléphone :
Adresse Courriel :

Ce rendez-vous est un engagement ferme. Si vous pensez ne pas pouvoir vous présenter pour des raisons personnelles ou professionnelles, veuillez m'en aviser dès maintenant et nous conserverons votre nom pour une étude ultérieure. Enfin, si jamais vous n'êtes pas en mesure de participer, veuillez nous prévenir le plus rapidement possible au [1-800-xxx-xxxx] pour que nous puissions trouver une personne pour vous remplacer.

Nous vous prions d'être sur les lieux au moins dix à quinze minutes avant le début de la rencontre et de vous présenter à notre personnel, qui se fera un plaisir de vous accueillir. Veuillez apporter une pièce d'identité avec photo ; cela nous permettra de vérifier que seules les personnes invitées participent au groupe. Il est possible que vous deviez revoir du matériel durant le cours de la discussion. Si vous nécessitez des lunettes, veuillez les apporter à la discussion. Merci de votre temps.

RECRUTEMENT FAIT PAR : _____

DATE DU RECRUTEMENT : _____

Appendix B – Discussion Guides

THE STRATEGIC COUNSEL 25

MODERATOR'S GUIDE – February 2020

INTRODUCTION (10 minutes) ALL LOCATIONS

GC NEWS (5 minutes) ALL LOCATIONS

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

PROMPT AS NEEDED: **ASK IN WHITEHORSE AND REGINA**

- Have you seen, read or heard anything about the Wet'suwet'en protests?
    - Have you heard anything about how the Government of Canada has responded?
        - Do you think the government has responded appropriately?
    - What else, if anything, should the Government of Canada be doing to address the situation?

PROMPT AS NEEDED: **ASK IN REGINA**

- Have you seen read or heard anything recently about the Teck Frontier Mine project in Northern Alberta? Has a decision been made if it will go forward?
    - If aware it is not going forward: based on what you know why did Teck decide to withdraw their proposal?
    - Do you think this was the right decision?
    - Does this outcome mean anything for the future of the oil industry in Canada?

BUDGET (30 minutes) ALL LOCATIONS EXCEPT WHITEHORSE

- Have you heard, read or seen anything about the upcoming federal government Budget that will outline the spending priorities for the government for the next fiscal year?

- Based on what you have seen, read or heard about the federal government, what would you expect to see included in the upcoming federal Budget?

- What topic do you think the federal government should focus on the most when making spending priorities in the upcoming Budget?

- HANDOUT: The following is a list of possible themes that the government could choose to focus on when making the new Budget. I want you to put a '1' beside the theme you would most like to see the government adopt and a '2' beside your second choice. If there are any that you think would be a bad theme for a Budget, put an 'x' beside them.

    - A Climate Budget

  - A Budget to Grow the Middle Class
  - A Budget to Make Life More Affordable
  - A Healthcare Budget
  - A Well-Being Budget
  - A Budget for Living Within our Means
  - An Innovation Budget
  - A Budget for Improving Quality of Life

- Which theme did you put a '1' beside? Why?

- Were there any that you put an 'x' beside? Why?

- If the federal government were to move forward with a "climate budget", what type of spending and policies would you expect to see included in the Budget? **NOTE TO MODERATOR: TRY TO GET A SENSE OF WHAT PARTICIPANTS WANT TO SEE INCLUDED IN BUDGET (E.G. MORE INFRASTRUCTURE SPENDING).**

  - What would the difference be, if any, between a "climate budget" and an "environment budget"? Which of these two would you rather the Government of Canada pursue?

- If the federal government were to move forward with a Budget focused on "improving quality of life", what type of spending and policies would you expect to see included in the Budget?

NORTHERN ISSUES (55 minutes) **ASK IN WHITEHORSE**

- What are the most important local issues in Whitehorse? ***LIST ON WHITE BOARD***
  - ***FOR EACH:*** Why is it important? What needs to be done? ***PROBE TO SEE IF OTHERS FEEL IT IS IMPORTANT***

- Thinking about everything the federal government has done in the past year, what, if anything, do you think will have the most positive impact on Whitehorse?

- Have they done anything that you think will have a negative impact on Whitehorse?

- And what does Whitehorse need in terms of infrastructure?
  - What are the biggest concerns/challenges? Is there anything that needs to be done?
  - Have you heard about the Atlin Hydro expansion? What have you heard? Do support the expansion of this project?
  - Should the federal government be doing more to support the hydroelectric industry in the Yukon?

- What are the biggest challenges related to housing in Whitehorse?
  - Has the federal government done anything to improve housing conditions in Whitehorse in the past few years?
  - What more should the federal government be doing?

- Have you heard anything about Canada's Arctic and Northern Policy Framework (ANPF)?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED
The Arctic and Northern Policy Framework is a new Government of Canada vision that will help make sure Canada's national and international priorities fit with the priorities of Indigenous peoples and Northern residents. Essentially, decisions that affect the northern communities will include federal, territorial and Indigenous partners so that decisions are made in a more shared way. This is sometimes referred to as an integrated decision-making process.

  - With that in mind, what do you think a more integrated decision-making process between federal, territorial and indigenous leadership should look like?

Next, I'm going to list several issues that involve the federal government:

- Have you heard anything about the travel deduction that can be claimed by northern residents when filing taxes?

- Have you heard anything that the federal government has done recently involving reconciliation with Indigenous communities?

  - What else should the government be doing when it comes to reconciliation in the Yukon?

- Have you heard anything recently about federal government immigration policies in the north?
  - Do changes need to be made to the current government approach?

- Have you heard anything recently about government investments in post-secondary education? About skills training programs?

  - What else could the federal government do to improve educational outcomes in the Yukon?

- Have you heard anything recently about federal government plans to restrict access to certain types of firearms?
  - The federal government has proposed a ban on assault rifles in Canada. Do you think Canadians should have access to assault rifles?
  - Would you support a program where the federal Government buys back all assault rifles currently owned by Canadians to remove them from circulation?

ENVIRONMENT (45 minutes) ALL LOCATIONS

- 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?

- HANDOUT: The following is a list of things that the Government of Canada could do, or has already done in order to protect the environment in Canada. From the list, I want you to circle the three items that you think would make the most positive impact on the environment, and put a star beside the item that you think the Government of Canada should prioritize the most.

    - Banning all single-use plastics in Canada
    - Conserving and protecting 25% of Canada's land and 25% of Canada's oceans
    - Educating Canadians on actions they can take to reduce their own carbon footprint
    - Financially supporting a transition to more energy efficient cars and trucks
    - Funding companies with innovative green technology projects
    - Implementing an Oceans Protection Plan to protect and clean up Canada's coastlines
    - Introducing a national price on carbon pollution, also known as a carbon tax
    - Phasing out all use of coal for electricity
    - Planting 2 billion new trees
    - Regulating the oil and gas sector to reduce the amount of emissions by the industry
    - Taking leadership on international climate change agreements with other countries.

- Which item did you put a star beside? Why?

- Are there any items on the list that you think it would be a bad idea for the Government to implement?

- Other than the items on the list, is there anything else the Government should be doing to protect the environment?

In 2016 the Government of Canada announced a plan to ensure a price on carbon pollution across the country, giving each province and territory the flexibility to develop a system that works for their circumstances, provided it meets the federal standard. In the five provinces that currently do not meet this standard – Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick*, and Alberta – the federal pricing system is currently in place. Under the federal system, the fuel charge rate started last year at $20 per tonne of carbon dioxide emissions and will be $30 per tonne starting in April. For gasoline purchases, $30 per tonne represents 6.6 cents a litre. However, the carbon tax and rebate are scheduled to increase each year, reaching $50 per tonne which represents about 11 cents per litre in 2022 with an average rebate of $500.

- So far, the federal government plan only outlines the plan through 2022, and the federal government will then have to either continue to increase the price on carbon, freeze it at $50, lower it, or eliminate it entirely. Based on what you know so far about the plan, what would you recommend they do?

- Turning away from what Government can do to address environmental issues to focus on your personal experience, is there anything you currently do to minimize the amount of emissions you are responsible for in your daily lives?
- Do you feel you have a good idea of what your own carbon footprint is, or how much you are contributing to greenhouse gas emissions?

- If the government were to introduce an online calculator that allows all Canadians to measure their own emissions and see tips for how to reduce your own carbon footprint, would you use it?

    - Do you think this strategy of educating Canadians about how they can reduce their own emissions would be an effective way to reduce Canada's overall carbon emissions? Why/why not? How so?

    - If you could look at a website that had tips for reducing your carbon footprint, what kinds of questions would you want answered?

- Thinking about possible approaches for addressing climate change issues, do you think it is generally more impactful when a large number of average Canadians change their behaviours in small ways that help the environment, or when a small number of big polluters change their behaviours in major ways that help the environment?

WESTERN ISSUES (15 minutes) ASK IN REGINA

HANDOUT:

- I want you to write down three words on a piece of paper that describe the current relationship between the Government of Canada and your province.
    - PROBE: Pick one of the words you wrote down and explain why you chose that word.
    - Overall, would you say the Government of Canada treats your province fairly or unfairly? Why?

- What could the federal government do to demonstrate that it is in touch with the concerns of people in your province?

Next, I am going to briefly discuss several topics that have recently been topics of debate that relate to Western Canada:

- Have you seen, read or heard anything recently about the TMX pipeline project?
    - To the best of your knowledge, has construction started on the pipeline?
    - Do you think it is likely that the pipeline will be built on schedule?

- Have you ever heard of the term 'equalization payments'?
    - IF YES: Can you describe to me how equalization payments work?
    - Based on your knowledge of how equalization payments work, do you think the equalization system should be changed? IF YES: How so?

- Have you heard anything lately about China blocking certain imports of Canadian canola products?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED
China, which had previously been the largest purchaser of Canadian canola, announced the blocking of certain Canadian canola products this March. The federal government has already announced financial support for farmers affected by this action.

- Do you think the government should make concessions to China so that China will buy our canola again, retaliate against China by imposing our own sanctions on their products, or continue to financially support farmers while trying to negotiate a solution with China that doesn't involve concessions or retaliation?

- Out of all the issues we have talked about so far that specifically affect Western Canada, which do you think should be the top priority of the Government of Canada?

FRONTIER MINE (15 minutes) ASK IN YORK, MONTREAL, MONCTON

- Have you heard, read or seen anything about the proposed Teck Frontier Mine oil sands project north of Fort McMurray?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED
The Frontier Mine, which was first proposed in 2011, would be the largest oil sands mine in history if approved by the federal government. This project could create as many as 7,500 new construction jobs in Alberta, but it would also be a major source of greenhouse gas emissions and could challenge Canada's ability to meet international commitments to reduce carbon pollution.

- Based on this, do you think the federal government should approve the project, reject the project, or approve the project only if there are commitments made by the company to ensure the environmental impact is limited?

- If you could set conditions that you think the company should meet before proceeding with the oil sands mine, what would they be?

- If the company behind the Frontier project pledges to off-set all emissions from the mine and reach a point where the company is emitting net-zero emissions by 2050, would that change how you feel about the project?

- As an alternative to giving an absolute approval or rejection to the project, some have suggested that the federal government negotiate with the province of Alberta to try and find a compromise that would allow Alberta to get the economic boost of the new project in exchange for promising to participate in national programs that combat climate change. I'm going to show you a list of things that some people have suggested the federal government would ask for in this scenario in return for approving the Frontier Mine.

  HANDOUT:

  - A commitment that Alberta set an ambitious limit on the amount of emissions the province can produce that would decrease over time
  - A promise that Alberta would reach net-zero carbon emissions by 2050
  - A promise that Albertan oil companies reach net-zero carbon emissions by 2050
  - A commitment that Alberta won't oppose the national price on carbon pollution
  - A commitment that Alberta plant 1 billion trees to offset emissions from the project
  - An agreement to put in place an enforcement mechanism that would penalize Alberta or any companies that fail to meet these commitments

- If a deal was negotiated between Alberta and the federal government, which contained most or all of the above elements, would you support the federal government approving the Frontier Mine in exchange?
  - Looking at this list, and thinking about what would be most important to include in this type of deal, please circle your top two choices, cross out your bottom two choices and put a star beside the one that you feel would be the most important to ask for.

CLARIFY AS NEEDED
Net-zero means Canada's total GHG emissions are balanced by actions that remove an equivalent amount of emissions from the air. Such actions could include planting new trees, carbon capture and storage, buying carbon credits, etc.

CANADA STUDENT LOANS (10 minutes) ASK IN MONCTON AND NANAIMO

- Has anyone heard of the Canada Student Loans Program? How would you describe it?

CLARIFY AS NEEDED
The Government of Canada offers student grants and loans to full-time and part-time students. Grants and loans help students pay for their post-secondary education.

HANDOUT: The Government of Canada is considering changing the name of this program. I'm going to give you a handout that has some potential names. I want you to put a #1 beside the name you like the best, a #2 beside your second choice and an 'x' beside any names that you dislike for this program.

NOTE TO MODERATOR: THE PROGRAM ITSELF IS NOT CHANGING, JUST POTENTIALLY THE NAME OF THE PROGRAM. THE EXISTING NAME IS THE FIRST ITEM ON THE LIST: CANADA STUDENT GRANTS AND LOANS.

- Canada Student Grants and Loans (Subventions et prêts canadiens d'études)
- Canada Student Support (Soutien aux étudiants canadiens)
- Canada Student Assistance (Aide canadienne aux études)
- Canada Student Financial Assistance (Aide canadienne au financement des études)

- ***HAVE EACH RESPONDENT LIST THEIR CHOICES AND EXPLAIN WHY THEY CHOSE THE ONE THEY CONSIDER TO BE THE BEST.***

- Did any of you put an 'x' beside a name? Why?

- What, if anything, would you add/change to any of the names? Could any of the names be improved?

CORONAVIRUS (10 minutes) ALL LOCATIONS EXCEPT MONCTON AND WHITEHORSE

- Has anybody heard about the new coronavirus?
  If yes:
  - What have you heard about the new coronavirus?
  - Where are you hearing about it?
  - Are you hearing consistent messages? Contradictory messages? (If so: Are you confused? What are you confused about? What are you hearing that is confusing you?)

    - In Canada, how serious do you think the new coronavirus is right now? Do you think it will get worse? Are you worried about it getting worse? What makes you say that?

- How concerned would you say you are that you or a member of your family will contract the new coronavirus?

    - Have you looked for information about the new coronavirus?

If yes:

- What types of information did you look for?
- Where did you look for it?

    - Are you planning to look for information about the new coronavirus?

If yes:

- What types of information would you look for?
- Where would you look for it?

    - Have you changed your behaviour in any way because of the new coronavirus?

- What have you done?
- Why haven't you done anything?

    - Do you feel that the Government of Canada is doing a good job at informing Canadians about the situation and at protecting Canadians?

- Do you think Canadian officials are over-reacting, being prudent and measured, or not reacting enough?
- What more could the government do to ensure Canadians are prepared and protected?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)

GUIDE DU MODÉRATEUR – Février 2020

INTRODUCTION (10 minutes) TOUS LES LIEUX

NOUVELLES DU GC (5 minutes) TOUS LES LIEUX

- Ces derniers temps, qu'avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu au sujet du gouvernement du Canada ?

DEMANDER, AU BESOIN : **DEMANDEZ À WHITEHORSE ET REGINA**

- Avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet des manifestations des Wet'suwet'en ?
    - Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit quant à la réaction du gouvernement du Canada ?
        - Pensez-vous que le gouvernement a réagi de façon appropriée ?
    - Que devrait faire le gouvernement du Canada, le cas échéant, pour remédier à la situation ?

DEMANDER, AU BESOIN : **DEMANDEZ À REGINA**

- Avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet du projet de mine Teck Frontier dans le nord de l'Alberta ? Est-ce qu'une décision a été prise à savoir si l'on procèdera avec celui-ci ?
    - Si l'on est au courant qu'on ne procèdera pas avec le projet : en fonction de ce que vous savez, pourquoi Teck a-t-elle décidé de retirer sa proposition ?
    - Croyez-vous que ce fût la bonne décision ?
    - Est-ce que ce dénouement a une signification pour l'avenir de l'industrie pétrolière au Canada ?

BUDGET (30 minutes) TOUS LES LIEUX, SAUF À WHITEHORSE

- Avez-vous entendu, lu ou vu quoi que ce soit au sujet du prochain budget du gouvernement fédéral qui énoncera les priorités, en matière de dépenses gouvernementales, pour la prochaine année d'imposition ?

- Selon ce que vous avez vu, lu ou entendu au sujet du gouvernement fédéral, à quoi vous attendez-vous dans le prochain budget fédéral ?

- Selon vous, sur quel sujet le gouvernement fédéral devrait-il se concentrer le plus lorsqu'il établira ses priorités de dépenses dans le prochain budget ?

DOCUMENT À DISTRIBUER : Voici une liste de thèmes possibles sur lesquels le gouvernement pourrait choisir de se concentrer lors de l'élaboration du nouveau budget. Je voudrais que vous mettiez un « 1 » à côté du thème que vous souhaitez le plus voir le gouvernement adopter et un « 2" à côté de votre deuxième choix. Si vous pensez que certains thèmes ne conviennent pas pour un budget, mettez un « x » à côté de ceux-ci.

- Un budget climatique
- Un budget pour faire croître la classe moyenne
- Un budget pour rendre la vie plus abordable
- Un budget soins de santé
- Un budget bien-être
- Un budget pour vivre selon nos moyens
- Un budget innovation
- Un budget pour améliorer la qualité de vie

- À côté de quel thème avez-vous mis un « 1 » ? Pourquoi ?

- Y en avait-il à côté desquels vous avez mis un « x » ? Pourquoi ?

- Si le gouvernement fédéral devait aller de l'avant avec un « budget climatique », quels types de dépenses et de politiques est-ce que vous vous attendriez à voir inclus dans le budget ? À L'ATTENTION DU MODÉRATEUR : ESSAYEZ DE CERNER CE QUE LES PARTICIPANTES ET PARTICIPANTS SOUHAITENT VOIR INCLUS DANS LE BUDGET (PAR EXEMPLE, PLUS DE DÉPENSES LIÉES AUX INFRASTRUCTURES).
    - Quelle serait la différence, le cas échéant, entre un « budget climatique » et un « budget environnemental » ? Lequel de ces deux types de budgets préféreriez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada privilégie ?

- Si le gouvernement fédéral devait aller de l'avant avec un budget axé sur « l'amélioration de la qualité de vie », quels types de dépenses et de politiques est-ce que vous vous attendriez à voir inclus dans le budget ?

ENJEUX DU NORD (55 minutes) DEMANDEZ À WHITEHORSE

- Quels sont les enjeux les plus importants à l'échelle locale à Whitehorse ? ***ÉNUMÉREZ LES ENJEUX SUR LE TABLEAU BLANC.***
    - ***POUR CHACUN DES ENJEUX :*** Pourquoi est-ce important ? Qu'est-ce qui doit être fait ? ***SONDER POUR VÉRIFIER SI LES AUTRES ESTIMENT QUE C'EST IMPORTANT.***

- En pensant à tout ce qu'a fait le gouvernement fédéral au cours de la dernière année, qu'est-ce qui, selon vous, aura les retombées les plus positives pour Whitehorse, s'il y a lieu ?

- Est-ce que le gouvernement fédéral a fait quelque chose qui, selon vous, aura des répercussions négatives sur Whitehorse ?

- Et quelles sont les infrastructures dont on a besoin à Whitehorse ?
    - Quelles sont les plus grandes préoccupations/quels sont les plus grands défis ? Y a-t-il autre chose qui doit être fait ?
    - Avez-vous entendu parler du projet d'expansion d'*Atlin Hydro* ? Qu'avez-vous entendu dire ? Est-ce que vous appuyez l'expansion de ce projet ?
    - Est-ce que le gouvernement fédéral devrait en faire davantage pour soutenir l'industrie hydroélectrique au Yukon ?

- Quels sont les plus grands défis en matière de logement à Whitehorse ?
    - Est-ce que le gouvernement fédéral a fait quoi que ce soit pour améliorer la situation du logement à Whitehorse au cours des quelques dernières années ?
    - En quoi le gouvernement fédéral devrait-il en faire plus ?

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit quant au *Cadre stratégique pour l'Arctique et le Nord du Canada* (CSAN) ?

ÉCLAIRCISSEMENTS, AU BESOIN :
Le Cadre stratégique pour l'Arctique et le Nord est une nouvelle vision qu'a le gouvernement du Canada et qui permettra de s'assurer que les priorités nationales et internationales du Canada correspondent aux priorités des peuples autochtones et des habitants du Nord. Essentiellement, les partenaires fédéraux, territoriaux et autochtones participeront aux prises de décisions ayant une incidence sur les communautés du Nord, afin de permettre une plus grande concertation à cet égard.

C'est ce qu'on appelle parfois un processus décisionnel intégré.
- Dans cette optique, à quoi devrait ressembler, selon vous, un processus décisionnel plus intégré entre les dirigeants fédéraux, territoriaux et autochtones ?

Puis, je vais énumérer plusieurs questions qui touchent le gouvernement fédéral :

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit quant à la déduction pour les avantages relatifs aux voyages, pour les résidents du Nord, au niveau de la déclaration de revenus ?

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de ce que le gouvernement fédéral a fait récemment en matière de réconciliation avec les communautés autochtones ?
    - Que devrait faire d'autre le gouvernement en ce qui concerne la réconciliation au Yukon ?

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit récemment au sujet des politiques d'immigration du gouvernement fédéral dans le Nord ?
    - Faut-il apporter des changements à l'approche actuelle du gouvernement ?

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit récemment sur les investissements du gouvernement dans l'éducation postsecondaire ? Qu'en est-il des programmes de formation axée sur les compétences ?
    - Que pourrait faire d'autre le gouvernement afin d'améliorer les résultats scolaires au Yukon ?

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit récemment quant aux intentions du gouvernement fédéral de restreindre l'accès à certains types d'armes à feu ?
    - Le gouvernement fédéral a proposé d'interdire les fusils d'assaut au Canada. Pensez-vous que les Canadiens devraient avoir accès aux fusils d'assaut ?
    - Seriez-vous favorable à un programme en vertu duquel le gouvernement fédéral rachèterait tous les fusils d'assaut actuellement détenus par les Canadiens pour les retirer de la circulation ?

ENVIRONNEMENT (45 minutes) TOUS LES LIEUX

- Dernièrement, qu'avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu au sujet de l'environnement ?
    - Et récemment, avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit en ce qui a trait au gouvernement du Canada et de l'environnement ?

- DOCUMENT À DISTRIBUER : Voici une liste de choses que le gouvernement du Canada pourrait faire, ou a déjà fait, en vue de protéger l'environnement au Canada. À partir de cette liste, j'aimerais que vous encercliez les trois éléments qui, selon vous, auraient l'impact le plus positif sur l'environnement, et que vous mettiez une étoile à côté de l'élément qui, selon vous, devrait être la priorité du gouvernement du Canada.

    - Bannir tous les plastiques à usage unique au Canada
    - Conserver et protéger 25 % des terres au Canada et 25 % des océans au Canada
    - Éduquer les Canadiennes et les Canadiens sur les mesures qu'ils peuvent prendre pour réduire leur propre empreinte carbone
    - Soutenir financièrement une transition vers des voitures et des camions plus économes en énergie
    - Financer des entreprises ayant des projets de technologies vertes innovantes
    - Mettre en œuvre un plan de protection des océans pour protéger et nettoyer les littoraux du Canada
    - Introduire un prix national sur la pollution par le carbone, aussi appelé taxe sur le carbone

- L'élimination progressive de toute utilisation du charbon pour produire de l'électricité
- Planter 2 milliards de nouveaux arbres
- Réglementer le secteur pétrolier et gazier pour réduire la quantité d'émissions provenant de ce secteur
- Jouer un rôle de chef de file quant aux accords internationaux sur le changement climatique conclus avec d'autres pays.

- À côté de quel élément avez-vous mis une étoile ? Pourquoi ?

- Y a-t-il des éléments qui figurent sur la liste que vous croyez qui seraient une mauvaise idée pour le gouvernement de les mettre en application ?

- Outre les éléments figurant sur la liste, y a-t-il autre chose que le gouvernement devrait faire pour protéger l'environnement ?

En 2016, le gouvernement du Canada a annoncé un plan visant à assurer la tarification de la pollution par le carbone dans l'ensemble du pays, en donnant à chaque province et territoire la souplesse nécessaire pour élaborer un système qui convient à leur situation, pour autant qu'il respecte la norme fédérale. Dans les cinq provinces qui ne satisfont pas actuellement à cette norme — l'Ontario, la Saskatchewan, le Manitoba, le Nouveau-Brunswick* et l'Alberta —, le système de tarification fédéral est actuellement en place. Dans le cadre du système fédéral, le taux de la taxe sur les carburants a commencé l'année dernière à 20 $ par tonne d'émissions de dioxyde de carbone et sera de 30 $ la tonne à partir du mois d'avril. Pour les achats d'essence, 30 $ la tonne représente 6,6 cents le litre. Toutefois, il est prévu que la taxe sur le carbone ainsi que le remboursement augmenteront chaque année pour atteindre 50 $ la tonne, ce qui représente environ 11 cents le litre, en 2022 avec un remboursement moyen de 500 $.

- À ce jour, le plan du gouvernement fédéral décrit seulement que les grandes lignes de ce plan pour la période allant jusqu'à 2022, et le gouvernement fédéral devra alors soit continuer d'augmenter le prix du carbone, soit le geler à 50 $, soit le réduire, ou encore l'éliminer complètement. Selon ce que vous savez du plan jusqu'à maintenant, que leur recommanderiez-vous de faire ?

- Si l'on met de côté ce que le gouvernement peut faire pour remédier aux questions environnementales et que l'on se concentre sur votre expérience personnelle, y a-t-il quelque chose que vous faites actuellement pour minimiser la quantité d'émissions dont vous êtes responsable dans votre vie quotidienne ?

- Avez-vous le sentiment d'avoir une bonne idée de votre propre empreinte carbone ou de votre contribution aux émissions de gaz à effet de serre ?

- Si le gouvernement lançait un calculateur en ligne qui permettrait à toutes les Canadiennes et à tous les Canadiens de chiffrer leurs propres émissions et de découvrir des astuces pour réduire leur propre empreinte carbone, l'utiliseriez-vous ?

    - Croyez-vous que cette stratégie visant à éduquer les Canadiennes et les Canadiens sur la façon de réduire leurs propres émissions serait un moyen efficace de réduire la quantité globale des émissions de carbone du Canada ? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas ? Comment ?

    - Si vous pouviez consulter un site web contenant des astuces pour réduire votre empreinte carbone, à quel genre de questions souhaiteriez-vous obtenir une réponse ?

- En réfléchissant aux approches possibles pour affronter les enjeux liés au changement climatique, pensez-vous généralement qu'il y ait plus d'impact lorsqu'un grand nombre de Canadiens moyens modifient leurs comportements par de petites actions qui aident l'environnement, ou lorsqu'un petit nombre de grands pollueurs modifient leurs comportements de manières importantes qui aident l'environnement ?

ENJEUX DE L'OUEST (15 minutes) DEMANDEZ À REGINA

DOCUMENT À DISTRIBUER :

- Sur une feuille de papier, je vous demanderais d'écrire trois mots qui décrivent la relation actuelle entre le gouvernement du Canada et votre province.
    - SONDER : Choisissez un des mots que vous avez écrits et veuillez m'expliquer pourquoi vous avez choisi ce mot.
    - Dans l'ensemble, diriez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada traite votre province équitablement ou injustement ? Pourquoi ?

- Que pourrait faire le gouvernement fédéral afin de démontrer sa sensibilité aux préoccupations des gens de votre province ?

Maintenant, je vais discuter brièvement de plusieurs sujets qui ont récemment fait l'objet de débats et qui concernent l'Ouest canadien :

- Avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quelque chose récemment au sujet du projet de pipeline TMX ?
    - Autant que vous sachiez, la construction du pipeline a-t-elle commencé ?
    - Selon vous, est-il probable que la construction du pipeline se réalise dans les délais prévus ?

- Maintenant que vous avez un peu entendu parler des deux lois, est-ce que l'une ou l'autre vous préoccupe ? Pourquoi ?
    - Que voudriez-vous savoir de plus au sujet de ces projets de loi, avant de décider s'ils sont nécessaires ou non ? Souhaitez-vous voir des changements bien précis à l'un ou l'autre de ces règlements ?

- Avez-vous déjà entendu parler du terme « paiements de péréquation » ?
    - SI OUI : Pouvez-vous me décrire comment fonctionnent les paiements de péréquation ?
    - Selon ce que vous savez du fonctionnement des paiements de péréquation, pensez-vous que le système de péréquation devrait être modifié ? SI OUI : De quelle façon ?

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit dernièrement au sujet du boycottage de l'industrie canadienne du canola par la Chine ?

ÉCLAIRCISSEMENTS, AU BESOIN
La Chine, qui était auparavant le plus gros acheteur de canola canadien, a annoncé qu'elle cesserait d'acheter des produits de canola canadiens dès le mois de mars. Le gouvernement fédéral a déjà annoncé une aide financière aux agriculteurs touchés par le boycottage.

- Pensez-vous que le gouvernement devrait accorder des concessions à la Chine pour que celle-ci achète de nouveau notre canola, qu'il réplique en imposant ses propres sanctions sur leurs produits, ou bien qu'il continue à soutenir financièrement les agriculteurs tout en essayant de négocier une solution avec la Chine qui ne comporterait ni concessions ni représailles ?

- De tous les enjeux dont nous avons discuté jusqu'à maintenant et qui touchent particulièrement l'Ouest canadien, selon vous, lequel devrait être la priorité absolue du gouvernement du Canada ?

MINE FRONTIER (15 minutes) DEMANDEZ À YORK, MONTRÉAL ET MONCTON

- Avez-vous entendu, lu ou vu quoi que ce soit au sujet du projet de sables bitumineux de la Mine Frontier proposé au nord de Fort McMurray ?

ÉCLAIRCISSEMENTS, AU BESOIN
La mine Frontier, qui fut proposée pour la première fois en 2011, serait la plus grande mine de sables bitumineux de l'histoire si le gouvernement fédéral l'approuvait. Ce projet pourrait créer jusqu'à 7 500 nouveaux emplois dans le secteur de la construction en Alberta, mais il constituerait également une source importante d'émissions de gaz à effet de serre et pourrait poser un défi à la capacité du Canada de respecter ses engagements internationaux en matière de réduction de la pollution par le carbone.

- En fonction de cela, pensez-vous que le gouvernement fédéral devrait approuver le projet, le rejeter ou l'approuver seulement si l'entreprise s'engage à limiter l'impact environnemental ?

    - Si vous pouviez établir des conditions que vous estimez que l'entreprise devrait respecter avant de poursuivre l'exploitation de la mine de sables bitumineux, quelles seraient-elles ?

- Si la société derrière le projet Frontier s'engage à compenser les émissions totales de la mine et à atteindre un niveau de zéro émission nette d'ici 2050, est-ce que cela changerait ce que vous pensez du projet ?

- Plutôt que de donner une approbation ou un refus catégorique au projet, il y en a qui suggèrent que le gouvernement fédéral négocie avec la province de l'Alberta afin de trouver un compromis qui permettrait à l'Alberta de bénéficier de l'élan économique du nouveau projet, en échange de sa promesse de participer aux programmes nationaux de lutte contre les changements climatiques. Je vais vous lire une liste de choses que certaines personnes ont suggéré que le gouvernement fédéral réclamerait dans ce scénario, en échange de son approbation pour la Frontier Mine :

DOCUMENT À DISTRIBUER :

    - Un engagement de la part de l'Alberta à fixer une limite ambitieuse sur la quantité d'émissions que la province peut produire et qui diminuerait avec le temps
    - Une promesse que l'Alberta atteindra un taux de zéro émission nette de carbone d'ici 2050
    - Une promesse que les compagnies pétrolières albertaines atteindront un taux de zéro émission nette de carbone d'ici 2050
    - Un engagement que l'Alberta ne s'opposera pas au prix national sur la pollution par le carbone
    - Un engagement de l'Alberta à planter un milliard d'arbres pour compenser les émissions du projet
    - Un accord pour mettre en place un mécanisme de mise en application qui pénaliserait sévèrement l'Alberta ou toute entreprise qui ne respecterait pas ces engagements

- Si un accord était négocié entre l'Alberta et le gouvernement fédéral et qu'il contenait la plupart ou la totalité des éléments ci-dessus, seriez-vous favorable à ce qu'en échange le gouvernement fédéral donne son approbation à la Frontier Mine ?
    - En regardant cette liste et en réfléchissant à ce qui serait le plus important à inclure dans ce genre d'accord, veuillez encercler vos deux premiers choix, rayer vos deux

derniers choix et mettre une étoile à côté de celui que vous estimez être le plus important à exiger.

ÉCLAIRCISSEMENTS, AU BESOIN
Le terme « zéro émission nette » signifie que les émissions totales de GES du Canada seront compensées par des mesures qui retireront une quantité équivalente d'émissions dans l'air. Ces mesures pourraient comprendre, planter de nouveaux arbres, capter et stocker le carbone, l'achat de crédits de carbone, etc.

PROGRAMME CANADIEN DE PRÊTS AUX ÉTUDIANTS (10 minutes) DEMANDEZ À MONCTON ET À NANAIMO

- Y a-t-il quelqu'un qui a entendu parler du Programme canadien de prêts aux étudiants ? Comment le décririez-vous ?

ÉCLAIRCISSEMENTS, AU BESOIN
Le gouvernement du Canada offre des bourses et des prêts aux étudiantes et aux étudiants à temps plein et à temps partiel. Les bourses et les prêts aident les étudiantes et les étudiants à payer leurs études postsecondaires.

DOCUMENT À DISTRIBUER :

Le gouvernement du Canada envisage de changer le nom de ce programme. Je vais vous remettre un document qui contient quelques noms potentiels. Je veux que vous mettiez un « 1 » à côté du nom que vous préférez, un « 2 » à côté de votre deuxième choix et un « x » à côté de tous les noms que vous n'aimez pas pour ce programme.

- Bourses et prêts d'études du Canada
- Soutien aux étudiants canadiens
- Aide canadienne aux études
- Aide canadienne au financement des études

- ***DEMANDER À CHAQUE RÉPONDANTE OU RÉPONDANT D'ÉNUMÉRER SES CHOIX ET D'EXPLIQUER LA RAISON POUR LEUR CHOIX DE CELUI QUI, SELON EUX, EST LE MEILLEUR***

- Y a-t-il quelqu'un parmi vous qui avez mis un « x » à côté d'un nom ? Pourquoi ?

- Qu'ajouteriez-vous ou changeriez-vous, le cas échéant, à l'un de ces noms ? Pourrait-on améliorer certains des noms ?

CORONAVIRUS (10 minutes) TOUS LES LIEUX, SAUF MONCTON ET WHITEHORSE

- Quelqu'un a-t-il entendu parler du nouveau coronavirus ?
  Si oui :
  - Qu'avez-vous entendu sur le nouveau coronavirus ?
  - Où en avez-vous entendu parler ?
  - Entendez-vous des messages cohérents ? Des messages contradictoires ? (Si oui : Êtes-vous confus ? Pourquoi êtes-vous confus ? Qu'entendez-vous qui vous rend confus ?)

- Au Canada, dans quelle mesure croyez-vous que le nouveau coronavirus est un enjeu sérieux à l'heure actuelle ? Pensez-vous que ça va s'aggraver ? Êtes-vous inquiet que cela s'aggrave ? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela ?

- Dans quelle mesure diriez-vous que vous êtes inquiète ou inquiet que vous, ou un membre de votre famille contractiez le nouveau coronavirus ?

- Avez-vous cherché des informations sur le nouveau coronavirus ?
  Si oui :
  - Quels types d'informations recherchiez-vous ?
  - Où les avez-vous trouvés ?

- Avez-vous l'intention de chercher des informations sur le nouveau coronavirus ?
  Si oui :
  - Quels types d'informations rechercheriez-vous ?
  - Où les rechercheriez-vous ?

- Avez-vous modifié votre comportement de quelque manière que ce soit en raison du nouveau coronavirus ?
  - Qu'avez-vous fait ?
  - Pourquoi n'avez-vous rien fait ?

- Pensez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada fait un bon travail pour informer les Canadiens sur la situation et pour protéger la population canadienne ?
  - Pensez-vous que les responsables canadiens réagissent de manière excessive, qu'ils sont prudents et mesurés, qu'ils ne réagissent pas assez ?
  - Qu'est-ce que le gouvernement pourrait faire de plus pour s'assurer que les Canadiennes et les Canadiens sont bien informés et protégés ?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes)