



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

Continuous Qualitative Data Collection of Canadians' Views – May 2024

Final Report

Prepared for the Privy Council Office

Supplier name: The Strategic Counsel

Contract number: CW2241412

Contract value: \$1,629,482.60

Award date: December 19, 2022

Delivery date: June 20, 2024

Registration number: POR- 053-22

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

May 2024

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 first cycle of the second year of this study included a total of twelve focus groups with Canadian adults (18 years of age and older) conducted between May 7th, 2024, and May 30th, 2024.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : Rapport final - Collecte continue de données qualitatives sur les opinions des Canadiens – mai 2024.

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

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

Catalogue Number:

CP12-4E-PDF

International Standard Serial Number (ISSN):

ISSN 2816-9360

Related publications (registration number: POR-053-22):


CP12-4F-PDF (Final Report, French)

ISSN 2816-9379

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: June 20, 2024

Donna Nixon, Partner
The Strategic Counsel

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	4
Methodology.....	5
Key Findings.....	6
Government of Canada in the News (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Lower Mainland British Columbia, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	6
Government of Canada Priorities and Performance (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	7
Budget 2024 (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia).....	9
Jobs (Montérégie Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	12
Climate Change (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)	13
Carbon Pricing (Saskatchewan, Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador).....	14
Carbon Pricing Video Testing (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador).....	15
Electric Vehicle Battery Manufacturing (Montérégie Region Quebec)	17
Immigration (Montérégie Region Quebec, Laurentides Region Quebec)	17
Issues Affecting the 2SLGBTQI+ Community (Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community).....	18
Opioids (Lower Mainland British Columbia).....	19
French Language Protection and Promotion (Laurentides Region Quebec).....	20
Community Safety (Hamilton)	21
Auto Theft (Hamilton).....	21
Detailed Findings.....	24
Timeline of May 2024 Announcements.....	25
Government of Canada in the News (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Lower Mainland British Columbia, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	27
Government of Canada Priorities and Performance (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	27
Housing (Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	29



Health Care (Laurentides Region Quebec).....	30
Cost of Living (Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community)	31
Local Issues (Montérégie Region Quebec).....	31
Budget 2024 (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia)	32
Overall Impressions (Saskatchewan).....	32
Wildfires (Lower Mainland British Columbia)	34
Capital Gains (Lower Mainland British Columbia)	35
Housing Initiatives (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia)	35
Jobs (Montérégie Region Quebec, Hamilton).....	38
Climate Change (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador).....	40
Carbon Pricing (Saskatchewan, Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)	42
Carbon Pricing Video Testing (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)	47
Electric Vehicle Battery Manufacturing (Montérégie Region Quebec).....	50
Immigration (Montérégie Region Quebec, Laurentides Region Quebec)	51
Issues Affecting the 2SLGBTQI+ Community (Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community).....	52
Opioids (Lower Mainland British Columbia)	54
French Language Protection and Promotion (Laurentides Region Quebec)	56
Community Safety (Hamilton)	57
Auto Theft (Hamilton).....	58
Appendices.....	60
Appendix A – Recruiting Scripts	61
English Recruiting Script	62
French Recruiting Script.....	73
Appendix B – Discussion Guides.....	82



English Moderator’s Guide	83
French Moderator’s Guide	112
Appendix C – Advertising Concepts.....	143
Government of Canada Carbon Pricing Video Testing.....	144

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 of Canada, as well as emerging trends.

This report includes findings from twelve online focus groups which were conducted between May 7th, 2024, and May 30th, 2024, in multiple locations across the country. Details concerning the locations, recruitment, and composition of the groups are provided in the section below.

The research for this cycle focused largely on climate change, carbon pricing, and concept testing for an informative video on carbon pricing created by the Government of Canada. Some groups also engaged in discussions regarding Budget 2024 and various initiatives that had been announced related to wildfires, capital gains, and housing.

Other topics for this cycle included what participants had seen, read, or heard about the Government of Canada recently as well as their impressions regarding the federal government's performance across a wide range of areas including housing, health care, the cost of living, and challenges facing their local communities. Participants also engaged in discussions related to jobs, electric vehicles (EVs), community safety, auto theft, opioids, and immigration. One group, comprised of individuals identifying as 2SLGBTQI+ residing in Montreal, discussed topics related to the 2SLGBTQI+ community, while participants in the Laurentides region of Quebec shared their thoughts regarding the protection and promotion of the French language in Canada.

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 location.
- Some groups focused on specific cohorts of the population, including millennials, members of Generation Z, those who are climate supportive or ambivalent, and members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community.

Detailed Approach

- Twelve groups were conducted across various regions in Canada.
- Six groups were conducted among the general population residing in Saskatchewan, the Montérégie region of Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Lower Mainland British Columbia (B.C.), the Laurentides region of Quebec, and Hamilton.
- The other six groups were conducted among key subgroups including:
 - Millennials residing in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island (P.E.I.);
 - Members of Generation Z in Calgary;
 - Those who are climate supportive or ambivalent (three groups, respectively based in mid-size and major centres in Manitoba, major centres in Alberta, and Central Ontario); and
 - Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community residing in Montreal
- The three groups based in Quebec were conducted in French. All other groups were conducted in English.
- All groups for this cycle were conducted online.
- A total of 8 participants were recruited for each group, assuming 6 to 8 participants would attend.
- Across all locations, 86 participants attended, in total. Details on attendance numbers by group can be found below.
- Each participant received an honorarium of \$125.

Group Locations and Composition

LOCATION	GROUP	LANGUAGE	DATE	TIME (EDT)	GROUP COMPOSITION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Saskatchewan	1	EN	Tues, May 7 th	8:00-10:00 PM	General Population	5
New Brunswick, Nova Scotia & PEI	2	EN	Wed, May 8 th	5:00-7:00 PM	Millennials, Ages 28-43	8
Calgary	3	EN	Thurs, May 9 th	8:00-10:00 PM	Generation Z, Ages 18-27	7
Mid-Size & Major Centres Manitoba	4	EN	Tues, May 14 th	7:00-9:00 PM	Climate Supportive & Ambivalent	7
Montréal Region Quebec	5	FR	Wed, May 15 th	6:00-8:00 PM	General Population	6
Major Centres Alberta	6	EN	Thurs, May 16 th	8:00-10:00 PM	Climate Supportive & Ambivalent	7
Central Ontario	7	EN	Tues, May 21 st	6:00-8:00 PM	Climate Supportive & Ambivalent	8
Montreal	7	FR	Wed, May 22 nd	6:00-8:00 PM	2SLGBTQI+	7
Newfoundland & Labrador	8	EN	Thurs, May 23 rd	4:30-6:30 PM	General Population	7
Lower Mainland BC	10	EN	Tues, May 28 th	9:00-11:00 PM	General Population	8
Laurentides Quebec	11	FR	Wed, May 29 th	6:00-8:00 PM	General Population	8
Hamilton	12	EN	Thurs, May 30 th	6:00-8:00 PM	General Population	8
Total number of participants						86

Key Findings

Government of Canada in the News (Montréal Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Lower Mainland British Columbia, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Participants in four groups were asked to share what they had seen, read, or heard about the Government of Canada in recent days. A range of actions and initiatives were recalled, including an announcement by the federal government that it would be taking actions to increase the supply of affordable housing in Canadian communities, a proposal to increase the capital gains inclusion rate (also referred to as the capital gains tax) paid by the wealthiest Canadians, and actions to stabilize the cost of groceries, including taking steps to increase competition within the grocery sector. Participants also recalled an announcement by Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) that it would be setting a two-year intake cap on international student study permit applications, and an



announcement by the Government of Canada that it would be increasing the number of temporary resident visa applications available to Palestinians with family members in Canada from 1,000 to 5,000.

Government of Canada Priorities and Performance (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Four groups engaged in conversations related to the issues currently facing Canadians as well as their perspectives regarding the federal government's management of these priorities. Participants were asked to identify areas in which they felt the Government of Canada was performing well as well as areas where they felt there was room for improvement.

On a number of issues participants expressed a range of positive and negative views. These included health care, protecting and promoting vulnerable populations, and actions that had been taken to protect the environment and mitigate the impacts of climate change. Participants also mentioned areas in which they felt that the Government of Canada had been performing well, including providing a wide range of supports and benefits for Canadians as well as its response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, participants identified a range of areas in which they believed the Government of Canada had room for improvement. These included the perceived high cost of groceries at present, a lack of affordable housing in many parts of the country, education and the need to hire more primary and secondary school teachers (proposed to be financed at least in part via federal funding), and the rising national debt.

Asked to identify what they viewed as the most important priorities for the federal government to be focusing on, many reiterated the need for a greater emphasis on making life more affordable for Canadians, including actions to stabilize the costs of essentials such as housing and groceries. A large number also mentioned the need for increased investments towards health care, including greater resources for issues related to mental health. Other priority areas mentioned by participants included protecting the environment and mitigating the impacts of climate change, reconciliation with Indigenous peoples, and the need to better support and protect the rights of vulnerable populations, such as racialized Canadians, persons living with disabilities, and 2SLGBTQI+ individuals.

Housing (Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Participants in two groups, based in the Laurentides Region of Quebec and Hamilton respectively, were asked a few additional questions about recent actions from the federal government related to housing. Asked what they viewed as the biggest challenges related to housing that the federal government needed to be focusing on, many identified the affordability of housing as a major issue. It was widely felt that housing, both to purchase and to rent, had become increasingly expensive for Canadians in recent years and that this had made it difficult for many lower- and middle-income families to secure safe and affordable housing in their communities. Several believed that there was not enough housing available to meet the current demand in their respective areas and that far more needed to be done at all levels of government to build more homes.



Discussing whether they were aware of any recent actions from the federal government related to housing, several mentioned the introduction of the first home savings account (FHSA). While most believed that this initiative was a step in the right direction, a number were of the opinion that unless actions were taken by the Government of Canada to significantly reduce the overall cost of housing, programs such as this would have little impact on improving home ownership prospects for aspiring first-time home buyers.

Health Care (Laurentides Region Quebec)

Participants in the Laurentides region of Quebec also engaged in a brief conversation related to health care, both in their communities as well as across Canada more broadly. Almost all viewed health care as a major issue that required greater prioritization from the Government of Canada. While most felt that the quality of health care in their region was relatively high, all believed that there were significant challenges at present related to the ability of those in their area to access health care services in a timely fashion. Many recalled having experienced long wait times and other challenges in accessing primary and emergency care, while others described difficulties they had faced related to finding a family doctor, scheduling appointments and/or procedures with specialists, and receiving follow up appointments with medical professionals they had previously consulted. Several viewed a perceived widespread shortage of health workers (such as doctors and nurses) as having been a key factor contributing to many of the health care related challenges currently facing their region.

All thought that federal government was on the wrong track when it came to improving health care for Canadians. Discussing potential actions that could be taken on this front going forward, many felt that more needed to be done by the Government of Canada to encourage individuals to pursue careers in health care as well as to expand the number of seats available in medical and nursing programs across the country. It was also thought that additional actions needed to be taken to incentivize family doctors and specialists to practice in smaller, more rural communities, with a number of the impression that those in less populated regions often had far less access to care compared to major urban centres.

Cost of Living (Montreal 2SLGBTQI+)

The group comprised of members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community residing in Montreal took part in an additional discussion related to the cost of living. Many viewed the perceived high cost of living at present as a fundamental issue, believing that a large number of individuals (and especially those from vulnerable populations) were currently struggling to afford basic necessities, such as food and housing. The view was expressed that the increased cost of living had disproportionately impacted lower- and middle-income households compared to the wealthiest Canadians, and that, if left unaddressed, this issue would likely lead to increased economic and social inequity in the years to come.

Asked whether they expected the cost of living to increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next year, a roughly equal number believed that it would increase compared to those who thought it would remain relatively stable. Among those who believed that the cost of living would likely worsen, a number expressed concerns related to climate change and expected that if this issue were to continue to escalate, life in Canada would likely become increasingly expensive in the years to come. A few also worried about the potential for perceived rising geopolitical tensions in some parts of the world to



disrupt global trade and supply chains, believing this could ultimately lead to higher prices for consumers.

Local Issues (Montérégie Region Quebec)

Participants residing in the Montérégie region of Quebec engaged in a brief conversation related to the challenges currently facing their local communities. Discussing the most important sectors and industries for their respective communities, several identified agriculture and food production as being key industries in their areas. A number viewed transportation (of food products and other goods) as a major industry in their region, while a few also described electric vehicle (EV) manufacturing as being increasingly economically important to their communities.

Asked which industries or sectors they felt required the most assistance in their region, a large number once again mentioned agriculture and transportation. Regarding the latter, it was felt that efforts needed to be taken by the federal government to build and repair vital transportation infrastructure such as highways and other roadways throughout the Montérégie region. Asked how the federal government could better support these industries (and the agriculture sector in particular), a number believed that more needed to be done to increase the amount of available farmland throughout Quebec (and Canada more broadly) as well as encourage more people to consider pursuing careers in the agriculture and food production sector.

Budget 2024 (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Two groups, based in Saskatchewan and Lower Mainland British Columbia (B.C.) respectively, engaged in conversations related to Budget 2024, which was tabled by the federal government on April 16th, 2024. Those residing in Saskatchewan shared their overall impressions related to a range of measures announced as part of the budget, while participants in B.C. focused on initiatives specifically related to the Government of Canada's wildfire response and actions to increase taxes on capital gains above a certain threshold. Additionally, both groups discussed a range of housing initiatives that had been announced as part of the budget.

Overall Impressions (Saskatchewan)

Asked what came to mind when they thought about this year's budget, a large number expressed uncertainty, commenting that they did not know enough about the initiatives that had been announced to provide a proper evaluation. A few recalled hearing that the budget had placed a significant focus on improving the affordability of housing for Canadians, which many believed was an important area for the federal government to be focusing on.

Engaging in an exercise where they were provided with information related to a number of measures that had been announced as part of the budget and asked to identify which they felt would have the greatest impact, participants widely believed that stabilizing the cost of groceries would have a positive impact on the largest number of Canadians. Some also expressed support for the creation of a National School Food Program, believing that it was important for the federal government to be



focusing on ensuring that all children, and especially those from lower-income families, were able to access proper meals during their school day without having to worry about the cost. A number also selected the initiative to implement health care agreements with every province and territory to improve access to primary care and reduce wait times, believing that this would be beneficial to a large number of Canadians who were currently struggling to access health care services in their communities.

Focusing on the federal government's proposal to ask the wealthiest Canadians to pay their fair share in taxes, while most were supportive of the notion of increasing the taxes for the wealthiest Canadians, several were skeptical as to whether this measure would be effective. The view was expressed that, given the greater financial resources of wealthier Canadians and their ability to hire professionals such as accountants to assist them in reducing their taxable income, it was unlikely that the highest earners would pay their fair share in taxes, even with this measure in place. Discussing the potential uses for the additional tax revenues raised by the federal government through this initiative, a few thought that these funds should be directed towards initiatives focused on protecting the environment and mitigating the impacts of climate change.

Wildfires (Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Participants residing in B.C.'s Lower Mainland engaged in an additional discussion related to the federal government's response to large-scale wildfires in their province in recent years as well as recently announced budget initiatives focusing on addressing this issue. Asked whether they were aware of any actions from the federal government related to preparing for and/or responding to wildfires, none indicated that they were.

Provided with information about recent measures announced as part of Budget 2024 related to wildfires, all reacted positively with several expressing that these initiatives represented a major step in assisting communities with preparing for and responding to wildfires. A number identified the initiatives to double the Volunteer Firefighter and Search and Rescue Volunteer Tax Credits as well as increase firefighting and emergency response partnerships with Indigenous peoples as being especially important. Discussing what more could be done by the federal government related to combatting wildfires, participants suggested increasing the use of fire prevention practices such as controlled burns as well as continuing to educate Canadians regarding how to best prepare for and respond to potential wildfires in their areas.

Capital Gains (Lower Mainland British Columbia)

The group based in Lower Mainland B.C. also took part in a brief conversation regarding initiatives from the budget related to capital gains. Asked whether they had heard anything about proposed changes to how capital gains are taxed, while a few reported that they had, none could recall any specific details.

Provided with information related to a proposal by the Government of Canada to increase the capital gains inclusion rate for capital gains over \$250,000, most responded positively, believing that this represented a fair approach that would likely benefit a large number of households. The view was

expressed that, given the perceived negative impact of real estate speculation on the supply of available housing in many parts of the country, increasing the capital gains tax on large transactions (such as the sale of a home) could help to discourage this type of practice. A few questioned whether the \$250,000 threshold was too low, with some expressing concern that this measure could also impact non-wealthy Canadians who may inherit property or who plan on selling investments in order to fund their retirements.

Housing Initiatives (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Both groups discussed a wide range of housing initiatives that had been announced by the Government of Canada as part of Budget 2024. Participants were informed that, as part of its plan to address the housing crisis, the Government of Canada had announced a three-part housing strategy aimed at unlocking 3.87 million new homes by 2031.

Groups were next presented with information related to specific actions the Government of Canada was taking as part of this plan. The first set of initiatives, highlighting some of the actions the Government of Canada was proposing to help build more homes, received positive reactions from participants. Several expected that by working to increase the supply of affordable housing, both for purchase and to rent, the federal government would help to ensure more Canadians would be able to access housing while also being able to afford other important expenses in their lives. Focusing on the agreements reached through the Housing Accelerator Fund to encourage municipalities to cut red tape, a few questioned whether this would lead to reduced construction and safety standards, with lower quality homes being built as a result.

Participants were next shown a second set of initiatives, this time focused on actions aimed at making it easier for Canadians to rent or own their own homes. Reactions were again resoundingly positive to these initiatives, with all believing that these actions would be helpful to renters and prospective first-time home buyers. A large number identified the action to encourage lenders to consider on-time rent payments when calculating credit scores as being especially impactful, believing this could be an effective way for young people and/or newcomers to Canada to build credit while saving towards the purchase of a home. The initiative to allow for 30-year mortgages for first-time home buyers who purchase newly built homes was also seen as potentially being very effective, with a number believing that this extended lending period would make the prospect of a mortgage far more affordable for many lower- and middle-income families. Several also commented positively on the measures to extend the ban on non-Canadians purchasing residential property as well restricting the purchase and acquisition of existing single-family homes by very large, corporate investors.

The final set of measures shown to participants focused on actions the federal government was proposing to assist those struggling with the cost of housing at present. A number reacted positively to the \$1 billion investment towards the Affordable Housing Fund and expressed that, going forward, they would rather see more funding provided to non-profit, co-operative, and public housing providers rather than for-profit developers. The initiative to create a Rental Protection Fund was also well-received by participants, with several believing that this would be an effective way to protect renters and ensure that affordable rental options remained available in Canadian communities.



Asked an additional question as to whether any of the measures they had discussed would be helpful to younger Canadians and future generations in ensuring they had access to a wide variety of affordable housing options, several in the group based in Saskatchewan believed that they would. A number, however, reiterated that unless action was taken to reduce the overall cost of housing and bring home prices down, it was unlikely that most younger Canadians would be able to realistically afford to purchase a home in the foreseeable future.

Jobs (Montréal Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Two groups engaged in discussions related to the Canadian economy and the employment market at present. At the outset of their conversation, participants residing in Hamilton were asked how they would describe the Government of Canada's management of the economy. A large number felt that the Canadian economy had not been well managed in recent years, citing perceived issues such as high interest rates, the rising cost of living, a growing national debt, and continued deficit spending by the federal government. Asked whether they felt the Government of Canada was on the right track when it came to its management of the economy, very few believed that it was. Discussing what they felt to be the most important economic issues facing Canadians at present, participants mentioned the high cost of essentials such as groceries and gasoline, a lack of affordable housing, what was viewed as an over-dependence of the Canadian economy on housing, and what were perceived as the high rates of taxation paid by many Canadian households.

Both groups were asked to share their views on the current state of the employment market in Canada. Regionally, a number residing in Hamilton expressed a mixed opinion, believing that while it was easy to find part time and/or low-paying employment, it was often quite difficult to obtain a rewarding, well-paying job. Several of those in the group based in the Montréal region of Quebec described the job market as being somewhat cyclical in their area. It was believed that many businesses, and especially those in the tourism and hospitality sector, were struggling to find workers at present and were dealing with significant labour shortages.

Asked to speculate what the state of the Canadian job market would be like in the next 5-10 years, most expected that it would remain relatively the same. Many expected that job growth would occur in industries related to technology, robotics and automation, artificial intelligence (AI), green technology and renewable energy, health care, and skilled trades (especially those related to the construction of homes). Several expressed concern regarding the potential for AI or automation to replace some jobs currently being performed by human beings.

Discussing whether they felt the Government of Canada was on the right track when it came to ensuring workers received the training they required to stay competitive, participants expressed a range of views. Regionally, most in the Montréal region felt that the federal government was on the wrong track on this front, believing that it did not provide employers with sufficient funding to offer their workers additional skills training. A large number residing in Hamilton felt differently, with most believing that the federal government was on the right track in this area. Several were of the impression that the federal government had made significant investments towards skills training and assisting Canadian workers with upgrading their skills.



Asked whether they felt that the federal government was headed in the right direction when it came to creating good jobs in Canada, several participants across both groups felt that it was. Describing additional actions that it could take to encourage the creation of well-paying jobs for Canadians, participants provided a number of suggestions. These included the provision of subsidies for those training to work in high-demand sectors, skills training programs for new immigrants to Canada, and incentives for companies to manufacture more products in Canada (as a way of increasing hiring in the manufacturing sector).

Climate Change (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)

Six groups took part in conversations related to the impacts of climate change as well as actions that could be taken on an individual and/or societal level to help in addressing this issue. Asked whether they felt that climate change was among the top priorities for the Government of Canada to be focusing on, participants were mixed in their opinions. While most viewed climate change as an important issue and believed it was an area worth prioritizing, it was widely felt that other challenges such as the high cost of living, a lack of affordable housing, and issues related to health care (such as long wait times and health worker shortages) were more urgent priorities for the federal government.

Asked whether they felt that climate change had affected the cost of living, most believed that it had. It was thought that the destruction caused by extreme weather events in recent years had been very costly for many Canadian communities and that the response to these natural disasters had required considerable financial assistance from both the federal and provincial/territorial governments. Several cited other negative impacts of climate change related to the cost of living, including increasing challenges for farmers to grow food due to issues such as drought and extreme heat, difficulties transporting goods and products due to the damage and disruption caused by natural disasters such as wildfires, and the increased costs that would likely be passed on to consumers as a result of these challenges.

Discussing the worst impacts (both at present and in the future) of climate change, participants identified a wide range of issues. These included decreased food production and potential food insecurity in some parts of the country, damage to public and private property from floods and wildfires, worsened air quality from wildfire smoke, and the potential for loss of life due to extreme temperatures and dangerous weather events, as well as irreversible damage to the environment and ecosystems across Canada.

Prompted to identify what they viewed as the most significant barriers to taking action against climate change, many expressed that, given other challenges such as inflation and the high cost of living, it was difficult to focus on larger issues such as climate change when trying to make ends meet financially each month. Related to this, a number identified what they perceived as the high costs of switching to more climate-friendly technology, such as purchasing an electric vehicle (EV), and/or making their homes more energy efficient by installing solar panels or heat pumps, as another major

barrier. Asked how important they felt it was for individuals as well as Canada as a whole to take action to address climate change, many believed that it was of greater importance for this fight to be a collective effort led by the Government of Canada, as opposed to primarily relying on actions being taken at the individual level.

Questioned how important they felt it was for Canada to be a global leader when it comes to taking climate action, most believed this to be an important reputation to maintain. It was felt by several that if combatting climate change was a major priority for the Government of Canada, it was important for it to lead by example on this front. Discussing how much responsibility they personally felt to take action to fight climate change and protect the environment, many reiterated the view that climate change was a significant issue and expressed that they were doing what they could on an individual level to engage in climate friendly behaviours such as recycling, reducing their energy use, and avoiding using single-use items.

Carbon Pricing (Saskatchewan, Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)

Seven groups engaged in conversations related to carbon pricing and recent actions that the Government of Canada had taken on this front. Almost all recalled having heard about pollution pricing (referred to by some as a carbon tax) with many aware that the federal carbon pricing system was currently in effect in their respective provinces. A number reported hearing that the price on carbon had recently increased, believing this would likely raise the cost of living further for many households. Asked whether they were familiar with the Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR), most indicated they were, with a number of the understanding that this was an amount paid by the federal government to Canadian households as a way to offset the increased costs that were thought to result from the price on carbon.

Provided with information related to the federal carbon pricing system and the amounts provided back to Canadians through CCR payments, several questioned why households were receiving money back. It was felt that providing the CCR contravened the primary aim of encouraging Canadians to reduce their emitting behaviours. The view was expressed that if most households knew they would eventually be receiving the amounts they paid under the carbon pricing system back in the form of rebates, few would feel any financial incentive to reduce their emissions. Several were uncertain as to whether the amounts provided would be sufficient to offset the financial impacts of the price on carbon, believing this initiative had served to significantly increase the cost of living and essentials such as gasoline and home heating.

While few were directly opposed to the implementation of a price on carbon pollution by the Government of Canada, several questioned whether this approach would actually be effective in combatting climate change. Focusing on the CCR, many were of the opinion that, rather than providing rebates back to Canadians, the funds collected via the carbon pricing system should instead



be invested towards projects aimed at promoting sustainability and mitigating the impacts of climate change.

All groups (with the exception of those in Saskatchewan) were asked how they felt about the revenues from the CCR being returned to individuals, businesses, and Indigenous groups and whether they felt this would help Canadians to afford the things they need. On balance, few believed that the amounts provided through CCR payments would be enough to make much of a difference for most Canadians who were currently struggling with the high cost of living. Sharing their reactions to the information that 8 out of 10 households receive more back than they spend on the price on carbon pollution, many reiterated the desire for further information as to how these figures were being calculated, including what metrics were being used in determining how much households were spending on the price on carbon pollution.

Overall, very few felt that the federal government's approach to carbon pollution pricing would be effective in reducing emissions. Asked whether they felt this approach was fair, participants were mixed in their opinions. A number believed that it was relatively fair in that equal CCR payments were sent out to all households. The view was also expressed, however, that due to the high cost of living at present, it was somewhat unfair for those households already struggling to make ends meet financially to also now have to accommodate the additional costs of a price on carbon pollution. This was felt to especially be the case for those residing in communities where there were fewer alternative options available (such as public transportation and renewable energy sources) that would assist them in reducing their personal emissions.

Carbon Pricing Video Testing (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)

Six groups shared their perspectives related to a video advertisement produced by the federal government to inform Canadians about the carbon pricing system. Participants were shown the video twice, in succession.

Participants were mixed in their reactions to this video. While some believed that it had been clear, well produced, and had helped to increase their understanding of the workings of the carbon pricing system, a roughly equal number felt otherwise. Among these participants it was felt that the video had not effectively explained the benefits of a carbon pricing system for Canadians. Some also viewed the notion that Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR) payments would help households to purchase the things they need as being somewhat unrealistic, believing that the amounts returned would do little to offset the perceived high cost of essentials such as groceries and gasoline. A few thought that the runtime of the video was somewhat long, believing that many viewers, and especially those who encountered this video while scrolling on their mobile devices, would be unlikely to watch it for its full duration.

Asked whether the video had introduced new information related to carbon pricing that they had not heard before, several reported having previously been unaware that the amounts received through CCR payments varied depending on the province or territory one resided in. A number also expressed that they were unaware of which provinces/territories were operating under the federal carbon pricing system and which (such as British Columbia (B.C.) and Quebec) had their own system in place.

Participants in Central Ontario and Newfoundland and Labrador were asked an additional question regarding whether they felt the climate-friendly alternatives highlighted in the video (such as cycling, driving an electric vehicle (EV), and heating one's home more efficiently) were effective examples regarding the actions that could be taken to reduce emissions, or whether different examples should be provided. While many believed that Canadians could reduce their emissions by adopting more climate-friendly alternatives, it was felt that activities such as cycling were unrealistic for those living in rural communities where one often had to travel far longer distances as part of their daily activities. Participants also viewed actions such as purchasing an EV and/or retrofitting one's home to be more energy efficient as being potentially prohibitively expensive for a large number of Canadians. Discussing alternative examples that could be used, participants mentioned actions such as growing one's own food, planting trees, utilizing public transit (for those living in communities where this was a realistic option), and switching to light-emitting diode (LED) bulbs.

All groups were asked whether, given everything they had discussed thus far, they felt the implementation of a price on carbon was effective in creating a financial incentive for Canadians to pollute less. On balance, only a small number felt that this approach would be effective, with most believing that it was unlikely that households would be willing or able to reduce their emissions. Discussing alternative actions that could be taken, participants suggested providing more financial incentives and rebates to those who purchase an EV or engage in projects such as installing solar panels or heat pumps in their homes. A number also believed that action should be taken to better educate Canadians on ways they can reduce their emissions and making it easier and/or more affordable for them to engage in these behaviours.

Asked whether they felt they could change their daily habits to lower their emissions and reduce the amount they are paying for carbon pollution, most believed that all Canadians could likely find ways to do their part in achieving this goal. Suggested actions included adjusting the thermostat less in the summer and winter months, purchasing locally sourced food, and installing more energy efficient appliances. Discussing whether they felt individuals would consider alternatives to driving, such as carpooling, utilizing public transportation, and/or cycling, in order to pay less into the price on pollution, most felt that this would likely vary on a person-by-person basis. It was thought that while some (and especially lower-income individuals) would be compelled to utilize these more affordable options if they were available to them, for others driving their own vehicles was a necessary part of their day-to-day activities and a habit that they would be unwilling or unable to change.

Discussing why they felt some provinces use their own system while others operated under the federal pollution pricing system, participants provided a variety of potential reasons. A number felt that some provinces, such as B.C. and Quebec, which used their own system, might already have more energy



efficient infrastructure in place and/or had already been pursuing actions to reduce their emissions prior to the Government of Canada introducing its own carbon pricing system. Some also thought that this might be a primarily financial decision, with some provinces (depending on how much they are emitting) finding it more financially efficient to use their own system rather than the one operated by the federal government.

Electric Vehicle Battery Manufacturing (Montérégie Region Quebec)

Participants residing in the Montérégie region of Quebec engaged in a brief discussion regarding a recent announcement from the federal government related to the construction of a new electric vehicle (EV) battery manufacturing plant in their area. Asked whether they had recently seen, read, or heard about any news related to the Government of Canada and EVs, several recalled hearing that it had made increased investments towards the building and manufacturing of EVs and EV parts in Canada.

Provided with information related to a combined \$7 billion investment from the Government of Canada and Government of Quebec towards the construction of a new EV battery manufacturing facility in Saint-Basile-le-Grand and McMasterville, Quebec operated by Northvolt Batteries North America, almost all reacted positively. Several expressed that the expected creation of 3,000 jobs would be greatly beneficial to the economic wellbeing of those living in these communities, as well as have a positive impact on the provincial and Canadian economies overall. A number, however, expressed concerns regarding the potential environmental issues they believed were associated with the mining of the raw materials required for EV batteries and the perceived difficulties in safely recycling these batteries once they reach the end of their lifespans. A few also worried about whether there would be enough housing in their region to support thousands of additional workers and questioned whether the construction of this facility would lead to an increase in housing costs in the future.

Immigration (Montérégie Region Quebec, Laurentides Region Quebec)

Participants in two groups, based in the Montérégie and Laurentides regions of Quebec respectively, engaged in a discussion regarding immigration. Asked to describe the current state of the immigration system in Canada, several believed that clearer processes and controls needed to be put into place to manage the flow of immigration and ensure that the communities in which new immigrants settle had the resources to sufficiently accommodate an increase to the population.

Discussing what they perceived as the primary benefits of immigration, many highlighted the ability of Canada to attract skilled workers, particularly doctors and health care workers, from other countries to work in Canada. Several mentioned that while they were interested in increasing immigration levels for skilled workers, they hoped that the federal government would reduce immigration levels for unskilled and temporary foreign workers, believing that these individuals provided little in the way of positive impacts for the Canadian economy.

Participants were next asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the statement that “*Canada needs to welcome more new immigrants to fill labour shortages and grow the economy*”. While most agreed with this statement, a number felt that the federal government’s focus should be primarily on recruiting highly skilled immigrants to work in key sectors such as health care and agriculture, that were currently believed to be facing labour shortages. Among the smaller number who disagreed with the statement, it was felt that any economic benefits of immigration would be outweighed by the perceived exacerbation of existing challenges faced by Canadians in a number of other areas, such as the high cost of living, a lack of affordable housing, and the perceived strain it placed on existing infrastructure and services (such as health care, education and transportation). Related to this, some expressed concerns that if these resources were not available, it could lead to some new immigrants experiencing extreme poverty, placing them in a very precarious position as a result.

Asked what the Government of Canada should do to address concerns related to immigration, many reiterated the need for targeted immigration focusing on bringing in immigrants with skills that could immediately contribute to the Canadian economy. Related to this, a few felt that more could be done to streamline the foreign credential recognition process to ensure that new immigrants were able to work in their fields of expertise upon arriving in Canada. Questioned whether they felt the Government of Canada should increase, decrease, or keep the rate of immigration relatively the same, a slightly larger number felt it should be decreased as those who believed it should remain stable. Almost no participants felt the rate of immigration should be increased.

Issues Affecting the 2SLGBTQI+ Community (Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community)

Participants in the group based in Montreal, comprised of individuals who identified as 2SLGBTQI+, shared their perspectives related to issues currently facing the 2SLGBTQI+ community in Canada. Asked to identify what they viewed as the most pressing challenges currently facing 2SLGBTQI+ individuals, several believed that there needed to be greater education and acceptance of transgender people across Canada. A number also thought that greater investments needed to be made toward ensuring that 2SLGBTQI+ individuals had sufficient access to health care and mental health services as well as safe places they could go to feel protected from discrimination.

Describing the level of acceptance, support, and inclusion in Canadians society for the 2SLGBTQI+ community, most felt that Canadians were generally accepting of their community, especially compared to many other parts of the world. Discussing whether they felt the level of acceptance of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals had changed over time, several were of the impression that Canadians had generally become more accepting of these communities in recent decades. This being said, a few believed that with the advent of social media, it had become easier for anti-2SLGBTQI+ hate to be disseminated online, leading to 2SLGBTQI+ people likely encountering hateful opinions more frequently today relative to past eras.

Asked what additional actions they felt should be taken by the federal government to promote the acceptance, support, and inclusion of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals in Canada, many believed that it was important to promote more widespread education for Canadians regarding the issues facing their communities. Other suggestions included the provision of increased protections for 2SLGBTQI+ youth



and more active consultations with 2SLGBTQI+ people and organizations when designing initiatives for their communities.

While most believed that the state of 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms had improved in recent decades, especially in terms of the legalization of same-sex marriage and allowing same-sex couples to adopt, it was felt by many that some challenges had persisted on this front. The view was expressed that 2SLGBTQI+ individuals continued to experience greater discrimination when accessing health care or interacting with law enforcement compared to other Canadians. Some also were of the impression that 2SLGBTQI+ individuals faced significant barriers in accessing various health services (including mental health supports), such as hormone therapy.

Discussing what actions the Government of Canada should take to better protect the rights and freedoms of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals, several believed that there needed to be a greater emphasis on ensuring that the laws in place aimed at protecting their communities were being properly enforced in all parts of the country. Asked whether they felt the federal government was on the right track on protecting 2SLGBTQI+ rights, a larger number believed that it was compared to those who felt otherwise.

Describing actions that the Government of Canada could take to improve its relations with the 2SLGBTQI+ community, many felt that a greater focus should be placed on increasing the representation of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals across all facets of Canadian life. The view was also reiterated that there needed to be greater consultation by the federal government with 2SLGBTQI+ individuals and organizations, as well as ensuring that 2SLGBTQI+ voices were included on panels, boards, groups, and committees, particularly those pertaining to 2SLGBTQI+ affairs. Discussing whether they were optimistic about their future as an 2SLGBTQI+ person living in Canada, most reported that they were, believing that their communities were typically far safer and better supported in Canada compared to most other parts of the world.

Opioids (Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Participants residing in British Columbia (B.C.)'s Lower Mainland took part in a discussion related to opioid use and addiction in their communities. All viewed opioid addiction as a major concern at present and believed that this issue had worsened significantly in recent years. Questioned whether they were aware of any actions that the Government of Canada had taken to address opioid addiction in B.C., a number believed it had provided funding towards harm reduction initiatives such as supervised consumption sites.

Discussing what came to mind when they heard the terms 'safe supply' and 'supervised consumption site', most believed these phrases were connected to the overall goal of harm reduction and ensuring that drug users were using clean substances under the supervision of health care professionals. While most felt it was important for harm reduction initiatives such as these to be in place, it was widely thought that these needed to be accompanied by an increase in treatment resources for those suffering from addiction. It was felt that unless steps were taken to help these individuals permanently

stop using drugs, issues such as substance use and addiction would continue to proliferate in the years to come.

Provided with information regarding actions the Government of Canada was taking through the Substance Use and Addictions Program (SUAP) to address this issue, while several viewed these as a step in the right direction, a large number reiterated the view that a greater focus needed to be placed on eliminating illicit substance use altogether and providing drug users with the tools and treatment they need to overcome addiction.

Many expressed support for the decision by the federal government to approve the Government of B.C.'s request to recriminalize the use of illicit drugs in public spaces. Several were of the impression that following the previous decision to decriminalize these substances, public drug use had become far more prevalent in the Lower Mainland. A number shared concerns regarding the impact that seeing open drug use would have on children and young people and did not believe that it was appropriate for drug users to be able to consume these substances in public spaces.

Asked what additional actions they would like to see from the Government of Canada related to addressing illicit substance use and addiction, all reiterated a desire for the greater prioritization of treatment and education, and the need for increased funding towards treatment centres and mental health resources. A small number felt there also needed to be a greater focus placed on preventing the influx of drugs into Canada from other parts of the world. Among these participants, it was believed that there was a disproportionate focus on working to change the behaviours of drug users rather than targeting those involved in trafficking and distributing these substances throughout Canada.

French Language Protection and Promotion (Laurentides Region Quebec)

One group, comprised of participants residing in the Laurentides region of Quebec, shared their perspectives regarding a range of initiatives that had been announced by the federal government related to protecting and promoting the French language in Canada. Asked how important they felt it was to protect and promote the use of French in Canada, several viewed this as a major priority, and expressed concern that if action was not taken the usage of French could diminish greatly among future generations. Discussing the current state of the French language in Canada, while most believed that it was widely spoken throughout Quebec and that there were numerous French language educational resources available within the province, it was thought that French was used very little in the rest of the country.

Asked whether they had heard anything about the Government of Canada's new Action Plan for Official Languages, none indicated that they had. Provided with information related to the key objectives of this plan and the specific measures that would be taken to achieve them, almost all reacted positively. Participants expressed particular praise for those initiatives focused on increasing investments towards Francophone child care centres across Canada, providing grants to French artists, the creation of a French-language centre within Heritage Canada, and encouraging increased rates of immigration from French-speaking countries. Regarding the latter, it was felt that this approach would



be far more effective towards increasing the prevalence of the French language compared to efforts to teach French to new immigrants after they arrive.

Community Safety (Hamilton)

Participants residing in Hamilton engaged in a discussion related to the level of crime in their area and their perceptions regarding the overall safety of their community. Asked how safe they felt Hamilton was at present, a roughly equal number viewed it as being relatively safe as those who felt otherwise. Among those who viewed their community as being unsafe, participants mentioned issues related to a perceived increase in criminal activities such as burglaries and break-ins, violent assaults (including shootings), illicit drug usage, property damage, and growing issues related to homelessness.

Almost all believed that the level of crime in their community had been increasing as of late. Asked what factors they felt might be contributing to this perceived rise in crime, participants described a number of issues. These included a perceived growing number of individuals suffering from addiction and mental health disorders and the difficulties they faced in accessing treatment for these issues, a proliferation of organized crime in Canada, what was viewed as a lack of consequences for those who engage in criminal actions, and the increased desperation of some individuals due to the high cost of living at present.

Asked who they felt was most responsible for dealing with crime, a large number viewed municipal law enforcement and officials as having the biggest role, specifically in regards to the funding and oversight municipalities provide for local police forces. Discussing what role they felt the Government of Canada should play when it came to addressing crime, participants felt it should primarily be responsible for ensuring the security of Canadian borders, preventing the trafficking of drugs into Canada, providing funding towards addiction and mental health programs, and imposing penalties for those who commit criminal offences. Questioned whether they felt that addressing crime was an important priority for the federal government to be focusing on, almost all believed that it was.

Auto Theft (Hamilton)

Participants residing in Hamilton engaged in a brief discussion related to auto theft and actions that had recently been taken by the federal government aimed at addressing this issue. Asked whether they had seen, read, or heard about any initiatives from the Government of Canada on this front, several mentioned the announcement of the National Action Plan on Combatting Auto Theft (though not specifically by name). A number also were of the impression that the federal government had taken steps to encourage the automotive industry to improve security features in the automobiles they manufacture in order to make them more difficult to steal.

Provided with information related to a range of measures the federal government had announced to combat auto theft, all reacted positively, with several identifying the measure to strengthen the ability of Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) officials to detect and search containers holding stolen vehicles as being particularly effective. Other initiatives mentioned positively by participants included



the allocation of \$15 million to provincial, territorial, and municipal police forces to assist them in addressing auto theft, as well as the introduction of additional criminal penalties related to auto theft, including a new aggravating factor at sentencing for offenders who involve a minor in the theft of an automobile.

Asked whether they felt these actions would have a major, minor, or no impact on combatting auto theft, all expected that they would have a minor impact. It was widely felt, however, that if properly implemented, these actions would provide a strong foundation for more comprehensive measures in the future aimed at addressing this issue.



THE
**STRATEGIC
COUNSEL**

MORE INFORMATION

The Strategic Counsel

Contract number: CW2241412

Contract award date: December 19, 2022

Contract value: \$ 814,741.30

Detailed Findings

Timeline of May 2024 Announcements

To help place the focus group discussions within the context of key events which occurred during the reporting cycle, below is a brief synopsis for the month of May 2024.

- May 1-7
 - May 1. The Government of Canada announced that, as of May 1st, the first one million seniors had successfully enrolled in the Canada Dental Care Plan (CDCP) and now had dental coverage under the plan.
 - May 2. The Government of Canada released its *2024 National Inventory Report* which found that, with the exception of the initial years of the COVID-19 pandemic (2020 and 2021), carbon emissions in 2022 had been at their lowest recorded levels in 25 years.
 - May 3. The Government of Canada announced a donation of \$65 million in humanitarian aid to support Lebanon.
 - Focus group was held with the general population in Saskatchewan (May 7).
- May 8-14
 - Focus group was held with millennials in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia & Prince Edward Island (P.E.I.) (May 8).
 - Focus group was held with members of Generation Z in Calgary (May 9).
 - May 10. The Government of Canada announced a contribution of \$76 million to Germany's Immediate Action on Air Defence initiative for the protection of Ukraine.
 - May 10. The Government of Canada announced additional sanctions against four individuals in response to terrorist attacks perpetrated by the Hamas terrorist organization against Israel.
 - Focus group was held with climate supportive and ambivalent individuals in mid-size and major centres in Manitoba (May 14).
- May 15-21
 - Focus group was held with the general population in the Montérégie region of Quebec (May 15).
 - May 16. The Government of Canada announced a contribution of over \$71 million through the New Horizons for Seniors Program (NHSP) to 3,541 community-based projects across the country aimed at improving the quality of life for seniors in Canada.
 - May 16. The Government of Canada announced that it would be imposing sanctions on perpetrators of extremist settler violence against Palestinian civilians and their property in the West Bank.
 - May 16. The Government of Canada announced a contribution of \$65 million in humanitarian aid to support Palestinian civilians taking refuge in the City of Rafah.
 - Focus group was held with climate supportive and ambivalent individuals in major centres in Alberta (May 16).
 - May 20. The Government of Canada announced it would be releasing its National Plan on Combatting Auto Theft which includes legislative and regulatory changes, enhancements to intelligence and information sharing, and improvements to the Canada Border Service Agency's (CBSA) capacity to intervene and intercept stolen vehicles.

- Focus group was held with climate supportive and ambivalent individuals in Central Ontario (May 21).
- May 22-28
 - May 22. The Government of Canada released its Enterprise Cyber Security Strategy which outlines the federal government's approach to responding to cyber security threats.
 - May 22. The Government of Canada proposed new regulations to aid in the launch of the Assault-Style Firearms Compensation program. These new regulations would allow businesses to temporarily be able to send firearms through the mail to collection centres in order to receive compensation for removing assault-style firearms from circulation.
 - Focus group was held with members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community in Montreal (May 22).
 - May 23. The Government of Canada introduced Bill C-71, *an Act to amend the Citizenship Act* which, if passed, would allow a Canadian parent born abroad who has a substantial connection to Canada to pass on citizenship to their child born abroad beyond the first generation.
 - May 23. The Government of Canada introduced temporary measures to support family members of Canadian citizens affected by the crisis in Haiti. These measures would allow Haitians with temporary resident status to apply for a study permit, open work permit, or status extension at no cost.
 - Focus group was held with the general population in Newfoundland and Labrador (May 23).
 - Focus group was held with the general population in Lower Mainland BC (May 28).
- May 29-31
 - The Government of Canada announced that it had awarded a 25-year and \$11.2 billion contract to SkyAlyne Canada Limited Partnership to invest in equipment and training for the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF).
 - Focus group was held with the general population in the Laurentides region of Quebec (May 29).
 - Focus group was held with the general population in Hamilton (May 30).

Government of Canada in the News (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Lower Mainland British Columbia, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Participants in four groups were asked to share what they had seen, read, or heard about the Government of Canada in recent days. A range of announcements and initiatives were recalled, including:

- An announcement by the federal government that it would be taking actions to increase the supply of affordable housing in Canadian communities, with the aim of addressing the perceived housing crisis in many parts of the country at present;
- A proposal by the Government of Canada to increase the capital gains inclusion rate (also referred to as the capital gains tax) on the portion of capital gains realized annually that are in excess of \$250,000 for individuals;
- Actions to stabilize the cost of groceries for Canadians, including taking steps to increase competition within the grocery sector as well as monitoring major grocery chains to ensure that they were not taking part in price inflation practices;
- The announcement by Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) that, beginning in 2024, the federal government would be setting an intake cap on international student study permit applications for a period of two years; and
- An announcement that, as a part of its ongoing humanitarian response to the conflict in Gaza, the Government of Canada would be increasing the number of temporary resident visa applications available to Palestinians with family members in Canada from 1,000 to 5,000.

Government of Canada Priorities and Performance (Montérégie Region Quebec, Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community, Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Four groups engaged in conversations related to the issues currently facing Canadians as well as their perspectives regarding the federal government's management of these priorities. Participants were asked to identify areas in which they felt the Government of Canada was performing well and areas where they felt there was room for improvement. On a number of issues participants expressed a range of positive and negative views. These included:

- Health care – Several identified health care as an area in which the Government of Canada had performed well, with some speaking especially positively of the recently established Canada Dental Care Plan (CDCP). A number felt that the ability to access high quality, universally affordable health care was an important part of living in Canada and an area in which the federal government had outperformed many of its peers throughout the world. A number, however, believed that more needed to be done to address health care related issues such as perceived long wait times for primary and emergency care, a shortage of health workers such as doctors and nurses, and what was viewed as a lack of resources for issues such as mental health and addiction;
- Protecting and promoting vulnerable populations – A number believed that the federal government had been effective in protecting and promoting diversity and multiculturalism, as well as the rights of vulnerable populations such women, seniors, and 2SLGBTQI+ individuals. A number in the group comprised of members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community residing in Montreal specifically mentioned actions taken by the federal government to reduce harmful practices such as conversion therapy as an area in which they felt the Government of Canada had performed well. Some in this group, however, also felt that more needed to be done to better ensure the safety of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals, with a number of the impression that members of these communities were currently far more vulnerable to issues such as homelessness, mental health, and addiction relative to other Canadians; and
- Climate change – While a few spoke positively of actions that the federal government had taken (such as the implementation of a price on carbon) to reduce emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change, a number felt that, given what they perceived as the urgency of this issue and the potential dangers it posed to present and future Canadians, more needed to be done on this front.

Participants also mentioned areas in which they felt that the Government of Canada had been performing well, including:

- Supports for Canadians – Several believed the federal government had performed well in providing a wide range of benefits and supports for Canadians. Programs and initiatives mentioned by participants included the Canada Child Benefit (CCB), the goods and services tax/harmonized sales tax (GST/HST) credit, and supports for seniors such as Old Age Security (OAS) and the Canada Pension Plan (CPP); and
- Response to the pandemic – A number also believed that the Government of Canada had done a good job in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. It was felt that the federal government had reacted quickly in its response to a rapidly changing situation as well as supporting Canadians during this challenging time through programs such as the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB).

Additionally, participants identified a range of areas in which they believed the Government of Canada had room for improvement. These included:

- Grocery costs – Many identified what they perceived as increasingly high grocery costs as a major concern. It was felt that more needed to be done by the federal government to make



groceries more affordable for Canadians as well as provide more financial supports to farmers and others in the agriculture sector to assist them in producing more food;

- Housing – A large number cited a lack of affordable housing in their communities, believing that housing costs had risen sharply for homeowners and renters alike in recent years. Several also identified homelessness as a rising problem in their respective areas. It was felt that housing insecurity had increasingly become a challenge for many Canadians as of late and that addressing this needed to be a top priority for the Government of Canada going forward;
- Education – Some believed that education needed to be a greater focus for the federal government, specifically in terms of increasing funding provided to provinces/territories for primary and secondary schools across the country, as well as building new schools to accommodate the growing population in many Canadian communities. It was felt that a particular focus needed to be placed on recruiting and training more individuals to be teachers, including finding ways to incentivize younger Canadians to consider teaching as a career path;
- National debt – A number also expressed concerns about the national debt and believed that a greater focus needed to be placed on maintaining balanced budgets in order to ensure the debt did not rise further.

Asked to identify what they viewed as the most important priorities for the federal government to be working on, many reiterated the need for a greater focus on making life more affordable for Canadians, including actions to stabilize the costs of essentials such as housing and groceries. A large number also mentioned the need for increased investments towards health care, including greater resources for issues related to mental health. Other priority areas mentioned by participants included protecting the environment and mitigating the impacts of climate change, reconciliation with Indigenous peoples, and the need to better support and protect the rights of vulnerable populations, such as racialized Canadians, persons living with disabilities, and 2SLGBTQI+ individuals. A few believed that there needed to be a greater focus placed on national defence and the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), while a small number in the Laurentides region of Quebec felt that there needed to be an increased emphasis on protecting and promoting the French language and strengthening its use throughout Canada.

Housing (Laurentides Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Participants in two groups, based in the Laurentides Region of Quebec and Hamilton respectively, were asked a few additional questions about recent actions from the federal government related to housing. All believed that housing represented a major priority for the Government of Canada to be focusing on at present.

Asked what they viewed as the biggest challenges related to housing, many identified the affordability of housing as a major issue. It was widely felt that housing, both to purchase and to rent, had become increasingly expensive for Canadians in recent years and that this had made it difficult for many lower- and middle-income families to secure safe and affordable housing. Several believed that there was not enough housing available to meet the current demand in their respective areas and that far more

needed to be done at all levels of government to build more homes. A number expressed the opinion that housing prices had been exacerbated by the increased demand placed on the housing market due to higher immigration to Canada in recent years, while some felt that the supply of available housing had also been negatively impacted by the prevalence of short-term rental services (such as Airbnb) in many Canadian communities. A few believed that higher interest rates had also led to increased challenges in this area. Among these participants, it was felt that higher rates had made it more difficult for prospective homebuyers to be approved for a mortgage and had also contributed to the perceived sharp increase in monthly mortgage payments for many existing homeowners.

Discussing whether they were aware of any recent actions from the federal government related to housing, several mentioned the introduction of the first home savings account (FHSA). While most believed that this initiative was a step in the right direction, a number were of the opinion that unless actions were taken by the Government of Canada to significantly reduce the overall cost of housing, programs such as this would have little impact on improving home ownership prospects for aspiring first-time home buyers.

Health Care (Laurentides Region Quebec)

Participants in the Laurentides region of Quebec also engaged in a brief conversation related to health care, both in their community as well as across Canada more broadly. Almost all viewed health care as a major issue that required greater prioritization from the Government of Canada. While most felt the quality of health care in their region was relatively high, all believed that there were significant challenges at present related to the ability of those in their area to access health care services in a timely fashion. Many recalled having experienced long wait times and other challenges in accessing primary and emergency care, while others described difficulties they had faced related to finding a family doctor, scheduling appointments and/or procedures with specialists, and receiving follow-up appointments with medical professionals they had previously consulted. A few recalled having to travel long distances to other regions in order to receive the care they needed. Several perceived a widespread shortage of health workers (such as doctors and nurses) as a key factor contributing to many of the health care related challenges currently facing their region.

Asked whether they were aware of any commitments or announcements from the Government of Canada related to health care, a small number mentioned the recent introduction of the Canada Dental Care Plan (CDCP). Questioned whether they had heard about any recent negotiations between the federal and provincial/territorial governments related to funding for health care, none reported that they had.

All thought that the federal government was on the wrong track when it came to improving health care for Canadians. Discussing potential actions that could be taken on this front going forward, many felt that more needed to be done to encourage individuals to pursue careers in health care as well as to expand the number of seats available in medical and nursing programs across the country. It was also thought that additional actions needed to be taken to incentivize family doctors and specialists to practice in smaller, more rural communities, with a number of the impression that those in less populated regions often had far less access to care compared to major urban centres. Several believed



that additional funding should be allocated by the federal government to the provinces and territories towards the building of additional infrastructure (such as hospitals) to ensure that the health care needs of a growing population could be met in the years to come.

Cost of Living (Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community)

The group comprised of members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community residing in Montreal took part in an additional discussion related to the cost of living. Many viewed the cost of living as a fundamental issue, believing that a large number of individuals (and especially those from vulnerable populations) were currently struggling to afford basic necessities, such as food and housing. The view was expressed that the increased cost of living had disproportionately impacted lower- and middle-income households compared to the wealthiest Canadians, and that, if left unaddressed, this issue would likely lead to increased economic and social inequity in the years to come.

Participants could not recall any recent actions or initiatives from the federal government related to the cost of living. Asked whether they expected the cost of living to increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next year, a roughly equal number believed that it would increase compared to those who thought it would remain relatively stable. Among those who believed that the cost of living would likely worsen, a number expressed concerns related to climate change and expected that if this issue were to continue to escalate, life in Canada would likely become increasingly expensive in the years to come. A few also worried about the potential for perceived rising geopolitical tensions in some parts of the world to disrupt global trade and supply chains, believing this could ultimately lead to higher prices for consumers. For those who expected the cost of living to remain mostly the same, it was believed that while issues such as inflation would continue to abate over the coming year, consumer prices would remain high.

Local Issues (Montérégie Region Quebec)

Participants residing in the Montérégie region of Quebec engaged in a brief conversation related to the challenges currently facing their local communities. Discussing the most important sectors and industries for their respective communities, several identified agriculture and food production as being key industries in their areas. A number viewed transportation (of food products and other goods) as a major industry in their region, while a few also described electric vehicle (EV) manufacturing as being increasingly economically important to their communities.

Asked which industries or sectors they felt required the most assistance in their region, a large number once again mentioned agriculture and transportation. Regarding the latter, it was felt that efforts needed to be taken by the federal government to build and repair vital transportation infrastructure such as highways and other roadways throughout the Montérégie region. Other sectors identified as requiring additional support included restaurants, the tourism and hospitality industry, and small businesses more generally. Questioned whether they could recall any actions from the Government of Canada to support these sectors, a few were of the impression that it had offered financial supports to assist small businesses in recent years, however, no other initiatives could be recalled. Asked how the

federal government could better support these industries (and the agriculture sector in particular), a number believed that more needed to be done to increase the amount of available farmland throughout Quebec (and Canada more broadly) as well as encourage more people to consider pursuing careers in the agriculture and food production sector.

Budget 2024 (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Two groups, based in Saskatchewan and Lower Mainland British Columbia (B.C.) respectively, engaged in conversations related to Budget 2024. Those residing in Saskatchewan shared their overall impressions related to a range of measures announced as part of the budget, while participants in B.C. focused on initiatives specifically related to the Government of Canada's wildfire response and actions to increase the inclusion rate on capital gains above a certain threshold. Additionally, both groups discussed a range of housing initiatives that had been announced as part of the budget.

Overall Impressions (Saskatchewan)

At the outset of their discussion, participants in Saskatchewan were provided with the following information:

Every year the federal government announces a budget for the coming year. This is where the government describes what it will invest in and any plans it has for new programs. The government will also make projections on things like the deficit and where the economy is headed. This year's federal budget was announced on April 16th.

Asked what came to mind when they thought about this year's budget, a large number expressed uncertainty, commenting that they did not know enough about the initiatives that had been announced to provide a proper evaluation. A few recalled hearing that the budget had placed a significant focus on improving the affordability of housing for Canadians, which many believed was an important area for the federal government to be focusing on. A small number expressed concerns related to the perceived high cost of the initiatives that had been announced and the impact this would have on the national debt in the long term.

Participants next engaged in an exercise where they were provided with information related to a number of measures that had been announced as part of the budget and asked to identify which two they felt would have the greatest positive impact on Canadians. These initiatives included:

- *Stabilizing the cost of groceries by monitoring the big grocers, increasing competition and tackling shrinkflation;*
- *Creating a National School Food Program to provide meals to 400,000 more kids every year;*
- *Cracking down on junk fees and making things like internet and cell phone plans cheaper;*



- *Launching a national pharmacare plan, beginning with universal coverage for birth control and diabetes medication and device;*
- *Implementing healthcare agreements with every province and territory to improve access to primary care and reduce wait times;*
- *Implementing action on Foreign Health Care Credential Recognition to help more healthcare workers practice in Canada; and*
- *Ensuring the wealthiest Canadians pay their fair share by asking the top 0.1% of Canadians to pay a little bit more*

Stabilizing the cost of groceries was widely seen as being the initiative that would have the most positive impacts on the largest number of Canadians. It was felt that high grocery costs were an issue affecting all Canadians at present and that more needed to be done to ensure that all households had access to affordable, nutritional food products. Some also expressed support for the creation of a National School Food Program, believing that it was important for the federal government to be focusing on ensuring that all children, and especially those from lower-income families, were able to access proper meals during their school day without having to worry about the cost. A number also selected the initiative to implement health care agreements with every province and territory to improve access to primary care and reduce wait times, believing that this would be beneficial to a large number of Canadians who were currently struggling to access health care services in their communities. Only a small number selected the measures to launch a national pharmacare plan and implement action on foreign health care credential recognition, while none selected the initiatives related to cracking down on junk fees and ensuring the wealthiest 0.1 per cent of Canadians pay their fair share in taxes.

Focusing on the federal government's proposal to ask the wealthiest Canadians to pay their fair share in taxes, participants were read the following quote from the budget speech in the House of Commons:

"In Canada and around the world, the 21st century winner-takes-all economy is making those at the very top richer, while too many middle-class Canadians are struggling just to avoid falling behind. The job of our tax system is to lean against this structural inequality—to fund investments in the middle class, especially in young Canadians, by asking those who are benefitting from the winner-takes-all economy to pay a little bit more. Today, our tax system does not do that. Today it is possible for a carpenter or a nurse to pay tax at a higher marginal rate than a multi-millionaire. That is not fair. That must change. And it will. Our government is raising the inclusion rate to two-thirds on annual capital gains above \$250,000 for individuals. This new revenue will help make life cost less for millions of Canadians, particularly Millennials and Gen Z. It will help fund our efforts to turbocharge the building of more homes. It will support investments in growth and productivity that will pay dividends for years to come."

While most were supportive of the notion of increasing the taxes for the wealthiest Canadians, several were skeptical as to whether this measure would be effective. The view was expressed that, given the greater financial resources of wealthier Canadians and their ability to hire professionals such as accountants to assist them in reducing their taxable income, it was unlikely that the highest earners would pay their fair share in taxes, even with this measure in place. Discussing the potential uses for

the additional tax revenues raised by the federal government through this initiative, a few thought that these funds should be directed towards initiatives focused on protecting the environment and mitigating the impacts of climate change.

Wildfires (Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Participants residing in B.C.'s Lower Mainland engaged in a discussion related to the federal government's response to large-scale wildfires in their province in recent years as well as recently announced budget initiatives related to addressing this issue. Asked whether they were aware of any actions from the federal government related to preparing for and/or responding to wildfires, none indicated they were. To aid in conversation, participants were provided with the following information:

The Government of Canada's approach to managing wildfires involves supporting communities in getting prepared, providing information through real-time monitoring, and offering support to communities and individuals impacted by wildfires.

In Budget 2024, the Government of Canada has committed to take several additional actions to help those affected by wildfires:

- *Doubling the Volunteer Firefighter and Search and Rescue Volunteer Tax Credits, which will increase from \$3,000 to \$6,000 for 2024, saving volunteer firefighters up to an additional \$450 per year;*
- *Investing \$800,000 more to expand firefighting capacity to help expand training program for firefighters to respond to wildfires that impact urban areas. This builds on existing funding to support the federal government's commitment to train 1,000 wildland firefighters; and*
- *Partnering with Indigenous Peoples to save lives and better protect communities against wildfires including:*
 - *Investing over \$145 million to help First Nations communities prepare for emergencies;*
 - *Providing \$20.9 million for fire prevention in First Nations communities; and,*
 - *Committing \$9 million to help support Indigenous governments directly affected by the 2023 wildfires in the Northwest Territories.*

All reacted positively to this information, with several expressing that the initiatives represented a major step towards proactively assisting communities with preparing for and responding to wildfires. A number identified the initiatives to double the Volunteer Firefighter and Search and Rescue Volunteer Tax Credits as well as increase firefighting and emergency response partnerships with Indigenous peoples as being especially important. Asked whether they felt the Government of Canada was doing enough to assist communities affected by wildfires, many were uncertain, believing that their answer would ultimately depend on how effectively these initiatives were implemented over the coming wildfire season. Discussing what more could be done by the federal government related to combatting wildfires, participants suggested increasing the use of fire prevention practices such as controlled burns as well as continuing to educate Canadians regarding how to best prepare for and respond to potential wildfires in their areas.



Capital Gains (Lower Mainland British Columbia)

The group based in Lower Mainland B.C. also took part in a brief conversation regarding initiatives from the budget related to capital gains. Asked whether they had heard anything about proposed changes to how capital gains are taxed, a few reported that they had, while none could recall any specific details. To clarify, participants were provided with the following information:

Capital gains are the profits people make when they sell valuable assets they own for more money than they originally paid for them. Capital gains can be made from valuable assets like real estate, stocks and bonds, mutual funds, precious metals, art and collectibles, cryptocurrencies, vehicles, personal property, and more.

In Canada, capital gains are subject to taxation. When someone sells a valuable asset for more than its original cost, they will owe taxes on the capital gain. Note that there is no capital gains tax on the sale of a primary home; that is, capital gains taxes only apply when people own multiple real estate properties and sell the ones they don't live in.

The Government of Canada is proposing to raise taxes on some of the wealthiest Canadians by increasing the tax on their capital gains above \$250,000. The government estimates that this change would only impact 0.1% of Canadians in any given year.

Reacting to this information, most responded positively to this initiative, believing this represented a fair approach that would likely benefit a large number of Canadians. The view was expressed that, given the perceived negative impact of real estate speculation on the supply of available housing in many parts of the country, it was felt that increasing capital gains on large transactions (such as the sale of a home) could help to discourage this type of practice. A few questioned whether the \$250,000 threshold was too low, with some expressing concern that this measure could also impact non-wealthy Canadians who may inherit property or who plan on selling investments in order to fund their retirements. While generally supportive of raising taxes on the wealthiest Canadians, a small number expressed concern that this action could have the negative impact of discouraging high earners (such as doctors) from residing in Canada as well as prompt large-scale investors to consider removing their wealth from the Canadian economy altogether. Asked whether they expected that this measure would impact them personally, participants felt it would not.

Housing Initiatives (Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Both groups discussed a wide range of housing initiatives that had been announced by the Government of Canada as part of Budget 2024. Asked whether they were aware of any recent actions from the federal government related to addressing the availability and affordability of housing, participants mentioned a number of initiatives. These included the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)'s Affordable Housing Fund, initiatives to open up some federally-owned land to build residential housing on, and agreements reached with numerous Canadian municipalities through the Housing Accelerator Fund (though not mentioned by name) to increase the rate of building new affordable housing.

Participants were next informed that, as part of its plan to address the housing crisis, the Government of Canada had announced a three-part housing strategy aimed at unlocking 3.87 million new homes by 2031. Groups were presented with information related to specific actions the Government of Canada was taking as part of this plan. The first set of initiatives, highlighting some of the actions the Government of Canada was proposing to help build more homes, included:

- *Signing 179 Housing Accelerator Fund agreements to date to cut red tape, fast tracking an estimated total of over 750,000 housing units over the next decade;*
- *Using federal lands, such as those used by Canada Post, the Department of National Defense, and federal government office buildings, to build more homes faster;*
- *Helping to get more rental homes built by investing more than \$15 billion through the Apartment Construction Loan Program, which helps builders get the capital they need for new projects;*
- *Changing how homes in Canada are built by investing in technology like prefabricated housing factories and pre-approved home design catalogues; and*
- *Streamlining foreign credential recognition in the construction sector and helping skilled trades workers get more homes built*

Almost all reacted positively to these initiatives and believed they represented a step in the right direction. Several were of the impression that by working to increase the supply of affordable housing, both for purchase and to rent, the federal government would help to ensure more Canadians had access to housing while also being able to afford other important expenses in their lives. While supportive of these actions, several questioned what regulations would be implemented to ensure that housing built through these initiatives would remain affordable for the long term. A number also felt a more concrete definition needed to be provided regarding what could be considered affordable housing. Among these participants, it was felt that affordability was a somewhat subjective term and would likely vary greatly across communities in Canada. Focusing on the agreements reached through the Housing Accelerator Fund to encourage municipalities to cut red tape, a few questioned whether this would lead to reduced construction and safety standards, with lower quality homes being built as a result. Asked whether they felt these initiatives would be effective in increasing the supply of affordable housing in Canadian communities, while several did, a number expected that so long as other issues (such as the perceived high rate of immigration) were left unaddressed, it was likely there would continue to be a high demand for housing in many parts of the country.

Participants were shown a second set of initiatives, this time focused on actions aimed at making it easier for Canadians to rent or own their own homes. These included:

- *Cracking down on illegal short-term rentals (e.g. Airbnb);*
- *Calling on fintech companies, credit bureaus, and lenders to build the ecosystem that will give renters the option to include their rental payment history in their credit scores, helping renters qualify for a mortgage and better rates;*
- *Creating a Canadian Renters' Bill of Rights to protect renters and provide a clear history of apartment pricing so renters can bargain fairly, crack down on renovictions, and create a nationwide standard lease agreement;*



- *Allowing 30-year mortgages for first-time homebuyers purchasing new builds;*
- *Extending the ban on foreign homebuyers by two years; and*
- *Restricting the purchase and acquisition of existing single-family homes by very large, corporate investors. The government will consult on how to go about this in the coming months.*

Reactions were resoundingly positive to these initiatives, with all believing that the actions would be helpful to renters and prospective first-time home buyers. A large number identified the action to encourage lenders to consider on-time rent payments when calculating credit scores as being especially impactful, believing this could be an effective way for young people and/or newcomers to Canada to build credit while saving towards the purchase of a home. The initiative to allow for 30-year mortgages for first-time home buyers who purchase newly built homes was also seen as potentially being very effective, with a number believing that this extended lending period would make the prospect of a mortgage far more affordable for many lower- and middle-income families. Several also commented positively on the measures to extend the ban on non-Canadians purchasing residential property as well restricting the purchase and acquisition of existing single-family homes by very large, corporate investors. It was felt that these actions would assist in disincentivizing individuals and corporations from purchasing residential housing as an investment vehicle rather than as a place to live. While most supported cracking down on illegal short-term rentals (such as non-compliant Airbnb listings), a few expressed concerns that this might limit options for travellers to Canadian tourism destinations and could lead to a downturn in tourism activity overall.

The final set of measures shown to participants focused on actions the federal government was proposing to assist those struggling with the cost of housing at present. These included:

- *Investing \$1 billion in the Affordable Housing Fund to support non-profit, co-operative, and public housing providers and respond to the needs of those most impacted by the housing crisis;*
- *Creating a Rental Protection Fund to help affordable housing providers buy units and preserve rents at a stable level instead of being turned into luxury condos; and*
- *Increasing funding to support organizations that prevent and reduce homelessness*

All felt that these initiatives would likely have a positive impact on the lives of those struggling with the cost of housing. A number reacted positively to the \$1 billion investment towards the Affordable Housing Fund and expressed that, going forward, they would rather see more funding provided to non-profit, co-operative, and public housing providers rather than for-profit developers. The initiative to create a Rental Protection Fund was also well-received by participants, with several believing that this would be an effective way to protect renters and ensure that affordable rental options remained available in Canadian communities. A few questioned how much additional funding would be provided to organizations focused on preventing and reducing homelessness and expressed a desire for more details related to this initiative. Among these participants it was believed that homelessness represented a significant growing challenge in their communities and that more needed to be done at all levels of government to address this issue.

Engaging in an exercise where they were prompted to select a word or phrase to describe their overall thoughts on Budget 2024, including the initiatives related to housing, several selected terms with positive connotations such as "hopeful", "great", "taking action", and "innovative". A few selected



phrases such as “overdue” or “too little, too late”, believing that many of these actions (and particularly those related to housing) should have been enacted earlier, prior to housing becoming a crisis issue.

Asked an additional question as to whether any of the measures they had discussed would be helpful to younger Canadians and future generations in ensuring they had access to a wide variety of affordable housing options, several in the group based in Saskatchewan believed that they would. A number, however, reiterated that unless action was taken to reduce the overall cost of housing and bring home prices down, it was unlikely that most younger Canadians would be able to realistically afford to purchase a home in the foreseeable future.

Jobs (Montérégie Region Quebec, Hamilton)

Two groups engaged in discussions related to the Canadian economy and the employment market at present. At the outset of their conversation, participants residing in Hamilton were asked how they would describe the Government of Canada’s management of the economy. A large number felt that the Canadian economy had not been well managed in recent years, citing perceived issues such as high interest rates, the rising cost of living, a growing national debt, and continued deficit spending by the federal government. A few believed that the Government of Canada had placed too high a priority on providing financial and/or humanitarian assistance to other countries and felt that it needed to place an increased focus on addressing the economic challenges faced by those living in Canada. Asked whether they felt the Government of Canada was on the right track when it came to its management of the economy, very few believed that it was.

Discussing what they felt to be the most important economic issues facing Canadians at present, participants mentioned the high cost of essentials such as groceries and gasoline, a lack of affordable housing, what was viewed as an over-dependence of the Canadian economy on housing, and what were perceived as the high rates of taxation paid by many Canadian households. Asked whether they felt their income had kept pace with the cost of living and rate of inflation, few did, with a number describing that while their income had remained relatively stable, their expenses had increased considerably in recent years.

Both groups were asked to share their views on the current state of the employment market in Canada. Regionally, a number residing in Hamilton expressed a mixed opinion, believing that while it was easy to find part time and/or low-paying employment, it was often quite difficult to obtain a rewarding, well-paying job. Several of those in the group based in the Montérégie region of Quebec described the job market as being somewhat cyclical in their area. It was believed that many businesses, and especially those in the tourism and hospitality sector, were struggling to find workers at present and were dealing with significant labour shortages. Asked to describe any challenges or barriers they had encountered when looking for work, a number in the Montérégie region reported having faced difficulties in obtaining jobs in their areas of interest, commenting that most of the jobs available in their communities were low-paying and in sectors such as manufacturing, service, and retail.



Furthermore, there was a perception that many of the available jobs provided little opportunity for professional growth.

Asked to speculate what the state of the Canadian job market would be like in the next 5-10 years, most expected that it would remain relatively the same. Many expected that job growth would occur in industries related to technology, robotics and automation, artificial intelligence (AI), green technology and renewable energy, health care, and skilled trades (especially those related to the construction of homes). Several expressed concern regarding the potential for AI or automation to eliminate some jobs. Questioned as to how confident they were that they would continue to have a good job in the future, many indicated they were, believing that their specific positions would not be at risk of being replaced by AI.

Discussing whether they felt the Government of Canada was on the right track when it came to ensuring workers received the training they required to stay competitive, participants expressed a range of views. Regionally, most in the Montérégie region felt the federal government was on the wrong track on this front, believing that it did not provide employers with sufficient funding to offer their workers additional skills training. The view was also expressed that due to the high cost of education and training programs, it was difficult for many lower- and middle-income Canadians to afford to upgrade their skills on their own. A large number residing in Hamilton felt differently, with most believing that the federal government was on the right track in this area. Several were of the impression that the federal government had made significant investments towards skills training and assisting Canadian workers with upgrading their skills.

Asked whether they felt the federal government was headed in the right direction when it came to creating good jobs in Canada, several participants across both groups felt that it was. A number specifically identified actions that the Government of Canada had taken in recent years to attract international investment and fund job creation in important emerging sectors, such as the manufacturing of electric vehicles (EVs) and its parts. A few expressed uncertainty regarding the federal government's performance on this front, stating that while they had heard about commitments it had made towards job creation, they were unaware as to whether any tangible progress had been made in this regard. Discussing additional actions that the Government of Canada could take to encourage the creation of well-paying jobs for Canadians, participants provided a number of suggestions including the provision of subsidies for those training to work in high-demand sectors, skills training programs for new immigrants to Canada, and incentives for companies to manufacture more products in Canada (as a way of increasing hiring in this sector).

Climate Change (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)

Six groups took part in conversations related to the impacts of climate change as well as actions that could be taken on an individual and/or societal level to help in addressing this issue. Asked whether they felt that climate change was among the top priorities for the Government of Canada to be focusing on, participants were mixed in their opinions. While most viewed climate change as an important issue and believed it was an area worth prioritizing, it was widely felt that other challenges such as the high cost of living, a lack of affordable housing, and issues related to health care (such as long wait times and health worker shortages) were more urgent priorities for the federal government. Among those who felt that working to mitigate the impacts of climate change represented an urgent priority for the Government of Canada, it was believed that this issue was already having a range of negative impacts on Canadians. Several viewed the perceived rise in large-scale natural disasters such as wildfires, windstorms, and floods in recent years as being directly connected to climate change and felt that, if left unaddressed, this issue would negatively impact an increasing number of communities in the years to come.

Asked whether they felt that climate change had affected the cost of living, most believed that it had. It was thought that the destruction caused by extreme weather events in recent years had been very costly for many Canadian communities and that the response to these natural disasters had required considerable financial assistance from both the federal and provincial/territorial governments. It was believed that responding to climate change would become increasingly costly in the years to come if dangerous weather events continued to become more prevalent. Several cited other negative impacts of climate change related to the cost of living, including increasing challenges for farmers to grow food due to issues such as drought and extreme heat, difficulties transporting goods and products due to the damage and disruption caused by natural disasters such as wildfires, and the increased costs that would likely be passed on to consumers as a result of these challenges. Among the small number who felt differently, the opinion was expressed that climate-focused measures, such as the implementation of a price on carbon by the federal government, had been more responsible for the increased cost of living in recent years than climate change itself.

Discussing the worst impacts (both at present and in the future) of climate change, participants identified a wide range of issues. These included decreased food production and potential food insecurity in some parts of the country, damage to public and private property from floods and wildfires, worsened air quality from wildfire smoke, and the potential for loss of life due to extreme temperatures and dangerous weather events, as well as irreversible damage to the environment and

ecosystems across Canada. A number described being especially concerned regarding the impact that climate change might have on future generations. Among these individuals, it was expected that future Canadians would have to deal with a multitude of challenges, including rising sea levels, more frequent and intense natural disasters, and the economic and social instability that they believed would result from an increasingly unstable and dangerous climate.

Prompted to identify what they viewed as the most significant barriers to taking action against climate change, many expressed that, given other challenges such as inflation and the high cost of living, it was difficult to focus on larger issues such as climate change when trying to make ends meet financially each month. Related to this, a number identified what they perceived as the high costs of switching to more climate-friendly technology, such as purchasing an electric vehicle (EV), and/or making their homes more energy efficient by installing solar panels or heat pumps, as another major barrier. A few also reported feeling somewhat powerless to fight climate change on an individual level, given the global scope of this issue and the high levels of emissions produced in other parts of the world.

Asked how important they felt it was for individuals as well as Canada as a whole to take action to address climate change, many believed that it was of greater importance for this fight to be a collective effort led by the Government of Canada, as opposed to primarily relying on actions being taken at the individual level. It was felt by several that the federal government's main focus on this front should be to place stricter regulations on the emitting behaviour of large industrial corporations, believing that these businesses were far greater contributors to climate change relative to individual Canadians.

Questioned how important they felt it was for Canada to be a global leader when it comes to taking climate action, most believed this to be an important reputation to maintain. It was felt by several that if combatting climate change was a major priority for the Government of Canada, it was important for it to lead by example on this front. A number were of the impression that Canada currently had a strong reputation on this front and was viewed as a climate leader by many countries throughout the world. Discussing how much responsibility they personally felt to take action to fight climate change and protect the environment, many reiterated the view that climate change was a significant issue and expressed that they were doing what they could on an individual level to engage in climate friendly behaviours such as recycling, reducing their energy use, and avoiding using single-use items.

Focusing further on the emissions of Canadians on a global scale, participants in the groups based in the Maritimes, Calgary, mid-size and major centres in Manitoba, and major centres in Alberta were informed that, on a per person basis, Canadians are among the top ten emitters of carbon pollution in the world. Those residing in Central Ontario and Newfoundland and Labrador were provided with slightly different information, and were told that, among the top carbon polluters in the world, Canada has the second highest greenhouse gas emissions on a per person basis. A large number expressed surprise to hear that the emissions of Canadians were so high per person, with several questioning how these calculations were made. Some believed that it made sense that the individual emissions of Canadians would be so high, given the relatively low population of the country, Canada being a highly



industrialized nation, and the need for homes and buildings to be constantly heated in many parts of the country during the winter months. A few reiterated that this information was frustrating to hear, especially given their impression that Canadians were generally committed to protecting the environment. A small number expressed the opinion that this information served as further confirmation to them that more needed to be done to curb the behaviours of large-scale emitters if progress was to be made on reducing carbon emissions going forward.

Carbon Pricing (Saskatchewan, Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)

Seven groups engaged in conversations related to carbon pricing and recent actions that the Government of Canada had taken on this front. Almost all recalled having heard about pollution pricing (referred to by some as a carbon tax) with many aware that the federal carbon pricing system was currently in effect in their respective provinces. A number reported hearing that the price on carbon had recently increased, believing this would likely raise the cost of living further for many households. Asked whether they were familiar with the Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR), most indicated they were, with a number of the understanding that this was an amount paid by the federal government to Canadian households as a way to offset the increased costs that were thought to result from the price on carbon.

To aid in conversation, participants were provided with information related to the federal carbon pricing system and the CCR. The information shown to participants varied among the groups. Those in the groups comprised of Millennials residing in the Maritimes and Generation Z living in Calgary were shown the following:

Pollution pricing, also known as carbon pricing, works by adding a levy or charge on carbon emissions.

This means there is a cost associated with polluting to encourage individuals and businesses to seek out cleaner options for things, like energy production, home heating, and transportation.

Revenues from the price on pollution are returned to Canadians each quarter through the Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR).



Participants in Newfoundland and Labrador, as well as the groups comprised of climate supportive or ambivalent participants, based in Manitoba, Alberta, and Central Ontario respectively, were provided with an extended version of this information:

- *The Government of Canada has put a fee on carbon pollution.*
- *Some people will reduce their carbon emissions to avoid paying the fee, while others may continue emitting as before.*
- *All the money collected from this fee, including from businesses, is pooled together and then split equally among every household in a province, through the Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR).*
- *This means that those who reduce their carbon emissions will benefit more, because they get the same rebate amount as everyone else in their province but have paid less in fees.*
- *Those who do not cut their emissions end up paying more but get the same rebate amount as everyone else in their province.*
- *After all the money (including from businesses) is pooled together and split equally, about 8-in-10 Canadian households get more money back through the Canada Carbon Rebate than they pay in fees.*
- *Over time, as more people try to pay less in fees by reducing their carbon emissions, carbon pollution will decrease overall.*

While few were directly opposed to the implementation of a price on carbon pollution by the Government of Canada, several questioned whether this approach would actually be effective in combatting climate change. Focusing on the CCR, several were of the opinion that rather than providing rebates back to Canadians, the funds collected via the carbon pricing system should instead be invested towards projects aimed at promoting sustainability and mitigating the impacts of climate change. A number expressed feeling discouraged upon hearing this information, commenting that while they would like to switch to cleaner, more sustainable options in areas such as transportation and home heating, the perceived high financial costs of purchasing and/or installing green technology represented a major barrier to them taking this action. A number who received the extended version of this information expressed feeling that this was a clear explanation of the carbon pricing program and that it was effective in conveying how the program worked. Discussing whether any of this information was new to them, several reported having been previously unaware that all the revenues collected from individuals and businesses were pooled together and split equally among every household in the province. Asked whether they were uncertain about any of the information they had received, a number questioned whether there would be an income threshold one would have to be under in order to qualify to receive a rebate. A few also asked whether businesses would also be receiving amounts back, or whether CCRs were only for individual households.



Those residing in Saskatchewan engaged in an extended conversation related to the CCR and were provided with the following information:

The federal pollution pricing creates a financial incentive for people and businesses to pollute less.

The Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR) is a tax-free amount to help eligible individuals and families offset the cost of the federal pollution pricing.

This year, a family of 4 in Saskatchewan can expect to receive roughly [amount]. Residents of small and rural communities receive an extra 10% top-up beyond the base rebate amount. Starting April 2024, the Government is planning to double the rural top-up to 20%, because of the increased energy needs of rural residents and their reduced access to transportation options.

Reacting to this information, several in this group questioned why households were receiving money back through CCRs. It was felt that providing the CCR contravened the primary aim of encouraging Canadians to reduce their emitting behaviours. The view was expressed that if most households knew they would eventually be receiving the amounts they paid under the carbon pricing system back in the form of rebates, few would feel any financial incentive to reduce their emissions. Several were uncertain as to whether the amounts provided would be sufficient to offset the financial impacts of the price on carbon, believing this initiative had served to significantly increase the cost of living and essentials such as gasoline and home heating. Focusing on the rural top-up specifically, participants agreed it was an important initiative, although a number commented that they were unaware of anyone they knew living rurally who had received a higher CCR payment.

Asked whether, based on what they knew about the price on carbon pollution and the CCR, they supported or opposed the Government of Canada's carbon pricing system, a much larger number of those residing in Saskatchewan reported being in opposition as those who supported it or were more neutral in their opinions. Among those who were opposed to this approach, it was widely felt that there needed to be a clearer explanation as to how CCR amounts were calculated as well as where the additional revenues collected under the price of carbon were being allocated. A few felt that a greater focus needed to be placed on reducing the emissions of large corporations, believing these were far greater contributors to issues such as climate change relative to individual Canadians. For the smaller number in support of this initiative, it was felt that any step towards combatting climate change was important, especially given the potential impacts this issue was expected to have on future generations.

Participants in this group were next informed that the Department of Finance Canada had calculated that, in 2024, the average household in Saskatchewan would receive back hundreds of dollars more than it pays as a result of the price on carbon. All expressed skepticism at this, with some reiterating their desire to see how these amounts are calculated. It was widely felt by participants that the additional amounts they paid each year under this system were likely far greater than the amounts that they received back in the form of CCR payments. To further clarify, participants were informed that:

The Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) is a neutral, non-partisan individual independent of government. The PBO is responsible for providing economic and financial analysis to Parliament for the purposes of



raising the quality of parliamentary debate and promoting greater budget transparency and accountability. The PBO has estimated that around 80% of Canadian families will receive more than they pay in carbon pricing.

Discussing whether this explanation affected their perspective, most felt that this statement sounded great at face value, however, several expressed feeling that they would need to do their own financial calculations and look into this initiative further in order to feel confident that this information was accurate.

Participants in the groups comprised of millennials living in the Maritimes and members of Generation Z in Calgary were asked an additional question regarding what the terms 'carbon pricing' and 'pollution pricing' meant to them. While most viewed these phrases as being quite similar, several felt that while carbon pricing might refer to those behaviours which emitted greenhouse gases, pollution pricing could be broader in its meaning, encompassing other forms of pollution such as the production of garbage and other forms of physical waste.

The two groups mentioned above, as well as those residing in Saskatchewan, were also asked whether, to the best of their knowledge, they or someone in their household had received a CCR. A roughly equal number of participants reported having received a CCR compared to those who did not believe that they had. Questioned whether they felt the amount they had received back was greater than what they had paid as a result of the price on carbon pollution, most were uncertain, feeling it was difficult to calculate the additional costs they had incurred following the implementation of this initiative.

All groups (with the exception of those in Saskatchewan) were asked how they felt about the revenues from the CCR being returned to individuals, businesses, and Indigenous groups and whether they felt this would help Canadians to afford the things they need. On balance, few believed that the amounts provided through CCR payments would be enough to make much of a difference for most Canadians who were currently struggling with the high cost of living at present. Sharing their reactions to the information that 8 out of 10 households receive more back than they spend on the price on carbon pollution, many reiterated the desire for further information as to how these figures were being calculated, including what metrics were being used in determining how much households were spending on the price on carbon pollution.

Overall, very few felt that the federal government's approach to carbon pollution pricing would be effective in reducing emissions. The view was expressed that due to the vast majority of households receiving as much or more back through CCR payments than they had paid as a result of this initiative, there was little financial incentive for individuals to adopt more sustainable behaviours. Asked whether they felt this approach was fair, participants were mixed in their opinions. A number believed that it was relatively fair in that equal CCR payments were sent out to all households. The view was also expressed, however, that due to the high cost of living at present, it was somewhat unfair for those households already struggling to make ends meet financially to also now have to accommodate the additional costs of a price on carbon pollution. This was felt to especially be the case for those residing in communities where there were fewer alternative options available (such as public transportation and renewable energy sources) that would assist them in reducing their personal emissions.



All groups (except for the group based in Saskatchewan) were asked to share their perspectives related to two different arguments in favour of carbon pricing. The first argument presented to participants was:

Carbon pricing is an effective and cost-efficient way to tackle climate change, while still giving businesses and Canadians the flexibility to decide how to make the switch to less-polluting alternatives.

The idea is that when businesses and Canadians start to make the switch, they create demand for things like clean tech, and end up attracting new investments to our economy, which can help create jobs and growth.

Various international organizations say that putting a price on pollution is the most cost-effective and flexible way to reduce emissions, and over 200 Canadian-based economists support this system.

While a number felt that this argument was clearly laid out and easy to understand, most did not perceive it as being effective in demonstrating the benefits of a price on carbon pollution. The view was reiterated that many Canadians were unable to switch to cleaner alternatives and technology (either due to the financial cost or a lack of availability in their area) and thus demand for these areas would not rise to the level that was expected. A number also felt there needed to be a stronger explanation as to the reasons 200 Canadian-based economists supported this system, as well as what the views were of the economists, if any, who did not agree with this rationale. A few believed that this argument could be improved if it provided examples of other countries in which this approach had already been successful in curbing emissions. A roughly similar number of participants reported having previously encountered this argument as those who were hearing it for the first time. Asked whether this argument made them feel better, worse, or had no impact on their impression of the price on carbon, very few reported that this had impacted their opinion in any way.

The second argument shown was:

Carbon pricing can help protect our environment and the well-being of future generations.

It is a major part of Canada's climate plan and accounts for a third of Canada's emission reduction goals. Carbon pricing is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) which are major contributors to increasingly intense wildfires, droughts, and floods.

Though many felt it important for the Government of Canada to be working to reduce emissions, few felt that the implementation of a price on carbon had been effective in this regard. With this in mind, a number expressed concern that this initiative represented one-third of Canada's emission reduction goals, believing that this indicated it was likely that the federal government was falling short of meeting these targets. Related to this, a number questioned what actions were being taken to achieve the other two-thirds of Canada's emission reduction goals and how effective these had been at addressing this issue. A few reacted more positively to this argument, believing that its focus on protecting the environment for future generations and reducing the intensity of extreme weather events such as wildfires, droughts, and floods was compelling and connected with them on a personal level. While a large number reported having not heard this argument before, very few indicated that this had changed their perspectives related to carbon pricing.

Carbon Pricing Video Testing (Maritimes Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive and Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador)

Six groups shared their perspectives related to a video advertisement produced by the federal government to inform Canadians about the carbon pricing system. Participants were shown the following video twice, in succession:



The clip above is an animated video that is 1 minute and 23 seconds long. The transcript of the video is as follows:

Pollution pricing. What is it? And how does it work? When greenhouse gasses or carbon pollution are emitted, they trap heat in the atmosphere. This heat is causing the earth to warm and the climate to change. Putting a price on carbon pollution creates a financial incentive for people and businesses to pollute less. Several provinces and territories have their own pollution pricing systems that meet Canada's standards and their individual needs. In others, the federal system applies, or a combination. All the money from the federal price on pollution charged to fuels goes directly back to benefit Canadians, their families, businesses and Indigenous groups in the same province or territory where it was collected, so they can afford to buy the things they need.

Where the federal system is used eight out of 10 households actually get more money back than they spend on the fuel charge with lower income households benefiting the most. There are also exemptions and support for farmers and a bonus for people who live in rural and remote areas.

By biking, driving an electric car or heating homes more efficiently, Canadians can benefit even more. Pollution pricing in Canada; putting money back in the pockets of families and fighting climate change. Learn more at Canada.ca/climateaction.

Participants were mixed in their reactions to this video. While some believed that it had been clear, well produced, and had helped to increase their understanding of the workings of the carbon pricing system, a roughly equal number felt otherwise. Among these participants it was felt that the video had not effectively explained the benefits of a carbon pricing system for Canadians. A number commented that while the video had proposed a number of greener practices individuals could adopt to reduce their emissions (such as taking public transportation, riding bicycles, or retrofitting their home with technology such as solar panels or heat pumps) these alternatives were frequently expensive and/or difficult to access for many Canadians. Some also viewed the notion that CCR payments would help households to purchase the things they need as being somewhat unrealistic, believing that the

amounts returned would do little to offset the perceived high cost of essentials such as groceries and gasoline. A few thought that the runtime of the video was somewhat long, believing that many viewers, and especially those who encountered this video while scrolling on their mobile devices, would be unlikely to watch it for its full duration.

Asked whether the video had introduced new information related to carbon pricing that they had not heard before, several reported having previously been unaware that the amounts received through CCR payments varied depending on the province or territory one resided in. A number also expressed they were unaware of which provinces/territories were operating under the federal carbon pricing system and which (such as British Columbia (B.C.) and Quebec) had their own system in place. Questioned whether, prior to seeing this video, they were aware of the exemptions in place for farmers, few indicated that they were, with the exception of the group based in major centres in Alberta where most recalled having heard about this. Similarly, only a small number across all groups were aware of the 20 per cent CCR top-up for those residing in rural or remote communities. On balance, most felt that this represented a fair approach, believing that given the important role of farmers in producing food for Canadians as well as the challenges and/or lack of options for those living in rural communities to reduce their emissions, it made sense to have these measures in place. Related to the exemption for farmers, a small number felt somewhat differently. Among these participants it was thought that, given their perception that farmers were already heavily subsidized by federal and provincial governments, it was unfair they were also exempt from the carbon pricing system.

Participants in Central Ontario and Newfoundland and Labrador were asked an additional question regarding whether they felt the climate-friendly alternatives highlighted in the video (such as cycling, driving an electric vehicle (EV), and heating one's home more efficiently) were effective examples regarding the actions that could be taken to reduce emissions, or whether different examples should be provided. While many believed that Canadians could reduce their emissions by adopting more climate-friendly alternatives, it was felt that activities such as cycling were unrealistic for those living in rural communities where one often had to travel far longer distances. Participants also reiterated the view that actions such as purchasing an EV and/or retrofitting one's home to be more energy efficient were likely prohibitively expensive for a large number of Canadians. Discussing alternative examples that could be used, participants mentioned actions such as growing one's own food, planting trees, utilizing public transit (for those living in communities where this was a realistic option), and switching to light-emitting diode (LED) bulbs. Asked whether they felt the video should highlight actions individuals could take to use less energy at home (such as replacing old windows and doors, improving insulation, and purchasing more-energy efficient appliances), while most felt that these would be positive steps to take, a number again mentioned the financial cost of taking these actions. A few were of the opinion that these actions would only be available to homeowners, and thus would not be relatable to those who were currently renters. Discussing whether the video should recommend eating less meat as a way of being more energy efficient, most believed that while this might represent a way of reducing emissions, it was felt that including this example could alienate a large portion of the viewing audience.



All groups were asked whether, given everything they had discussed thus far, they felt the implementation of a price on carbon was effective in creating a financial incentive for Canadians to pollute less. On balance, only a small number felt that this approach would be effective, with most believing that it was unlikely that households would be willing or able to reduce their emissions. Discussing alternative actions that could be taken, participants suggested providing more financial incentives and rebates to those who purchase an EV or engage in projects such as installing solar panels or heat pumps in their homes. A number also believed that action should be taken to better educate Canadians on ways they can reduce their emissions and making it easier and/or more affordable for them to engage in these behaviours. Some also suggested that, rather than returning revenues collected through the carbon pricing system via CCRs, these funds should instead be allocated towards initiatives focusing on promoting sustainability and combatting climate change.

Asked whether they felt they could change their daily habits to lower their emissions and reduce the amount they are paying for carbon pollution, most believed that all Canadians could likely find ways to do their part in achieving this goal. Suggested actions included adjusting the thermostat less in the summer and winter months, purchasing locally sourced food, and installing more energy efficient appliances. Discussing whether they felt individuals would consider alternatives to driving, such as carpooling, utilizing public transportation, and/or cycling, in order to pay less into the price on pollution, most felt that this would likely vary on a person-by-person basis. It was thought that while some (and especially lower-income individuals) would be compelled to utilize these more affordable options if they were available to them, for others driving their own vehicles was a necessary part of their day-to-day activities and a habit that they would be unwilling or unable to change.

While most believed that using more efficient home heating would help to reduce the costs they paid into the carbon pricing system, a number again mentioned the challenges faced by lower-and middle-income households as well as renters in taking these actions. Asked whether they were aware of any federal government programs that assist with home heating efficiency, a larger number reported that they were compared to those who were unaware of these initiatives. Describing specific supports that they believed were available, participants mentioned (though not by name) initiatives such as the Canada Greener Homes Grant and the Incentives for Zero-Emission Vehicles (iZEV) program. Questioned whether knowing that the Government of Canada was providing these types of supports changed their view of the carbon pricing system, while a few felt more positively, several did not see these initiatives as being connected and felt that the incentives to Canadians could be provided without the need for a price on carbon to be in place. A few commented that the federal government should increase its efforts to communicate these programs to Canadians, believing that many were currently unaware of the existence of these supports.

Discussing why they felt some provinces use their own system while others operated under the federal pollution pricing system, participants provided a variety of potential reasons. A number felt that some provinces, such as B.C. and Quebec, which used their own system, might already have more energy efficient infrastructure in place and/or had already been pursuing actions to reduce their emissions prior to the Government of Canada introducing its own carbon pricing system. Some also thought that this might be a primarily financial decision, with some provinces (depending on how much they



are emitting) finding it more financially efficient to use their own system rather than the one operated by the federal government. Asked whether they would prefer their respective provinces to be under the federal system, a provincial system, or no system at all, participants expressed a range of opinions. While all groups were relatively mixed in their views, a slightly larger number in the groups based in Manitoba, Newfoundland and Labrador, and major centres in Alberta favoured a provincial system compared to those in the groups comprised of millennials in the Maritimes, members of Generation Z in Calgary, and those in Central Ontario. Among those who favoured a provincial system, it was felt that this approach would likely be better tailored to the individual needs of their province, rather than what they perceived as a broader, more one-size-fits-all federal approach.

Electric Vehicle Battery Manufacturing (Montérégie Region Quebec)

Participants residing in the Montérégie region of Quebec engaged in a brief discussion regarding a recent announcement from the federal government related to the construction of a new electric vehicle (EV) battery manufacturing plant in their area. Asked whether they had recently seen, read, or heard about any news regarding the Government of Canada and EVs, several recalled hearing that it had made increased investments towards the building and manufacturing of EVs and EV parts in Canada. A few also recalled the Incentives for Zero-Emission Vehicles (iZEV) program, though not by name. To aid in discussion, participants were provided with the following information:

The federal and Quebec governments announced last fall that they are investing \$7B (combined) in Northvolt Batteries North America to build a new electric vehicle battery manufacturing facility in Saint-Basile-le-Grand and McMasterville, Quebec. The batteries produced at this facility will be among the greenest batteries in the world, and the plant will create up to 3,000 jobs in the region. This investment is also estimated to directly and indirectly create thousands of jobs across the country.

Almost all reacted positively to this information, with several expecting that the creation of 3,000 jobs would be greatly beneficial to the economic wellbeing of those living in these communities. Several believed that these investments would have a positive impact on the provincial and Canadian economy and hoped that this would encourage further international investment in Canada in the years to come. A number, however, expressed concerns regarding the potential environmental issues believed to be associated with the mining of the raw materials required for EV batteries and the perceived difficulties in safely recycling these batteries once they reach the end of their lifespans. A few also worried about whether there would be enough housing in their region to support thousands of additional workers and questioned whether the construction of this facility would lead to an increase in housing costs for those residing in the area.

Asked whether they expected this action would have an impact on themselves, people they know, and/or their community, most expected that it would have a direct impact. While believing this impact would be mostly positive from an economic perspective, a few reiterated concerns regarding their region's capacity to handle the increase to the local population that they expected would occur as a

result of this initiative. With this in mind, it was hoped that the federal government would also focus on making investments towards increasing the local housing supply and bolstering the capacity of vital infrastructure such as roadways to accommodate the thousands of EV workers that they expected would be working at this facility.

Immigration (Montérégie Region Quebec, Laurentides Region Quebec)

Participants in two groups, based in the Montérégie and Laurentides regions of Quebec respectively, engaged in a discussion regarding immigration. To begin, participants were asked if they had recently seen, read, or heard any news regarding immigration to Quebec, as well as Canada more broadly. A number were of the impression that a cap had recently been placed on immigration to Quebec, though none could recall any specific details. While some supported this action, believing that the province had taken in more immigrants than it could reasonably accommodate in recent years, a roughly equal number expressed concerns about the potential negative economic impacts this could have on the labour force and the provincial economy. Asked to describe the current state of the immigration system in Canada, several believed that clearer processes and controls needed to be put into place to manage the flow of immigration and ensure that the communities in which new immigrants settle had the resources to sufficiently accommodate an increase to the population. A few described the immigration system as being relatively open and inclusive and were of the impression that individuals from many parts of the world had the opportunity to immigrate to Canada.

Discussing what they perceived as the primary benefits of immigration, many highlighted the ability of Canada to attract skilled workers, particularly doctors and health care workers, from other countries to work in Canada. Several mentioned that while they were interested in increasing immigration levels for skilled workers, they hoped that the federal government would reduce immigration levels for unskilled and temporary foreign workers, believing that these individuals provided little in the way of positive impacts for the Canadian economy. Discussing other potential benefits of immigration, some viewed it as a way of increasing the tax base and better supporting Canada's aging population, ensuring that there would be enough individuals available to replace the large number of workers that were expected to retire in the near future. A few in the group from the Laurentides region also emphasized the importance of attracting French-speaking immigrants as a way of protecting and promoting the French language and culture in Canada.

Participants were next asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the statement that "*Canada needs to welcome more new immigrants to fill labour shortages and grow the economy*". While most agreed, a number felt that the federal government's focus should be primarily on recruiting highly skilled immigrants to work in key sectors that were believed to be facing labour shortages, such as health care and agriculture. A few also commented that while they felt immigration was important, it had to be carried out in a manageable way and steps needed to be taken to ensure that enough resources (such as housing) were available to accommodate a growing population. Among the smaller



number who disagreed with the statement, it was felt that any economic benefits of immigration would be outweighed by the perceived exacerbation of existing challenges faced by Canadians in a number of other areas, such as the high cost of living, a lack of affordable housing, and the perceived strain it placed on existing infrastructure and services (such as health care, education and transportation). Related to this, some expressed concerns that if these resources were not available, it could lead to some new immigrants experiencing extreme poverty, placing them in a very precarious position as a result.

Asked what the Government of Canada should do to address concerns related to immigration, many reiterated the need for targeted immigration focusing on bringing in immigrants with skills that could immediately contribute to the Canadian economy. Related to this, a few felt that more could be done to streamline the foreign credential recognition process to ensure that new immigrants were able to work in their fields of expertise upon arriving in Canada. It was also felt that increased resources should be provided for new immigrants to assist them with establishing their lives in Canada and acclimatizing to their new communities. Questioned whether they felt the Government of Canada should increase, decrease, or keep the rate of immigration relatively the same, a slightly larger number felt it should be decreased as those who believed it should remain stable. Almost no participants felt the rate of immigration should be increased.

Issues Affecting the 2SLGBTQI+ Community (Montreal Members of the 2SLGBTQI+ Community)

Participants in the group based in Montreal, comprised of individuals who identified as members of the 2SLGBTQI+ community, shared their perspectives related to issues currently facing the 2SLGBTQI+ community in Canada. Asked to identify what they viewed as the most pressing challenges on this front, participants provided a range of responses. Several believed that there needed to be greater education and acceptance of transgender people across Canada. The view was expressed that transgender individuals frequently encountered discrimination in many parts of the country and that more needed to be done to protect their rights and security. A number also thought that greater investments needed to be made toward ensuring that 2SLGBTQI+ individuals had sufficient access to health care and mental health services as well as safe places they could go to feel protected from discrimination. A few believed that while practices such as conversion therapy continued to be an issue in some parts of the country, it was felt that the Government of Canada's recent action to prohibit this practice had made significant progress in protecting 2SLGBTQI+ individuals, and especially 2SLGBTQI+ youth.

Asked what they felt the Government of Canada's role should be in addressing these issues, participants felt that more needed to be done to protect and promote the rights of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals guaranteed under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* as well as ensure these

individuals were not discriminated against when seeking to obtain employment or access important services such as health care. Questioned whether they were aware of any actions that the federal government had taken on this front, none recalled having heard anything.

Describing the level of acceptance, support, and inclusion in Canadian society for the 2SLGBTQI+ community, most felt that Canadians were generally accepting of their community, especially when compared to many other parts of the world. A number were of the impression that acceptance of these communities was considerably higher in major urban centres, such as Montreal, compared to smaller and/or more rural locales. A few, however, expressed the opinion that some groups, such as transgender or intersex people, were less understood and faced greater discrimination compared to others in the 2SLGBTQI+ community.

Discussing whether they felt the level of acceptance of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals had changed over time, several were of the impression that Canadians had generally become more accepting in recent decades. This being said, a few believed that with the advent of social media, it had become easier for anti-2SLGBTQI+ hate to be disseminated online, leading to 2SLGBTQI+ people likely encountering hateful content more frequently today relative to past eras. A number believed that the greater inclusion and representation of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals in many aspects of Canadian life and culture as of late had assisted in increasing the overall acceptance and support for these communities.

Asked what additional actions they felt should be taken by the federal government to promote the acceptance, support, and inclusion of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals in Canada, many believed that it was important to promote more widespread education for Canadians regarding the issues facing their community. It was hoped that with increased knowledge and understanding, Canadians would become more accepting and inclusive of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals. Other suggestions included the provision of increased protections for 2SLGBTQI+ youth and more active consultations with 2SLGBTQI+ people and organizations.

While most believed that the state of 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms had improved in recent decades, especially in terms of the legalization of same-sex marriage and allowing same-sex couples to adopt, it was felt by many that some challenges had persisted on this front. The view was expressed that 2SLGBTQI+ individuals continued to experience greater discrimination when accessing health care or interacting with law enforcement compared to other Canadians. Some were also of the impression that 2SLGBTQI+ individuals faced significant barriers in accessing various health services (including mental health supports), such as hormone therapy. Discussing what actions the Government of Canada should take to better protect the rights and freedoms of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals, several believed that there needed to be a greater emphasis on ensuring that laws aimed at protecting their communities were being properly enforced in all parts of the country.

Asked whether they felt the federal government was on the right track on protecting 2SLGBTQI+ rights, a larger number believed that it was compared to those who felt otherwise. Among these individuals it was felt that protecting the rights of and freedoms of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals had been a major priority for the federal government and that it had taken several positive steps on this front in recent years. For the smaller number who felt differently, the view was reiterated that some groups

(such as transgender individuals) continued to face discrimination and that until this was addressed, it was difficult for them to view the federal government as being on the right track.

Questioned whether they were aware of any specific actions the Government of Canada had taken on this front, participants mentioned initiatives such as the inclusion of gender-neutral bathrooms in federal buildings and increased education, especially for young people, related to the experiences of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals in Canada. Participants were next asked to describe their level of awareness of a number of measures that had been introduced by the Government of Canada related to protecting the rights and freedoms of 2SLGBTQI+ communities. These included:

- *Investing \$75 million for 2SLGBTQI+ community organizations that advocate for and serve 2SLGBTQI+ communities;*
- *Passing Bill C-16, a law written to recognize gender expression and gender identity as a human right and protect gender diverse individuals from discrimination and hate propaganda;*
- *Passing Bill C-4, an Act to amend the Criminal Code to ban conversion therapy;*
- *The action by Health Canada to lift the ban on blood donations from men who have sex with men.*

Among these initiatives, awareness was highest of the decision by Health Canada to lift the ban on blood donations from men have sex with men, while a smaller number were aware of the passing of legislation such as Bill C-16 and Bill C-4. No participants recalled having heard about the investment of \$75 million towards 2SLGBTQI+ community organizations, with some sharing the impression that this amount was likely too low to make any tangible difference in protecting the rights and freedoms of 2SLGBTQI+ communities.

Asked what the Government of Canada should do to improve relations with the 2SLGBTQI+ community, many felt that a focus should be placed on increasing the representation of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals across all facets of Canadian life. The view was also reiterated that there needed to be greater consultation by the federal government with 2SLGBTQI+ individuals and organizations, as well as ensuring that 2SLGBTQI+ voices were included on panels, boards, groups, and committees, particularly those pertaining to 2SLGBTQI+ affairs. Questioned whether they agreed with the statement that *the Government of Canada listens, cares, and responds to the needs of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals*, many indicated that they did, though a number reiterated the need for increased representation of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals at all levels of government. Discussing whether they were optimistic about their future as an 2SLGBTQI+ person living in Canada, most reported that they were, believing that their community was typically far safer and better supported in Canada compared to most other parts of the world.

Opioids (Lower Mainland British Columbia)

Participants residing in British Columbia (B.C.)'s Lower Mainland took part in a discussion related to opioid use and addiction in their communities. All viewed opioid addiction as a major concern at present and believed that the issue had worsened significantly in recent years. Asked whether they



were hopeful that there would be progress on this issue in the coming years, a roughly equal number expected the situation to stay the same as those who felt it would gradually improve. Questioned whether they were aware of any actions that the Government of Canada had taken to address opioid addiction in B.C., a number believed it had provided funding towards harm reduction initiatives such as supervised consumption sites. Discussing what came to mind when they heard the terms 'safe supply' and 'supervised consumption site', most believed these phrases were connected to the overall goal of harm reduction and ensuring that drug users were using clean substances under the supervision of health care professionals. To aid in conversation, participants were provided with the following information:

Safe supply refers to providing prescribed medications as a safer alternative to the toxic illegal drug supply to people who are at high risk of overdose. Safer supply services can help prevent overdoses, save lives, and connect people who use drugs to other health and social services.

Supervised consumption sites provide a safe, clean, space for people to bring and consume their own drugs in the presence of trained staff. This prevents accidental overdoses and reduces the spread of infectious diseases. They also offer a range of harm reduction services.

While most felt it was important for harm reduction initiatives such as these to be in place, it was widely thought that these needed to be accompanied by an increase in treatment resources for those suffering from addiction. It was felt that unless steps were taken to address the root causes of addiction, issues such as substance use and addiction would continue to proliferate in the years to come. Participants were next provided with the following information related to actions the Government of Canada was taking to address the harms related to substance use:

Through the Substance Use and Addictions Program (SUAP), the Government of Canada is funding projects that address harms associated with substance use. More specifically, through this program, the Government of Canada is funding safer supply and consumption site services, and they are also funding projects that focus on things like overdose prevention, education, detox support, peer support, outreach, mentorship, and mental health supports, among other initiatives.

On balance, while several reacted positively to these initiatives and viewed them as a step in the right direction, a large number reiterated the view that a greater focus needed to be placed on eliminating illicit substance use altogether and providing drug users with the tools and treatment they need to overcome addiction. It was felt that until this occurred, these actions would only have a minimal impact on curbing illicit drug use in their communities. A few hoped that actions such as overdose prevention and better education related to these substances would help to take some pressure off of the health care system going forward. Participants were next informed that:

Last year, the Government of Canada granted an exemption to the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act to remove criminal penalties for possession of up to 2.5 grams of certain illegal drugs in British Columbia. Recently, the federal government approved the B.C. government's request to recriminalize the use of illicit drugs in public spaces. Adults will still be allowed to carry small amounts of illicit drugs and use them in private, but they could be arrested for using them in public.



Many expressed support for the decision by the federal government to approve the Government of B.C.'s request to recriminalize the use of illicit drugs in public spaces. Several were of the impression that following the previous decision to decriminalize these substances, public drug use had become far more prevalent in the Lower Mainland. A number shared concerns regarding the impact that seeing open drug use would have on children and young people and did not believe that it was appropriate for drug users to be able to consume these substances in public spaces. It was felt that while it was important not to increase the stigma faced by drug users, there also needed to be regulations in place to prevent the use of these substances in public, as well as consequences for those who choose to engage in these actions.

Asked what additional actions they would like to see from the Government of Canada related to addressing illicit substance use and addiction, all reiterated a desire for the greater prioritization of treatment and education, and the need for increased funding towards treatment centres and mental health resources. A small number felt there also needed to be a greater focus placed on preventing the influx of drugs into Canada from other parts of the world. Among these participants, it was believed that there was a disproportionate focus on working to change the behaviours of drug users rather than targeting those involved in trafficking and distributing these substances throughout Canada.

French Language Protection and Promotion (Laurentides Region Quebec)

One group, comprised of participants residing in the Laurentides region of Quebec, shared their perspectives regarding a range of initiatives that had been announced by the federal government related to protecting and promoting the French language in Canada. Asked how important they felt it was to protect and promote the use of French in Canada, several viewed this as a major priority, and expressed concern that if action was not taken, the usage of French could diminish greatly among future generations. A smaller number viewed this as a more minor priority, believing that while it was important to protect the French language, there were other more pressing issues (such as the high cost of living) at present. Discussing the current state of the French language in Canada, while most believed that it was widely spoken throughout Quebec and that there were numerous French language educational resources available within the province, it was thought that French was used very little in the rest of the country. A few expressed the view that greater efforts needed to be taken to encourage new immigrants to Quebec to learn French, believing that this was of considerable importance towards ensuring the long-term viability of the language.

Asked whether they had heard anything about the Government of Canada's new Action Plan for Official Languages, none indicated that they had. To aid in conversation, participants were provided with the following information:



The Government of Canada has an Action Plan for Official Languages. The Action Plan proposes over 30 measures aimed at achieving a few key objectives. The information below describes these key objectives as well as specific measures that will be enacted to achieve them:

- **Encouraging more Francophone immigration to Canada**
 - *Creating a new French immigration policy;*
 - *Expanding global promotion and recruitment work in French-speaking countries; and*
 - *Investing in language training for newcomers.*

- **Promoting lifelong learning opportunities in French**
 - *Expanding program offerings in French minority-language schools outside of Quebec;*
 - *Investing in French second-language programs throughout Canada; and*
 - *Investing in Francophone child care centres across Canada.*

- **Supporting French community organizations**
 - *Boosting funding to Francophone community organizations;*
 - *Providing grants to projects that strengthen attachment to the French language and Francophone culture; and*
 - *Providing grants to Francophone artists.*

- **Creating a centre within Heritage Canada** *that supports the Government of Canada in taking additional steps to support French language minority communities.*

Almost all reacted positively to these measures, with some particularly praising the initiatives to invest in Francophone child care centres across Canada, provide grants to French artists, create a French-language centre within Heritage Canada, as well as encourage increased rates of immigration from French-speaking countries. Regarding the latter, it was felt that this approach would be far more effective towards increasing the prevalence of the French language compared to efforts to teach French to new immigrants after they arrive. A small number worried about the additional financial costs of these measures and questioned whether they would be able to have a tangible impact on protecting the French language. Asked to share any additional actions they felt the Government of Canada should take on this front, some proposed increased investments towards Francophone cultural festivals both within and outside of Quebec. It was felt that this would be an effective way of communicating and sharing Francophone culture with the rest of the country as well as demonstrating the importance of the French language to recent immigrants to Canada.

Community Safety (Hamilton)

Participants residing in Hamilton engaged in a discussion related to the level of crime in their area and their perceptions regarding the overall safety of their community. Asked how safe they felt Hamilton was at present, a roughly equal number viewed it as being relatively safe as those who felt otherwise. Among those who viewed their community as being unsafe, participants mentioned issues related to a



perceived increase in criminal activities such as burglaries and break-ins, violent assaults (including shootings), illicit drug usage, property damage, and growing issues related to homelessness. A small number clarified that while they felt relatively safe in their own neighbourhoods, they felt less safe in other parts of the city.

Almost all believed that the level of crime in their community had been increasing as of late. Asked what factors they felt might be contributing to this perceived rise in crime, participants described a number of issues. These included a perceived growing number of individuals suffering from addiction and mental health disorders and the difficulties they faced in accessing treatment for these issues, a proliferation of organized crime in Canada, what was viewed as a lack of consequences for those who engage in criminal actions, and the increased desperation of some individuals due to the high cost of living at present.

Asked who they felt was most responsible for dealing with crime, a large number viewed municipal law enforcement and officials as having the biggest role, specifically in regards to the funding and oversight municipalities provide for local police forces. Discussing what role they felt the Government of Canada should play when it came to addressing crime, participants felt it should primarily be responsible for ensuring the security of Canadian borders, preventing the trafficking of drugs into Canada, providing funding towards addiction and mental health programs, and imposing penalties for those who commit criminal offences.

Questioned whether they were aware of any actions from the federal government in recent years related to addressing crime, none were. Asked specifically if they could recall any initiatives related to the regulation of firearms, a small number were of the impression that stricter regulations had been enacted related to the types of firearms, such as handguns, that could be owned by Canadians. A few expressed opposition to this action, believing that it had unfairly impacted law-abiding gun owners while doing little to address those who committed crimes with illegally sourced firearms. Discussing additional actions that could be taken by the Government of Canada to prevent crime, participants reiterated the need for increased mental health and addictions services, as well as ensuring vulnerable individuals had access to affordable housing options. It was felt that if essentials such as housing became more accessible, fewer individuals would be placed in precarious living situations where they would be more likely to partake in illegal activities. Asked whether they felt that addressing crime was an important priority for the federal government to be focusing on, almost all believed that it was.

Auto Theft (Hamilton)

Participants residing in Hamilton engaged in a brief discussion related to auto theft and actions that had recently been taken by the federal government aimed at addressing this issue. Asked whether they had seen, read, or heard about any initiatives from the Government of Canada on this front, several mentioned the announcement of the National Action Plan on Combatting Auto Theft (though not specifically by name). A number also were of the impression that the federal government had taken steps to encourage the automotive industry to improve security features in the automobiles they



manufacture in order to make them more difficult to steal. To aid in discussion, participants were provided with the following information related to a range of measures the federal government had announced to combat auto theft:

The Government of Canada is cracking down on auto theft to make it harder to steal vehicles and to export stolen vehicles by:

- **Intending to amend the Criminal Code**, including:
 - **New criminal offences** related to auto theft involving:
 - **The use of violence** or links to **organized crime**.
 - Possession or distribution of an **electronic or digital device** for the purposes of committing auto theft.
 - **Laundering proceeds of crime** for the benefit of a criminal organization.
 - A new aggravating factor at sentencing **if an offender involved a young person** in committing an offence under the Criminal Code;
- **Intending to amend the Radiocommunication Act** to regulate the sale, possession, distribution, and import of devices used to steal cars. **This will enable law enforcement agencies to remove devices** believed to be used to steal cars from the Canadian marketplace;
- **Strengthening the Canada Border Services Agency's (CBSA) capacity to detect and search containers** with stolen vehicles, and for **testing technologies** that could support the work of border services officers; and
- **Allocating \$15 million** to provincial, territorial, and municipal police forces **to address auto theft**, and to strengthen policing to **crack down on international organized crime**.

All reacted positively to these initiatives, with several identifying the measure to strengthen the ability of Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) officials to detect and search containers believed to be holding stolen vehicles as being particularly effective. Other initiatives mentioned positively by participants included the allocation of \$15 million to provincial, territorial, and municipal police forces to assist them in addressing auto theft, as well as the introduction of additional criminal penalties related to auto theft, including a new aggravating factor at sentencing for offenders who involve a minor in the theft of an automobile. A few also viewed the federal government cracking down on money laundering by criminal organizations involved in auto theft as being an important step towards combatting this issue. Asked whether they felt these actions would have a major, minor, or no impact on combatting auto theft, all expected that they would have a minor impact. It was widely felt, however, that if properly implemented, these actions would provide a strong foundation for more comprehensive measures in the future aimed at addressing this issue.

Appendices

Appendix A – Recruiting Scripts

English Recruiting Script

**Privy Council Office
Recruiting Script – May 2024
English Groups**

Recruitment Specifications Summary

- Groups conducted online.
- Each group is expected to last for two hours.
- Recruit 8 participants.
- Incentives will be \$125 per person and will be sent to participants via e-transfer following the group.

Specifications for the focus groups are as follows:

Group	Date	Time (EDT)	Local Time	Location	Composition	Moderator
1	Tues, May 7 th	8:00-10:00 PM	6:00-8:00 (CST)	Saskatchewan	General Population	TBW
2	Wed, May 8 th	5:00-7:00 PM	6:00-8:00 (ADT)	New Brunswick, Nova Scotia & PEI	Millennials, Ages 28-43	DN
3	Thurs, May 9 th	8:00-10:00 PM	6:00-8:00 (MDT)	Calgary	Generation Z, Age 18-27	TBW
4	Tues, May 14 th	7:00-9:00 PM	6:00-8:00 (CDT)	Mid-Size & Major Centres Manitoba	Climate Supportive & Ambivalent	MP
6	Thurs, May 16 th	8:00-10:00 PM	6:00-8:00 (MDT)	Major Centres Alberta	Climate Supportive & Ambivalent	TBW
7	Tues, May 21 st	6:00-8:00 PM	6:00-8:00 PM (EDT)	Central Ontario	Climate Supportive & Ambivalent	DN
9	Thurs, May 23 rd	4:30-6:30 PM	6:00-8:00 PM (NDT)	Newfoundland & Labrador	General Population	DN
10	Tues, May 28 th	9:00-11:00 PM	6:00-8:00 (PDT)	Lower Mainland BC	General Population	TBW
12	Thurs, May 30 th	6:00-8:00 PM	6:00-8:00 PM (EDT)	Hamilton	General Population	DN



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? / Préférez-vous continuer en français ou en anglais?
[CONTINUE IN LANGUAGE OF PREFERENCE]

RECORD LANGUAGE

English **CONTINUE**
French **SWITCH TO FRENCH SCREENER**

On behalf of the Government of Canada, we're organizing a series of online video 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. In which city do you reside?

LOCATION	CITIES	
Saskatchewan	<p>Cities could include (but are not limited to):</p> <p>Major Centres: Population of 100,000+</p> <p>Saskatoon, Regina</p> <p>Mid-Size Centres: Population of 30,00-100,000</p> <p>Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Lloydminster</p> <p>Small Centres: Population of <30,000</p> <p>Swift Current, Yorkton, North Battleford, Estevan, Warman, Weyburn, Martensville, Melfort, Humboldt, Meadow Lake</p> <p>NO MORE THAN TWO PER CITY. ENSURE A GOOD MIX OF CITIES ACROSS THE REGION. INCLUDE THOSE RESIDING IN LARGER AND SMALLER COMMUNITIES.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 1
New Brunswick, Nova Scotia & PEI	<p>Cities/regions could include (but are not limited to):</p> <p><u>Nova Scotia:</u> Halifax, Cape Breton, New Glasgow, Glace Bay, Truro</p> <p><u>New Brunswick:</u> Greater Moncton Area, Greater Saint John Area, Quispamsis – Rothesay, Dieppe, Miramichi, Edmundston, Fredericton, Saint John</p> <p><u>Prince Edward Island:</u> Charlottetown, Charlottetown Region</p> <p>ENSURE A GOOD MIX OF CITIES/REGIONS ACROSS PROVINCES. NO MORE THAN 3 FROM EACH PROVINCE.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 2

Calgary	<p>Cities include:</p> <p>Calgary</p> <p>PARTICIPANTS MUST RESIDE IN ABOVE NOTED CITY PROPER.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 3
Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba	<p>Cities include:</p> <p>Mid-Size Centres: Population of 10,000-100,000</p> <p>Brandon, Steinbach, Winkler, Thompson, Selkirk</p> <p>Major Centres: Population of 100,000+</p> <p>Winnipeg</p> <p>ENSURE A GOOD MIX ACROSS THE REGION.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 4
Major Centres Alberta	<p>Cities include:</p> <p>Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer, Lethbridge</p> <p>PARTICIPANTS SHOULD RESIDE IN THE ABOVE-NOTED CENTERS PROPER. NO MORE THAN 3 PER CITY.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 6
Central Ontario	<p>Cities include (but are not limited to):</p> <p>Barrie, Orillia, Belleville, Peterborough, Quinte West, Bancroft, Cobourg, Campbellford, Penetanguishene, Midland, Madoc, Haliburton, Cardiff</p> <p>ENSURE A GOOD MIX ACROSS THE REGION. INCLUDE THOSE RESIDING IN LARGER AND SMALLER COMMUNITIES.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 7
Newfoundland and Labrador	<p>Cities/regions could include (but are not limited to):</p> <p>St. John’s, Corner Brook, Conception Bay, Mount Pearl, Labrador City, Grand Falls-Windsor, Paradise</p> <p>ENSURE A GOOD MIX.</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 9
Lower Mainland BC	<p>Cities include:</p> <p>Vancouver, Abbotsford, Burnaby, Coquitlam, Richmond, Surrey, Delta, Langley, White Rock, Chilliwack, Mission Hope, Maple Ridge, New</p>	CONTINUE – GROUP 10

	Westminster, North Vancouver, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody ENSURE A GOOD MIX OF CITIES ACROSS THE REGION. NO MORE THAN TWO PER CITY. INCLUDE THOSE RESIDING IN LARGER AND SMALLER COMMUNITIES.	
Hamilton	Cities include: Hamilton PARTICIPANTS MUST RESIDE IN ABOVE NOTED CITY PROPER.	CONTINUE – GROUP 12
VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer		THANK AND END

2a. How long have you lived in [INSERT CITY]? **RECORD NUMBER OF YEARS.**

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

3. 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.
18-27	IF GROUP 2 – THANK AND END FOR ALL OTHERS – CONTINUE
28-43	IF GROUP 3 – THANK AND END FOR ALL OTHERS – CONTINUE
44-49	IF GROUP 2 OR GROUP 3 – THANK AND END FOR ALL OTHERS – CONTINUE
50-54	
55-64	
65+	
VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer	THANK AND END

ENSURE A GOOD MIX WHERE APPLICABLE. GROUP 3 WILL BE COMPOSED ENTIRELY OF THOSE AGED 18-27. GROUP 2 WILL BE COMPOSED ENTIRELY OF THOSE AGED 28-43.

4. **ASK ONLY IF GROUPS 4, 6 & 7** Which one of the following five descriptions most closely resemble your own thinking?
1. I strongly believe in climate change and think it is caused by humans. I am extremely worried about it. I am committed to taking climate action and think my actions would have an effect, but I am not particularly hopeful about progress overall.
 2. I strongly believe in climate change and think it is mostly caused by humans. I am very worried about it. I am willing to take climate action, and think my actions would have some effect.
 3. I mostly believe in climate change and think it is probably caused by humans, but sometimes I feel a bit confused about the issue and am only moderately worried about it. I am somewhat willing to take climate action.
 4. I do not have strong feelings about climate change and am a bit uncertain about what causes it. I am not too worried about it. I am not particularly willing to take climate action and am unsure that my actions would have an effect.
 5. I do not believe in climate change or that it is caused by humans. I feel no confusion about the issue, and am not at all worried about it. I am very unwilling to take climate action and do not think my actions would have any effect.

2 = SUPPORTIVE, 3 = AMBIVALENT. ENSURE A GOOD MIX BETWEEN THOSE WHO ARE SUPPORTIVE AND AMBIVALENT. GROUPS 4, 6 & 7 WILL BE COMPOSED ENTIRELY OF THOSE WHO SAY THEY ALIGN WITH RESPONSE 2 OR 3 AT Q4.

5. **ASK ALL GROUPS** Do you own or rent your current residence? **IF ASKED/CLARIFICATION REQUIRED:** You are considered a homeowner even if you have outstanding debt that you owe on your mortgage loan.

Own	CONTINUE
Rent	
VOLUNTEERED Living at home	
VOLUNTEERED Other, please specify:	
VOLUNTEERED Don't know/not sure	THANK AND END

ENSURE A GOOD MIX WHERE APPLICABLE.

- 5a. **ASK ALL GROUPS** Which of the following best describes the residence you currently [own/rent]?

Condo	CONTINUE
Apartment	CONTINUE
Single family home	CONTINUE
Townhome	CONTINUE
Other, please specify: _____	CONTINUE

ENSURE A GOOD MIX.



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

Yes **CONTINUE**

No **EXPLAIN THE FOLLOWING** “a focus group consists of six to eight 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.”

7. As part of the focus group, you will be asked to actively participate in a conversation. Thinking of how you engage in group discussions, how would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means ‘you tend to sit back and listen to others’ and 5 means ‘you are usually one of the first people to speak’?

1-2 **THANK AND END**

3-5 **CONTINUE**

8. As this group is being conducted online, in order to participate you will need to have high-speed Internet and a computer with a working webcam, microphone and speaker. **RECRUITER TO CONFIRM THE FOLLOWING. TERMINATE IF NO TO EITHER.**

Participant has high-speed access to the Internet

Participant has a computer/webcam

9. **ASK ALL GROUPS** Have you used online meeting software, such as Zoom, Webex, Microsoft Teams, Google Hangouts/Meet, etc., in the last two years?

Yes **CONTINUE**

No **CONTINUE**

10. **ASK ALL GROUPS** How skilled would you say you are at using online meeting platforms on your own, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means you are not at all skilled, and 5 means you are very skilled?

1-2 **THANK AND END**

3-5 **CONTINUE**

11. **ASK ALL GROUPS** During the discussion, you could be asked to read or view materials on screen and/or participate in poll-type exercises online. You will also be asked to actively participate online using a webcam. Can you think of any reason why you may have difficulty reading the materials or participating by video?

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, ANY CONCERNS WITH USING A WEBCAM OR IF YOU AS THE INTERVIEWER HAVE A CONCERN ABOUT THE PARTICIPANT’S ABILITY TO PARTICIPATE EFFECTIVELY.

12. 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.16**



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

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

More than 6 months ago **CONTINUE**

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

0-4 groups **CONTINUE**

5 or more groups **THANK AND END**

15. On what topics were they and do you recall who or what organization the groups were being undertaken for?

TERMINATE IF ANY ON SIMILAR/SAME TOPIC OR GOVERNMENT OF CANADA IDENTIFIED AS ORGANIZATION

ADDITIONAL RECRUITING CRITERIA

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

16. 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 **THANK AND END**

ENSURE A GOOD MIX.

17. ASK ALL GROUPS Which of the following best describes the industry/sector in which you are currently employed?

Accommodation and Food Services

Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services

Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting

Arts, Entertainment and Recreation

Automotive

Construction

Educational Services

Finance & Insurance

Health Care

Social Assistance

Information and Cultural Industries

- Management of Companies and Enterprises
- Manufacturing
- Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction
- Other Services (except Public Administration)
- Professional, Scientific and Technical Services
- Public Administration
- Real Estate and Rental and Leasing
- Retail Trade
- Transportation and Warehousing
- Utilities
- Wholesale Trade
- Unemployed
- Full Time Student
- Retired
- Other, please specify: _____

ENSURE A GOOD MIX BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT IF APPLICABLE. NO MORE THAN TWO PER SECTOR. NO MORE THAN 2 WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED. NO INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN ANY GROUPS.

- 18. ASK ALL GROUPS** Which of the following categories best describes your total household income in 2023? That is, the total income of all persons in your household combined, before taxes?

Under \$20,000	CONTINUE
\$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 \$125,000	
\$100,000 to just under \$150,000	
\$150,000 and above	
VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer	THANK AND END

ENSURE A GOOD MIX WHERE APPLICABLE.

- 19. ASK ALL GROUPS** Which of the following racial or cultural groups best describes you? (multi-select)

- White/Caucasian
- South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)
- Chinese
- Black
- Latin American
- Filipino
- Arab
- Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai)
- Korean or Japanese
- Indigenous
- Other (specify)

VOLUNTEERED Prefer not to answer **THANK AND END**
ENSURE A GOOD MIX.

20. [DO NOT ASK] Gender RECORD BY OBSERVATION.

Male	CONTINUE
Female	CONTINUE

ENSURE A GOOD MIX BY GENDER IN EACH GROUP WHERE APPLICABLE.

21. 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 **CONTINUE TO INVITATION ON NEXT PAGE**

No **THANK AND END**



INVITATION

I would like to invite you to this online 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 \$125 for your participation following the group via an e-transfer.

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.

Would you be willing to attend?

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

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:

You will receive an e-mail from **[INSERT RECRUITER]** with the instructions to login to the online group. Should you have any issues logging into the system specifically, you can contact our technical support team at support@thestrategiccounsel.com.

We ask that you are online at least 15 minutes prior to the beginning of the session in order to ensure you are set up and to allow our support team to assist you in case you run into any technical issues. We also ask that you restart your computer prior to joining 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. Also, you will need a pen and paper in order to take some notes throughout the group.

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.

Thank you very much for your time.

RECRUITED BY: _____

DATE RECRUITED: _____

French Recruiting Script

**Bureau du Conseil privé
Questionnaire de recrutement – mai 2024
Groupes en français**

Résumé des consignes de recrutement

- Groupes tenus en ligne.
- Durée prévue de chaque rencontre : deux heures.
- Recrutement de huit participants.
- Incitatifs de 125 \$ par personne, versés aux participants par transfert électronique après la rencontre.

Caractéristiques des groupes de discussion :

GROUPE	DATE	HEURE (HNE)	HEURE (LOCALE)	LIEU	COMPOSITION DU GROUPE	MODÉRAT EUR
5	15 mai	6:00-8:00	6:00-8:00 (HAE)	Région de la Montérégie	Population générale	MP
8	22 mai	6:00-8:00	6:00-8:00 (HAE)	Ville de Montréal	2SLGBTQI+	MP
11	29 mai	6:00-8:00	6:00-8:00 (HAE)	La région des Laurentides	Population générale	MP

Questionnaire de recrutement

INTRODUCTION

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. / 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

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

NOTER LA LANGUE ET CONTINUER

Français **CONTINUER**

Anglais **PASSER AU QUESTIONNAIRE ANGLAIS**



Nous organisons, pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada, une série de groupes de discussion vidéo en ligne afin 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. Quelle est la langue officielle du Canada que vous parlez principalement aujourd'hui?

Anglais **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Français **CONTINUER**
Autre [Préciser ou non la langue, selon les besoins de l'étude] **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
Préfère ne pas répondre **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

3. Dans quelle ville habitez-vous?

LIEU	VILLES	
Région de la Montérégie	<p>Ces villes peuvent notamment comprendre (mais ne sont pas limité à):</p> <p>Boucherville, Brossard, Châteauguay, Longueuil, Saint-Hyacinthe, Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Salaberry-de-Valleyfield and Vaudreuil-Dorion.</p> <p>PAS PLUS QUE DEUX PARTICIPANT PAR VILLE. ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE. ASSURER UNE BONNE REPRÉSENTATION DES VILLES DE LA RÉGION.</p>	CONTINUER – GROUPE 5
Ville de Montréal	<p>Ces villes peuvent comprendre :</p> <p>Ville de Montréal</p> <p>LES PARTICIPANTS DOIVENT RÉSIDER À MONTRÉAL À PROPRIÉTÉ PARLER</p>	CONTINUER – GROUPE 8
La région des Laurentides	<p>Ces villes peuvent notamment comprendre (mais ne sont pas limité à):</p> <p>Blainville, Boisbriand, Deux-Montagnes, Lachute, Mirabel, Mont-Laurier, Rosemère, Saint-Jérôme, Sainte-Thérèse, Doncaster, Saint-Eustache, Mont-Tremblant, Sainte-Marthe-sur-le-Lac, Saint-Lin-Laurentides, Saint-Colomban</p> <p>ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE.</p>	CONTINUER – GROUPE 11
<p>RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Préfère ne pas répondre</p>		REMERCIER ET CONCLURE

4. Depuis combien de temps habitez-vous à [INSÉRER LE NOM DE LA VILLE]? **NOTER LE NOMBRE D'ANNÉES.**

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

5. **DEMANDER UNIQUEMENT AU GROUP 8** Vous identifiez-vous comme un ou plusieurs des choix suivants? **[LIRE TOUS ET ACCEPTER PLUSIEURS RÉPONSES]**

Lesbienne
Gai.e
Hétérosexuel.le
Homme
Femme
Queer
Personne transgenre
Bisexuel.le
Bispirituel.le/deux-esprits
Personne non-binaire
En questionnement
Genre fluide
Personne intersexuée
Autre (Veuillez préciser) : _____

RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Préfère ne pas répondre **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**

SI LA REPONSE N'EST QUE 'HÉTÉROSEXUEL.LE' OU LA REPONSE EST UNIQUEMENT HOMME OU FEMME, REMERCIER ET CONCLURE. ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE. LIMITER CEUX QUI DIT 'AUTRE, VEUILLEZ PRÉCISER'.

6. 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 27 ans	CONTINUER
28 à 43 ans	
43 à 54 ans	
55 ans ou plus	
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Préfère ne pas répondre	REMERCIER ET CONCLURE

ASSURER UNE BONNE REPRÉSENTATION D'ÂGES DANS CHAQUE GROUPE, S'IL Y A LIEU.



7. Êtes-vous actuellement propriétaire ou locataire de votre résidence principale? **ECLAIRCISSEMENT AU BESOIN** : Vous êtes considéré comme propriétaire même si vous avez une dette hypothécaire active.

Propriétaire	CONTINUER
Locataire	CONTINUER
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Habitant au domicile parentale	CONTINUER
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Autre, veuillez précisez :	CONTINUER
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE Ne sais pas/Préfère ne pas répondre	REMERCIER ET CONCLURE

- 7a. Parmi les choix suivants, lequel décrit le mieux la résidence dont vous êtes actuellement [propriétaire/locataire]?

Condo **CONTINUER**
Appartement **CONTINUER**
Maison unifamiliale **CONTINUER**
Maison en rangée **CONTINUER**
Autre, veuillez préciser : _____ **CONTINUER**
ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE.

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

Oui **CONTINUER**
Non **EXPLIQUER QUE** : « *un groupe de discussion se compose de six à huit 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* ».

9. Dans le cadre du groupe de discussion, on vous demandera de participer activement à une conversation. En pensant à la manière dont vous interagissez lors de discussions en groupe, quelle note vous donneriez-vous sur une échelle de 1 à 5 si 1 signifie « j'ai tendance à ne pas intervenir et à écouter les autres parler » et 5, « je suis habituellement une des premières personnes à parler »?

1-2 **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
3-5 **CONTINUER**

10. Étant donné que ce groupe se réunira en ligne, vous aurez besoin, pour participer, d'un accès Internet haut débit et d'un ordinateur muni d'une caméra Web, d'un microphone et d'un haut-parleur en bon état de marche. **CONFIRMER LES POINTS CI-DESSOUS. METTRE FIN À L'APPEL SI NON À L'UN DES TROIS.**

Le participant a accès à Internet haut débit
Le participant a un ordinateur avec caméra Web



11. Avez-vous utilisé des logiciels de réunion en ligne tels que Zoom, Webex, Microsoft Teams, Google Hangouts/Meet, etc., au cours des deux dernières années?

Oui **CONTINUER**
Non **CONTINUER**

12. Sur une échelle de 1 à 5 signifie que vous n'êtes pas du tout habile et 5 que vous êtes très habile, comment évaluez-vous votre capacité à utiliser seul(e) les plateformes de réunion en ligne?

1-2 **REMERCIER ET CONCLURE**
3-5 **CONTINUER**

13. Au cours de la discussion, vous pourriez devoir lire ou visionner du matériel affiché à l'écran, ou faire des exercices en ligne comme ceux qu'on trouve dans les sondages. On vous demandera aussi de participer activement à la discussion en ligne à l'aide d'une caméra Web. Pensez-vous avoir de la difficulté, pour une raison ou une autre, à lire les documents ou à participer à la discussion par vidéo?

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, SI L'UTILISATION D'UNE CAMÉRA WEB LUI POSE PROBLÈME, OU SI VOUS, EN TANT QU'INTERVIEWEUR, AVEZ DES DOUBTES QUANT À SA CAPACITÉ DE PARTICIPER EFFICACEMENT AUX DISCUSSIONS.

14. 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.18**

15. 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**

16. 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**

17. Quel était leur sujet, et vous rappelez-vous pour qui ou pour quelle organisation ces groupes étaient organisés?

TERMINER SI LE SUJET EST SEMBLABLE OU IDENTIQUE, OU SI L'ORGANISATION NOMMÉE EST LE GOUVERNEMENT DU CANADA

CRITÈRES DE RECRUTEMENT SUPPLÉMENTAIRES

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

18. Laquelle des catégories suivantes décrit le mieux le revenu annuel total de votre ménage en 2023 – c'est-à-dire le revenu cumulatif de l'ensemble des membres de votre ménage avant impôt?

Moins de 20 000 \$	CONTINUER
20 000 \$ à moins de 40 000 \$	CONTINUER
40 000 \$ à moins de 60 000 \$	CONTINUER
60 000 \$ à moins de 80 000 \$	CONTINUER
80 000 \$ à moins de 100 000 \$	CONTINUER
100 000 \$ à moins de 150 000 \$	CONTINUER
150 000 \$ ou plus	CONTINUER
RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE : Préfère ne pas répondre	REMERCIER ET CONCLURE

ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE, S'IL Y A LIEU.

19. Lequel ou lesquels des groupes raciaux ou culturels suivants vous décrivent le mieux? (Plusieurs choix possibles)

Blanc
Sud-asiatique (p. ex., indien, pakistanais, sri-lankais)
Chinois
Noir
Latino-américain
Philippin
Arabe
Asiatique du sud-est (p. ex., vietnamien, cambodgien, thaïlandais)
Coréen ou japonais
Autochtone
Autre groupe racial ou culturel (préciser)

RÉPONSE SPONTANÉE : Préfère ne pas répondre

ASSURER UN BON MÉLANGE.

20. 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.



21. [NE PAS DEMANDER] Sexe NOTER SELON VOTRE OBSERVATION SAUF **GROUP 8.**

Homme

Femme

ASSURER UNE PROPORTION ÉGALE D'HOMMES ET DE FEMMES DANS CHAQUE GROUPE.

22. Parmi les choix suivants, lequel décrit le mieux le secteur d'activité dans lequel vous travaillez?

Métier de la construction ou métier spécialisé	TOUS LES GROUPES - CONTINUER
Administrations publiques	
Agriculture, foresterie, pêche et chasse	
Arts, spectacle et loisirs	
Autres services, sauf les administrations publiques	
Commerce de détail	
Commerce de gros	
Extraction minière, exploitation en carrière, et extraction de pétrole et de gaz	
Fabrication	
Finance et assurances	
Gestion de sociétés et d'entreprises	
Hébergement et services de restauration	
Industrie de l'information et industrie culturelle	
Services administratifs, services de soutien, services de gestion des déchets et services d'assainissement	
Services d'enseignement	
Services immobiliers et services de location et de location à bail	
Services professionnels, scientifiques et techniques	
Services publics	
Soins de santé et assistance sociale	
Transport et entreposage	
Sans emploi	
Aux études à temps plein	
À la retraite	
Autre situation ou autre secteur; veuillez préciser :	

ASSURER UNE BONNE REPRÉSENTATION DES TYPES D'EMPLOI DANS CHAQUE GROUPE. PAS PLUS DE DEUX RÉPONDANTS PAR SECTEUR D'ACTIVITÉ. PAS D'ÉTUDIANTS ÉTRANGERS.

23. 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 **CONTINUER À L'INVITATION**

Non **REMERCIER ET CONCLUREE**



INVITATION

J'aimerais vous inviter à ce groupe de discussion en ligne, qui aura lieu le **[DONNER LA DATE ET L'HEURE EN FONCTION DU NO DE GROUPE INDIQUÉ DANS LE TABLEAU, PAGE 1]**. La discussion durera deux heures et vous recevrez 125 \$ pour votre participation. Ce montant vous sera envoyé par transfert électronique après la tenue du groupe de discussion.

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 donnez votre consentement à ces modalités.

Est-ce que vous accepteriez de participer?

Oui	CONTINUER
Non	REMERCIER ET CONCLURE

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 au sujet du groupe?

Nom :

Numéro de téléphone :

Adresse courriel :

Vous recevrez un courrier électronique du **[INSÉRER LE NOM DU RECRUTEUR]** expliquant comment rejoindre le groupe en ligne. Si la connexion au système vous pose des difficultés, veuillez en aviser notre équipe de soutien technique à : support@thestrategiccounsel.com.

Nous vous prions de vous mettre en ligne au moins 15 minutes avant l'heure prévue, afin d'avoir le temps de vous installer et d'obtenir l'aide de notre équipe de soutien en cas de problèmes techniques. Veuillez également redémarrer votre ordinateur avant de vous joindre au groupe.

Vous pourriez devoir lire des documents au cours de la discussion. Si vous utilisez des lunettes, assurez-vous de les avoir à portée de main durant la rencontre. Vous aurez également besoin d'un stylo et de papier pour prendre des notes.

Ce rendez-vous est un engagement ferme. Si vous pensez ne pas pouvoir participer 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 quelqu'un pour vous remplacer.

Merci de votre temps.

RECRUTEMENT FAIT PAR : _____

DATE DU RECRUTEMENT : _____

Appendix B – Discussion Guides

English Moderator's Guide

MASTER MODERATOR'S GUIDE MAY 2024

INTRODUCTION (10 minutes) All Locations

- Moderator or technician should let participants know that they will need pen and paper in order to take some notes, jot down some thoughts around some material that we will show them later in the discussion.

CARBON PRICING (25 minutes) Saskatchewan

- Have you heard anything about carbon pollution from the news or government announcements (either federal or provincial government announcements)?
 - PROMPT AS NEEDED: What about carbon pollution pricing? Have you heard anything about that?
 - IF YES: What have you heard?
- As far as you know, is there a price on carbon pollution in your province today? (SHOW OF HANDS FOR THOSE WHO THINK THERE IS)

SHOW ON SCREEN

The federal pollution pricing creates a financial incentive for people and businesses to pollute less.

The Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR) is a tax-free amount to help eligible individuals and families offset the cost of the federal pollution pricing.

This year, a family of 4 in Saskatchewan can expect to receive roughly \$1,500. Residents of small and rural communities receive an extra 10% top-up beyond the base rebate amount. Starting April 2024, the Government is planning to double the rural top-up to 20%, because of the increased energy needs of rural residents and their reduced access to transportation options.

- What are your reactions to this information?
- Based on what you know about the price on carbon pollution and the rebate, do you support or oppose the Government of Canada's carbon pricing system? What makes you say that?
- To the best of your knowledge, have you or someone else in your household received this rebate?

- IF YES: Do you think you get back more than you pay in carbon pricing? What makes you say that?
- The Department of Finance Canada has calculated that the average household in Saskatchewan will receive \$349 more than it pays this year. Does this affect your perspective at all?
 - IF SKEPTICAL OF CALCULATION: What makes you question this calculation? What kind of information would you need to see for you to feel that this estimate is accurate?

The Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) is a neutral, non-partisan individual independent of government. The PBO is responsible for providing economic and financial analysis to Parliament for the purposes of raising the quality of parliamentary debate and promoting greater budget transparency and accountability.

- The PBO has estimated that around 80% of Canadian families will receive more than they pay in carbon pricing. Does this affect your perspective at all?

BUDGET – SPECIFIC MEASURES (40 minutes) Saskatchewan

Now I'd like to discuss the federal budget...

Every year the federal government announces a budget for the coming year. This is where the government describes what it will invest in and any plans it has for new programs. The government will also make projections on things like the deficit and where the economy is headed. This year's federal budget was announced on April 16th.

- What comes to mind about this year's federal budget? It could be your overall reaction to the budget, or it could be a specific measure you remember from the budget.
 - What makes you say that?

There were many specific measures in the budget, and I want to go over some of the highlights to get your reactions, even if this is the first time you're hearing about them.

I'm going to show you a list of measures that were announced in the budget to get your reactions. Note that this is not an exhaustive list of everything in the budget.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Stabilizing the cost of groceries by monitoring the big grocers, increasing competition and tackling shrinkflation
- Creating a National School Food Program to provide meals to 400,000 more kids every year
- Cracking down on junk fees and making things like internet and cell phone plans cheaper



- Launching a national pharmacare plan, beginning with universal coverage for birth control and diabetes medication and devices
 - Implementing healthcare agreements with every province and territory to improve access to primary care and reduce wait times
 - Implementing action on Foreign Health Care Credential Recognition to help more healthcare workers practice in Canada
 - Ensuring the wealthiest Canadians pay their fair share by asking the top 0.1% of Canadians to pay a little bit more
- **POLL:** Now I'd like you to select the ones that you think will have the most positive impact on Canadians. You can select up to 2. If you don't think any will have a positive impact, don't select any.
 - Stabilizing the cost of groceries
 - Creating a National School Food Program
 - Cracking down on junk fees and making things like internet and cell phone plans cheaper
 - Launching a national pharmacare plan
 - Implementing healthcare agreements with every province and territory
 - Implementing action on Foreign Health Care Credential Recognition
 - Asking the wealthiest 0.1% of Canadians to pay a bit more in taxes
 - MODERATOR TO GO THROUGH SELECTIONS: Why did you select this measure?
 - Is there anything in this section that the Government of Canada should not be doing?

Now, I want to talk a little bit more about government's proposal to ask the wealthiest Canadians to pay their fair share. For this, I'm going to read out a quote from the Budget speech in the House of Commons:

"In Canada and around the world, the 21st century winner-takes-all economy is making those at the very top richer, while too many middle-class Canadians are struggling just to avoid falling behind. The job of our tax system is to lean against this structural inequality—to fund investments in the middle class, especially in young Canadians, by asking those who are benefitting from the winner-takes-all economy to pay a little bit more. Today, our tax system doesn't do that. Today it is possible for a carpenter or a nurse to pay tax at a higher marginal rate than a multi-millionaire. That isn't fair. That must change. And it will. Our government is raising the inclusion rate to two-thirds on annual capital gains above \$250,000 for individuals. This new revenue will help make life cost less for millions of Canadians, particularly Millennials and Gen Z. It will help fund our efforts to turbocharge the building

of more homes. It will support investments in growth and productivity that will pay dividends for years to come.”

- Do you support or oppose the approach outlined here? Why or why not?
 - Do you have any concerns about tax evasion?
 - Can you think of any other preferred uses for the revenues raised?
- Do you think any of these measures would help ensure younger Canadians get ahead?

HOUSING (40 minutes) Saskatchewan

- Prior to today, has anyone heard of any steps the Government of Canada is taking to try to deal with housing affordability and availability?
 - IF YES: What have you heard?

In addition to what we have already discussed, the Government of Canada introduced a plan to address the housing crisis as part of the budget. The plan lays out a strategy to unlock 3.87 million new homes by 2031. The federal government’s housing plan has three parts. We will go through each part and get your reaction to a few of the specific measures included.

Here is the first part, which highlights some of the measures the Government of Canada is proposing in the budget as part of its strategy to help build more homes.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Signing 179 Housing Accelerator Fund agreements to date to cut red tape, fast tracking an estimated total of over 750,000 housing units over the next decade
 - Using federal lands, such as those used by Canada Post, the Department of National Defense, and federal government office buildings, to build more homes faster
 - Helping to get more rental homes built by investing more than \$15 billion through the Apartment Construction Loan Program, which helps builders get the capital they need for new projects
 - Changing how homes in Canada are built by investing in technology like prefabricated housing factories and pre-approved home design catalogues
 - Streamlining foreign credential recognition in the construction sector and helping skilled trades workers get more homes built
- What do you think of these measures?
 - Do you think they will have an impact on the supply of homes in Canada?
 - What about the affordability of homes?

Here is the second part, which highlights some of the measures the Government of Canada is proposing to make it easier to own or rent your home.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Cracking down on illegal short-term rentals (e.g. Airbnb)
 - Calling on fintech companies, credit bureaus, and lenders to build the ecosystem that will give renters the option to include their rental payment history in their credit scores, helping renters qualify for a mortgage and better rates
 - Creating a Canadian Renters' Bill of Rights to protect renters and provide a clear history of apartment pricing so renters can bargain fairly, crack down on renovations, and create a nationwide standard lease agreement
 - Allowing 30-year mortgages for first-time homebuyers purchasing new builds
 - Extending the ban on foreign homebuyers by two years
 - Restricting the purchase and acquisition of existing single-family homes by very large, corporate investors. The government will consult on how to go about this in the coming months.
- What do you think of these measures?
 - Do you think they will have an impact on the supply of homes in Canada?
 - What about the affordability of homes?
 - Will they make it easier to own a home?

And here is the third part, which highlights some of the measures the Government of Canada is proposing to help those who struggle most with the cost of housing.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Investing \$1 billion in the Affordable Housing Fund to support non-profit, co-operative, and public housing providers and respond to the needs of those most impacted by the housing crisis
 - Creating a Rental Protection Fund to help affordable housing providers buy units and preserve rents at a stable level instead of being turned into luxury condos
 - Increasing funding to support organizations that prevent and reduce homelessness
- What do you think of these measures?
 - What impact, if any, will they have on helping those who struggle to afford housing find a place to call home?

- Now that you have seen this list of highlights from the budget, I'd like you to think of a word that describes your overall reaction to the budget. That is, think of a word you would use to describe the budget overall.
 - MODERATOR TO ASK EACH PARTICIPANT: What word did you choose and why did you pick that word?
- Now, thinking about all of the measures we have discussed today, do you think any of them will help younger Canadians, and help ensure all generations – especially young people – have access to a variety of affordable housing options?

PRIORITIES (20 minutes) Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador

- What would you say is the top priority the Government of Canada should be prioritizing?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about climate change? How big of a priority should climate change be?
 - Why do you feel this way?
- Does climate change affect the cost of living?
 - IF YES: In what ways? Why do you feel this way?
- What are the worst impacts of climate change?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about extreme weather events, wildfires, pollution, natural disasters, or droughts?
 - How concerned are you, if at all, about these impacts?
 - What do you find most concerning?
- What do you see as being the biggest barriers to taking action against climate change?
- How important is it, if at all, for Canada as a whole and individual Canadians to take action to address climate change?
 - IF IMPORTANT: Can you explain why you feel it is important?
 - Is it important to you that Canada be a global leader when it comes to taking climate action? Why or why not?
 - How much responsibility, if any, do you feel personally to take action to help fight climate change?
 - What about protecting the environment? Do you feel any responsibility to take action to protect the environment?

On a per person basis, Canadians are among the top 10 emitters of carbon pollution in the world.

[Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Among the top carbon polluters in the world, on a per person basis, Canada has the second-highest GHG emissions.]

- How do you feel when you hear this? Does it change your feelings about whether Canada should take climate action?

CARBON PRICING (OVERVIEW) (45 minutes) Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador

- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Have you seen, read, or heard lately about a price on pollution, sometimes known as a ‘carbon tax’?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Do you know how the carbon pricing system works in Canada?
 - IF YES: How would you explain it?
 - Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador IF NOT MENTIONED: Who has heard about the Canada Carbon Rebate? (SHOW OF HANDS)
 - Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador IF YES: Can you explain how it works?

Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador I’m now going to share with you some information about the carbon pricing system.

SHOW ON SCREEN – Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z

Pollution pricing, also known as carbon pricing, works by adding a levy or charge on carbon emissions.

This means there is a cost associated with polluting to encourage individuals and businesses to seek out cleaner options for things, like energy production, home heating, and transportation.

Revenues from the price on pollution are returned to Canadians each quarter through the Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR).

SHOW ON SCREEN – Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador

- The Government of Canada has put a fee on carbon pollution.
- Some people will reduce their carbon emissions to avoid paying the fee, while others may continue emitting as before.
- All the money collected from this fee, including from businesses, is pooled together and then split equally among every household in a province, through the Canada Carbon Rebate (CCR).
- This means that those who reduce their carbon emissions will benefit more, because they get the same rebate amount as everyone else in their province but have paid less in fees.
- Those who don't cut their emissions end up paying more but get the same rebate amount as everyone else in their province.
- After all the money (including from businesses) is pooled together and split equally, about 8-in-10 Canadian households get more money back through the Canada Carbon Rebate than they pay in fees.
- Over time, as more people try to pay less in fees by reducing their carbon emissions, carbon pollution will decrease overall.
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador What are your reactions to this?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Had you heard any of this information before? Is any of it new to you?



- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Is there any information that is unclear, or you have questions about?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Is there any other information you would like to know that isn't included?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z What does the term "pollution pricing" mean to you?
 - What about "carbon pricing"?
 - Are these two terms essentially the same or are they different?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z Prior to this focus group, who had heard about the Canada Carbon Rebate? (SHOW OF HANDS)
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z FOR THOSE WHO HAD HEARD OF THE CANADA CARBON REBATE: Can you explain how it works?
 - Has your household received the Canada Carbon Rebate?
 - IF RECEIVED: When did you receive it?
 - How much did you receive?
 - Do you think the amount you received from the Canada Carbon Rebate was more than the amount you paid into the price on pollution? Why or why not?
 - How much would you estimate you paid vs how much you received?
- Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Now that you've seen this information, can you summarize how the carbon pricing system works?

Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador I'd like to focus a bit more on the Canada Carbon Rebate...

- Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Do you think the Canada Carbon Rebate helps Canadians afford the things they need?



- Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador What are your reactions to the fact that 8 out of 10 households get more back than they spend on the price on pollution?
 - Do you have any questions about this number?
- Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Is this approach effective at reducing emissions? Why or why not? How do you know?
- Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Is this approach fair? Why or why not?

Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z I'm now going to share with you some more information about pollution pricing.

SHOW ON SCREEN – Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z

As mentioned earlier, all revenues are returned to the province or territory in which they were collected.

Most of the revenues – about 90% – are delivered to families through the Canada Carbon Rebate, paid every three months.

8 out of 10 households get back more money through these rebates than they pay.

The remaining revenues benefit Indigenous communities and small businesses.

- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z What are your reactions to this?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z Is there any information that is unclear, or you have questions about?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z Does this information make you feel better, worse, or have no impact on your impression of the price on carbon pollution?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z How do you feel about the revenues from the Canada Carbon Rebate going back to individuals, businesses, and Indigenous groups?
 - Do you think that this helps Canadians afford the things they need?

- **Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z** What are your reactions to the fact that 8 out of 10 households get more back than they spend on the price on pollution?
 - Do you have any questions about this number?
- **Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z** Is this approach effective at reducing emissions? Why or why not? How do you know?
- **Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z** Is this approach fair? Why or why not?

Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador I'm now going to show you an argument in favour of carbon pricing...

SHOW ON SCREEN - Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador
Carbon pricing is an effective and cost-efficient way to tackle climate change, while still giving businesses and Canadians the flexibility to decide how to make the switch to less-polluting alternatives.

The idea is that when businesses and Canadians start to make the switch, they create demand for things like clean tech, and end up attracting new investments to our economy, which can help create jobs and growth.

Various international organizations say that putting a price on pollution is the most cost-effective and flexible way to reduce emissions, and over 200 Canadian-based economists support this system.

- **Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador** What are your reactions to this?
- **Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador** Have you heard this argument in favour of carbon pollution pricing before, or is it new to you?
- **Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador** Do you have any questions related to this argument?

- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Does this argument make you feel better, worse, or have no impact on your impression of the price on carbon pollution?

Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador I've got another argument in favour of carbon pricing I'm going to show you...

SHOW ON SCREEN - Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Carbon pricing can help protect our environment and the well-being of future generations.

It is a major part of Canada's climate plan and accounts for a third of Canada's emission reduction goals. Carbon pricing is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) which are major contributors to increasingly intense wildfires, droughts, and floods.

- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador What are your reactions to this?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Have you heard this argument in favour of carbon pollution pricing before, or is it new to you?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Do you have any questions related to this argument?
- Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador Does this argument make you feel better, worse, or have no impact on your impression of the price on carbon pollution?



CARBON PRICING VIDEO (40 minutes) Maritime Millennials, Calgary Generation Z, Mid-Size and Major Centres Manitoba Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Major Centres Alberta Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Central Ontario Climate Supportive & Ambivalent, Newfoundland and Labrador

I'm now going to show you a video from the Government of Canada that informs Canadians about the carbon pricing system. I will show the video to you twice, and then we will discuss what we thought about it. Feel free to take notes to help you remember what you liked and didn't like about the video.

SHOW VIDEO. MODERATOR SHOWS THE AD TWICE

- After watching this video, what are your initial reactions?
- Was the explanation clear?
 - What, if anything, was unclear or could be improved?
- Did the video introduce any new information that you did not know prior to this focus group?
 - IF YES: What information was new for you?
- Now that you've seen this video, can you summarize how the price on pollution works?
- Prior to seeing this video, were you aware of the exemptions for farmers?
 - What are your reactions to these exemptions?
- Prior to seeing this video, were you aware of the 20% bonus on the Canada Carbon Rebate for those living in rural or remote communities?
 - How do you feel about this bonus?

Now, thinking about everything we've discussed so far...

- Do you believe the price on carbon pollution is effective in creating a financial incentive to pollute less? Why or why not?
 - I'll get your opinions on other approaches shortly, but thinking about this carbon pricing system specifically, how would you improve it, if at all?
- Do you think you can change your daily habits to lower your emissions and pay less into the carbon price?
 - IF YES: What kind of changes would you consider making?
- Do you think people will look for alternatives to driving, such as driving less, carpooling, taking public transportation where it's available, biking where it's available, or things like that to pay less into the price on pollution? Why or why not?

- Based on your understanding of the carbon pricing system, would using more efficient home heating reduce your carbon price costs?
 - Are you aware of any federal government programs that assist with home heating efficiency?
 - Would your view of the carbon pricing system change if you knew the Government of Canada provided support for energy-efficient heating?

And now thinking about the various approaches to the pollution pricing system within Canada...

- Why do you think some provinces use the federal pollution pricing system while others use their own provincial systems?
- Would you rather your province be part of the federal pollution pricing, a provincial system, or no system at all? Why do you feel this way?
 - IF NO SYSTEM AT ALL: Do you think it should be free to emit carbon pollution, do you think there should be a cost imposed, or would you propose something different?
 - IF SOMETHING DIFFERENT: What would you propose instead?
 - Do you think this would be more effective than the current pollution pricing system? What makes you say that?

PERFORMANCE AND PRIORITIES – [LOCAL ISSUES/INDUSTRIES/HOUSING] (20-25 minutes)

Montréal, Québec, Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador

- **Montréal, Québec, Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador** What does the Government of Canada do well?
- **Montréal, Québec, Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador** What does the Government of Canada need to improve on?
- **Montréal, Québec, Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador** In your opinion, what are the top issues that the Government of Canada should be prioritizing?
 - **Montréal, Québec** What are the top issues in your community specifically that the federal government should be prioritizing?
 - **Montréal, Québec** Has the Government of Canada done anything to address these issues?
 - **Montréal, Québec, Ontario** IF NOT MENTIONED: What about the cost of living? **Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador** What about housing?
 - **Montréal, Québec, Ontario** What have you seen, read, or heard lately about work the Government of Canada is doing to address the cost of living and housing?
 - **Montréal, Québec, Ontario** How do you expect the cost of living to change a year from now? Do you think things will be better, worse, or stay the same as they are now? Why?

- **Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton** What are the biggest challenges in housing that the Government of Canada should be addressing? Why should this challenge be prioritized?
 - **Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton** IF NOT MENTIONED: What about helping Canadians buy their first homes?
 - **Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton** IF NOT MENTIONED: What about building more homes?
- **Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton** What have you seen, read, or heard lately about the Government of Canada's work on housing?
 - **Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton** How do you feel about what you've seen, read, or heard?
- **Montréal** What are the most important sectors and industries for your community?
 - **Montréal** Which sectors and industries in your community do you feel need the most help?
 - **Montréal** IF NOT MENTIONED: What about agriculture?
 - **Montréal** Has the Government of Canada done anything to support these sectors and industries?
 - **Montréal** And thinking about the agriculture sector specifically, what would you like to see the Government of Canada do, if anything, to support this sector?

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA IN THE NEWS (5 minutes) **Montréal, Montreal 2SLGBTQI+, Lower Mainland BC, Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton**

Montréal And now thinking more broadly...

- **Montréal, Montreal 2SLGBTQI+, Lower Mainland BC, Laurentides Quebec, Hamilton** What have you seen, read or heard about the Government of Canada in the last few days?
 - **Montreal 2SLGBTQI+** What are your reactions to this news?
- **Montreal 2SLGBTQI+** What are your primary sources for news? (TV news, radio, social media, friends/family)

ELECTRIC VEHICLES (20 minutes) **Montréal**

- Has anyone heard of any news related to the Government of Canada and electric vehicles recently?

SHOW ON SCREEN:

The federal and Quebec governments announced last fall that they are investing \$7B (combined) in Northvolt Batteries North America to build a new electric vehicle battery manufacturing facility in

Saint-Basile-le-Grand and McMasterville, Quebec. The batteries produced at this facility will be among the greenest batteries in the world, and the plant will create up to 3,000 jobs in the region. This investment is also estimated to directly and indirectly create thousands of jobs across the country.

- What are your reactions to this? What do you think the impacts of this investment will be? How do you think this investment will impact Quebec's economy?
 - AS NEEDED: What about when it comes to creating jobs? Do you believe the job creation from Northvolt's new plant will have a direct or indirect impact on you, someone you know, or your community?
 - IF NO: Do you think this will impact you, someone you know, or your community in any other ways?
 - IF YES: In what ways?
- Do you have any questions or concerns about this investment?

Jobs (30 minutes) Montérégie, Hamilton

Montérégie Now I'd like to talk about the job market more broadly...

Hamilton Shifting topics...

- **Montérégie** Overall, how would you rate the state of the job market in Canada? Is it good, poor, or somewhere in between? Why?
 - **Montérégie** How easy is it for someone like you to find a job in the field you're interested in? Are there any challenges/barriers you've encountered when searching for work?
 - Are there enough job opportunities in your area?
 - **Montérégie** Are there labour shortages in your area?
 - IF YES: What are the impacts of labour shortages in your area?
- **Hamilton** Generally, how would you describe the Government of Canada's management of the economy?
 - Are they generally on the right track or the wrong track? What makes you say that?
- **Hamilton** Which economic issues do you think are the most important?
- **Hamilton** Do you feel that your wages are keeping up with the cost of living and inflation? Why or why not?



- **Hamilton** Overall, how would you rate the state of the job market right now? Is it good, poor, or somewhere in between? Why do you feel this way?
- **Montréal, Hamilton** Thinking about five years from now, do you imagine the Canadian job market will be worse, better, or the same? What makes you say that? Why do you feel this way?
- **Montréal, Hamilton** Thinking five to ten years in the future, what do you think the job market in Canada might look like?
 - Which industries do you think will see the most growth?
 - Which skills do you think will be in demand?
 - How confident do you feel, if at all, that you will have a good job in this future economy? Why do you feel this way?
- **Montréal, Hamilton** Would you say the Government of Canada is on the right track or wrong track when it comes to ensuring workers get the skills training they need to stay competitive?
- **Montréal, Hamilton** Would you say the Government of Canada is on the right track or wrong track when it comes to creating good jobs in Canada?
- **Montréal, Hamilton** Are you aware on any work the Government of Canada is doing to help create jobs, provide skills training, or otherwise support workers?
 - What should the Government of Canada do to help?

IMMIGRATION (25 minutes) Montréal, Laurentides Quebec

Changing topics again ...

- Have you seen, read, or heard any news related to immigration in Canada or Quebec recently?
 - What do you think about what you saw, read, or heard?
- Overall, how would you describe the current state of the immigration system in Canada?
- What do you think are some of the benefits of welcoming new immigrants to Canada?
- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Canada needs to welcome more new immigrants to fill labour shortages and grow the economy.”?
 - Why do you feel this way?

- Do you have any concerns about welcoming new immigrants?
 - IF YES: What are your concerns?
 - What should the Government of Canada do to address these concerns?
- Do you think the Government of Canada should increase, decrease, or keep the rate of immigration at about the same level? Why?
 - IF INCREASE OR DECREASE: What impacts would this have in Canada, either socially or economically?
- Before we close, do you have any other thoughts you would like to share on the Canadian immigration system?

2SLGBTQI+ (70 minutes) Montreal 2SLGBTQI+

- 2SLGBTQI+ individuals have different perspectives and lived experiences, and it can sometimes be difficult to discuss issues facing this group broadly. However, from your individual perspectives, what are some of the more pressing issues impacting 2SLGBTQI+ folks?
 - What role, if any, does the Government of Canada have in addressing these issues?
 - What work, if any, has the Government of Canada done to address these issues?
- How would you describe the level of acceptance, support, and inclusion that Canadian society has for the 2SLGBTQI+ community? Why do you feel this way?
 - Has the level of acceptance, support, and inclusion changed over time?
 - IF YES: How so? What's behind this change?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: Has the level of hate against the 2SLGBTQI+ community changed over time?
 - IF YES: How so? What's behind this change?
 - What should be done to promote the acceptance, support, and inclusion of 2SLGBTQI+ individuals in Canadians society?
- How would you describe the current state of 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about when it comes to 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms in schools? At the workplace? In the healthcare system?
 - Has the state of 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms changed more recently?
 - IF YES: How so? What do you think is behind this change?
 - What are your biggest concerns about the state of 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms in Canada today?
 - What should the Government of Canada do to promote and protect 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms?
- When it comes to promoting and protecting 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms, would you say the Government of Canada is generally on the right track or wrong track? Why do you say that?

- IF WRONG TRACK: What could the Government of Canada do to get on the right track?
- Are you aware of any work the Government of Canada is doing to protect and promote 2SLGBTQI+ rights and freedoms in Canada?
 - More broadly, are you aware of any work the federal government has done to support the 2SLGBTQI+ community? What are your reactions, feelings, or thoughts to this?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about investing \$75 million for 2SLGBTQI+ community organizations that advocate for and serve 2SLGBTQI+ communities?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about passing Bill C-16, a law written to recognize gender expression and gender identity as a human right and protect gender diverse individuals from discrimination and hate propaganda?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about Bill C-4, an Act to amend the Criminal Code to ban conversion therapy?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about Health Canada lifting the ban on blood donations from men who have sex with men?
- What should the Government of Canada do to improve relations with the 2SLGBTQI+ community?
 - Would you agree or disagree with the statement that the Government of Canada listens, cares, and responds to the needs of folks within the 2SLGBTQI+ communities? Why or why not?
- When thinking about your future living in Canada, what makes you feel optimistic?

WILDFIRES (15 minutes) Lower Mainland BC

- IF NOT MENTIONED: Have you seen, read, or heard about the federal government's response to the wildfires?
 - How would you describe the Government of Canada's response to the wildfires?

SHOW ON SCREEN:

The Government of Canada's approach to managing wildfires involves supporting communities in getting prepared, providing information through real-time monitoring, and offering support to communities and individuals impacted by wildfires.

In Budget 2024, the Government of Canada has committed to take several additional actions to help those affected by wildfires:



- **Doubling the Volunteer Firefighter and Search and Rescue Volunteer Tax Credits**, which will increase from \$3,000 to \$6,000 for 2024, saving volunteer firefighters up to an additional \$450 per year.
- **Investing \$800,000 more to expand firefighting capacity** to help expand training program for firefighters to respond to wildfires that impact urban areas. This builds on existing funding to support the federal government's commitment to train 1,000 wildland firefighters.
- Partnering with Indigenous Peoples to save lives and better protect communities against wildfires including:
 - Investing over \$145 million to help First Nations communities prepare for emergencies;
 - Providing \$20.9 million for fire prevention in First Nations communities; and,
 - Committing \$9 million to help support Indigenous governments directly affected by the 2023 wildfires in the Northwest Territories.
- What are your initial thoughts about these actions?
 - Is the Government of Canada doing enough to help communities affected by the wildfires?
 - What more should the federal government be doing?

CAPITAL GAINS (15 minutes) Lower Mainland BC

- IF NOT MENTIONED ABOVE: Have you heard anything about the proposed change to capital gains taxes?

SHOW ON SCREEN

Capital gains are the profits people make when they sell valuable assets they own for more money than they originally paid for them. Capital gains can be made from valuable assets like real estate, stocks and bonds, mutual funds, precious metals, art and collectibles, cryptocurrencies, vehicles, personal property, and more.

In Canada, capital gains are subject to taxation. When someone sells a valuable asset for more than its original cost, they'll owe taxes on the capital gain. Note that there is no capital gains tax on the sale of a primary home; that is, capital gains taxes only apply when people own multiple real estate properties and sell the ones they don't live in.

The Government of Canada is proposing to raise taxes on some of the wealthiest Canadians by increasing the tax on their capital gains above \$250,000. The government estimates that this change would only impact 0.1% of Canadians in any given year.

- What do you think of this proposed change?
- Who do you think will be impacted by this change?
- Do you think you will pay more in taxes because of this proposed change, pay less, or you won't be impacted?
 - IF EXPECT TO PAY MORE: Why do you think you will pay more in taxes?

HOUSING (40 minutes) Lower Mainland BC

- Prior to today, has anyone heard of any steps the Government of Canada is taking to try to deal with housing affordability and availability?
 - IF YES: What have you heard?

In addition to what we have already discussed, the Government of Canada introduced a plan to address the housing crisis as part of the budget. The plan lays out a strategy to unlock 3.87 million new homes by 2031. The federal government's housing plan has three parts. We will go through each part and get your reaction to a few of the specific measures included.

Here is the first part, which highlights some of the measures the Government of Canada is proposing in the budget as part of its strategy to help build more homes.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Signing 179 Housing Accelerator Fund agreements to date to cut red tape, fast tracking an estimated total of over 750,000 housing units over the next decade
 - Using federal lands, such as those used by Canada Post, the Department of National Defense, and federal government office buildings, to build more homes faster
 - Helping to get more rental homes built by investing more than \$15 billion through the Apartment Construction Loan Program, which helps builders get the capital they need for new projects
 - Changing how homes in Canada are built by investing in technology like prefabricated housing factories and pre-approved home design catalogues
 - Streamlining foreign credential recognition in the construction sector and helping skilled trades workers get more homes built
- What do you think of these measures?
 - Do you think they will have an impact on the supply of homes in Canada?

- What about the affordability of homes?

Here is the second part, which highlights some of the measures the Government of Canada is proposing to make it easier to own or rent your home.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Cracking down on illegal short-term rentals (e.g. Airbnb)
 - Calling on fintech companies, credit bureaus, and lenders to build the ecosystem that will give renters the option to include their rental payment history in their credit scores, helping renters qualify for a mortgage and better rates
 - Creating a Canadian Renters' Bill of Rights to protect renters and provide a clear history of apartment pricing so renters can bargain fairly, crack down on renovations, and create a nationwide standard lease agreement
 - Allowing 30-year mortgages for first-time homebuyers purchasing new builds
 - Extending the ban on foreign homebuyers by two years
 - Restricting the purchase and acquisition of existing single-family homes by very large, corporate investors. The government will consult on how to go about this in the coming months.
- What do you think of these measures?
 - Do you think they will have an impact on the supply of homes in Canada?
 - What about the affordability of homes?
 - Will they make it easier to own a home?

And here is the third part, which highlights some of the measures the Government of Canada is proposing to help those who struggle most with the cost of housing.

SHOW ON SCREEN

- Investing \$1 billion in the Affordable Housing Fund to support non-profit, co-operative, and public housing providers and respond to the needs of those most impacted by the housing crisis
 - Creating a Rental Protection Fund to help affordable housing providers buy units and preserve rents at a stable level instead of being turned into luxury condos
 - Increasing funding to support organizations that prevent and reduce homelessness
- What do you think of these measures?
 - What impact, if any, will they have on helping those who struggle to afford housing find a place to call home?



- Now that you have seen some highlights from the budget regarding wildfires, the proposed change to the capital gains tax, and housing, I'd like you to think of a word that describes your overall reaction to the budget. That is, think of a word you would use to describe the budget overall.
 - MODERATOR TO ASK EACH PARTICIPANT: What word did you choose and why did you pick that word?
- Now, thinking about all of the measures we have discussed today, do you think any of them will help younger Canadians, and help ensure all generations – especially young people – have access to a variety of affordable housing options?

OPIOIDS (30 minutes) Lower Mainland BC

Moving on to a different topic ...

- Would you say that opioid addiction is a major issue, a minor issue, or not an issue at all in your community?
- Briefly, how has this issue evolved over time? Has it gotten better or worse?
- Are you hopeful that there will be progress on this issue in the coming years? Why or why not?
- What, if anything, has the Government of Canada done to address opioid addiction in British Columbia?
- What comes to mind when you hear the term “safe supply”? What comes to mind when you hear “supervised consumption sites?”

CLARIFY:

Safe supply refers to providing prescribed medications as a safer alternative to the toxic illegal drug supply to people who are at high risk of overdose. Safer supply services can help prevent overdoses, save lives, and connect people who use drugs to other health and social services.

Supervised consumption sites provide a safe, clean, space for people to bring and consume their own drugs in the presence of trained staff. This prevents accidental overdoses and reduces the spread of infectious diseases. They also offer a range of harm reduction services.

- What are your reactions to hearing these definitions?
- How important, if at all, is it for those suffering with opioid addiction to have access to a safe supply and supervised consumption sites? Why do you feel this way?
- What role does the Government of Canada have in safer supply services and supervised consumption sites?

CLARIFY: Through the Substance Use and Addictions Program (SUAP), the Government of Canada is funding projects that address the harms associated with substance use.

More specifically, through this program, the Government of Canada is funding safer supply and consumption site services. They are also funding projects that focus on things like overdose prevention, education, detox support, peer support, outreach, mentorship, mental health supports, among other initiatives.

- What are your reactions to the Government of Canada investing in harm reduction projects?
 - What impacts, if any, do you expect these projects to have?

Last year, the Government of Canada granted an exemption to the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act to remove criminal penalties for possession of up to 2.5 grams of certain illegal drugs in British Columbia. Recently, the federal government approved the BC government's request to recriminalize the use of illicit drugs in public spaces. Adults will still be allowed to carry small amounts of illicit drugs and use them in private, but they could be arrested for using them in public.

- What are your reactions to this approach?
 - What impacts, if any, will this have?
 - Will this have an impact on crime in British Columbia? Why do you feel this way?

What else would you like to see the Government of Canada do to address these issues?

HEALTH CARE (20 minutes) Laurentides Quebec

- IF HEALTHCARE MENTIONED EARLIER AS A TOP ISSUE: Some of you noted that health care is one of the top issues impacting Quebeckers.



- IF HEALTHCARE NOT MENTIONED EARLIER AS A TOP ISSUE: Thinking of the issues you identified as being the top issues impacting Quebeckers, where does health care fit in? Is it more important, less important, or of the same importance?
- How would you rate the quality of the healthcare system where you live? What makes you say that?
- And what about access to healthcare services? What makes you say that?
- What are the biggest challenges facing health care in your area?
- Has anyone heard about any commitments or announcements made by the Government of Canada on healthcare?
 - PROBE: Have you heard anything about negotiations between the federal and provincial governments on funding for health care?
 - IF YES: What did you hear? What were your impressions of the negotiations?
- Would you say that when it comes to health care, the Government of Canada is generally on the right track or wrong track? Why do you say that?
 - IF WRONG TRACK: What could the federal government do to get on the right track?

PROMOTING AND PROTECTING THE FRENCH LANGUAGE (35 minutes) Laurentides Quebec

Moving on to a different topic...

- How big of a priority should protecting and promoting the French language in Canada be?
- How do you feel about the state of the French language in Canada?
- What, if anything, is the Government of Canada doing to help protect and promote the French language?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: Has anyone seen, read, or heard anything about the Government of Canada's new Action Plan for Official Languages?

The Government of Canada has an Action Plan for Official Languages. The Action Plan proposes over 30 measures aimed at achieving a few key objectives. First, I'm going to share with you the key

objectives and a few examples of the proposed measures, and then I'll ask for your thoughts.

SHOW ON SCREEN ONE AT A TIME

Encouraging more Francophone immigration to Canada

Examples of measures:

- Creating a new French immigration policy;
- Expanding global promotion and recruitment work in French-speaking countries; and
- Investing in language training for newcomers.

Promoting lifelong learning opportunities in French

Examples of measures:

- Expanding program offerings in French minority-language schools outside of Quebec;
- Investing in French second-language programs throughout Canada; and
- Investing in Francophone child care centres across Canada.

Supporting French community organizations

Examples of measures:

- Boosting funding to Francophone community organizations;
- Providing grants to projects that strengthen attachment to the French language and Francophone culture; and
- Providing grants to Francophone artists.

Creating a centre within Heritage Canada that supports the Government of Canada in taking additional steps to support French language minority communities.

- What are your reactions to each of these objectives and measures?
- Which do you feel will have the greatest impact on promoting and protecting the French language?
- Is there anything here the Government of Canada should not be doing? Why?
- What else should the Government of Canada do to promote and protect the French language?

COMMUNITY SAFETY (25 MINUTES) Hamilton

Now turning to community safety ...

- Do you feel that your community is safe? Why or why not?
- As far as you can tell, has there been an increase, decrease, or no change in the level of crime in your community?
 - IF INCREASE: What have you noticed specifically?
 - What do you think is behind the increase in crime? What are some of the causes?
- Who is most responsible for dealing with crime?
 - What role does the Government of Canada have when it comes to addressing crime?
- Do you know of anything the Government of Canada has done over the last few years to address crime? Are you aware of anything they are doing now?
 - IF NOT MENTIONED: What about any work on gun control?
 - IF AWARE: What are your reactions to this?
- Can you think of anything else the Government of Canada could do to prevent crime?
 - PROBE: What about more mental health services? Addiction treatment? Housing?
 - Would these have an impact? Why or why not?
 - Should they be a priority for the federal government?
- What else should the Government of Canada do to help reduce crime?

AUTOMOBILE THEFT (30 minutes) Hamilton

Now I'd like to focus specifically on auto theft...

- Have you seen, read, or heard anything from the Government of Canada about what it is doing to address auto theft?
 - IF YES: What did you see, read, or hear? Where did you see, read, or hear this? What do you think about what you heard?

The federal budget announced new measures to crack down on auto theft, in addition to some actions the federal government undertook a couple of months ago.

I'm now going to show you some of these (including actions already underway) ...

SHOW ON SCREEN

The Government of Canada is cracking down on auto theft to make it harder to steal vehicles and to export stolen vehicles by:

- **Intending to amend the Criminal Code**, including:
 - **New criminal offences** related to auto theft involving:
 - The **use of violence** or links to **organized crime**.
 - Possession or distribution of an **electronic or digital device** for the purposes of committing auto theft.
 - **Laundering proceeds of crime** for the benefit of a criminal organization.
 - A new aggravating factor at sentencing **if an offender involved a young person** in committing an offence under the Criminal Code.
- **Intending to amend the Radiocommunication Act** to regulate the sale, possession, distribution, and import of devices used to steal cars. This will **enable law enforcement agencies to remove devices** believed to be used to steal cars from the Canadian marketplace.
- **Strengthening the Canada Border Services Agency's (CBSA) capacity to detect and search containers** with stolen vehicles, and for **testing technologies** that could support the work of border services officers.
- **Allocating \$15 million** to provincial, territorial, and municipal police forces **to address auto theft**, and to strengthen policing to **crack down on international organized crime**.
- What are your initial reactions after seeing this?
- Are there any measures listed that you think are particularly important?
- Are there any measures listed that you do not think should be there? Why do you say that?
- Overall, do you think these actions will have a major, minor or no impact on auto theft in Canada? Why?



- Would you say you support the Government of Canada's plans to combat auto theft, oppose them, or neither? Why?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes) All Locations

- Before we close, is there anything else you would like to say to the federal government? It can be an additional point related to anything we discussed today or it could be something you think is important but wasn't discussed.

French Moderator's Guide

GUIDE DU MODÉRATEUR – DOCUMENT MAÎTRE MAI 2024

INTRODUCTION (10 minutes) Tous les lieux

- Le modérateur ou la personne responsable du soutien technique doit faire savoir aux participantes et aux participants qu'un stylo et du papier seront nécessaires afin de prendre des notes et d'écrire quelques réflexions au sujet des pièces de communication que nous leur montrerons plus tard au cours de la discussion.

TARIFICATION DU CARBONE (25 minutes) Saskatchewan

- Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de la pollution par le carbone dans les actualités ou dans les annonces du gouvernement (qu'il s'agisse d'annonces du gouvernement fédéral ou de gouvernements provinciaux)?
 - DEMANDER AU BESOIN : Et au sujet de la tarification du carbone? Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit à ce sujet?
 - SI OUI : Qu'avez-vous entendu?
- À votre connaissance, la pollution par le carbone est-elle tarifée aujourd'hui dans votre province? (INVITER LES RÉPONDANTS QUI SONT D'AVIS QU'ELLE L'EST À LEVER LA MAIN)

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN :

La tarification de la pollution par le carbone crée un incitatif financier encourageant particuliers et entreprises à polluer moins.

La Remise canadienne sur le carbone (RCC) est un montant non imposable versé pour aider les particuliers et les familles à compenser le coût de la tarification fédérale de la pollution.

Le montant que peut s'attendre à recevoir une famille de 4 personnes en Saskatchewan est de 1 500 dollars. Les résidents de petites collectivités ou de collectivités rurales reçoivent un supplément de 10 % en plus du montant de base de la remise. À compter d'avril 2024, le gouvernement doublera le supplément rural, qui passera à 20 %, en raison des besoins énergétiques accrus des populations rurales et de leur accès limité à des moyens de transport.

- Quelles sont vos réactions à cette information?



- D'après ce que vous savez sur la tarification de la pollution par le carbone et la remise, êtes-vous pour ou contre le système de tarification du carbone mis en place par le gouvernement du Canada? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
- À votre connaissance, est-ce que vous ou une autre personne de votre ménage avez reçu ce paiement?
 - SI OUI : Pensez-vous que la tarification du carbone vous rapporte plus qu'elle ne vous coûte? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
- Le ministère des Finances du Canada a calculé que le ménage moyen en Saskatchewan recevra 349 \$ de plus que ce qu'il aura payé cette année. Cela change-t-il votre point de vue?
 - EN CAS DE SCEPTICISME QUANT AU CALCUL : Qu'est-ce qui vous fait mettre en doute ce calcul? Quels sont les éléments d'information dont vous auriez besoin pour considérer cette estimation comme étant exacte?

Le directeur parlementaire du budget (DPB) est une personne neutre, non partisane et indépendante du gouvernement. Le DPB est chargé de fournir au Parlement des analyses économiques et financières dans le but d'améliorer la qualité des débats parlementaires et de promouvoir la transparence et la responsabilité budgétaire.

- Le DPB a estimé qu'environ 80 % des ménages recevront plus en transferts que la taxe carbone qu'ils auront payée ». Cela change-t-il dans une quelconque mesure votre point de vue?

BUDGET – MESURES PARTICULIÈRES (40 minutes) Saskatchewan

J'aimerais maintenant que nous discutons du budget fédéral...

Chaque année, le gouvernement fédéral annonce un budget pour l'année à venir. C'est à cette occasion que le gouvernement décrit les investissements qu'il entend réaliser et les nouveaux programmes qu'il envisage de mettre en place. Le gouvernement fait également des projections concernant le déficit et l'évolution de l'économie. Le budget fédéral prévu pour cette année a été annoncé le 16 avril.

- Qu'est-ce qui vous vient à l'esprit au sujet du budget fédéral de cette année? Vous pouvez réagir de manière générale au budget ou mentionner une mesure budgétaire précise dont vous vous souvenez.
 - Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?

Le budget comporte de nombreuses mesures particulières et je souhaite en évoquer les grandes lignes afin de recueillir vos réactions, même si c'est la première fois que vous en entendez parler.

Je vais vous montrer une liste de mesures annoncées dans le budget, après quoi je vous inviterai à me faire part de vos réactions. Notez qu'il ne s'agit pas d'une liste exhaustive de tout ce que contient le budget.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN :

- Stabiliser le prix des produits d'épicerie en encadrant les grands épiciers, en augmentant la concurrence et en s'attaquant à la réinflation
 - Créer un programme national d'alimentation scolaire dans l'objectif de fournir des repas à 400 000 enfants de plus chaque année
 - Sévir contre les frais indésirables et rendre les services Internet et de téléphonie cellulaire plus abordables
 - Lancer un régime national d'assurance médicaments, en commençant par une couverture universelle pour les médicaments et les dispositifs de contrôle des naissances et du diabète
 - Mettre en œuvre les accords en matière de soins de santé avec chaque province et territoire afin d'améliorer l'accès à des soins primaires et de réduire les temps d'attente
 - Mettre en application les mesures relatives à la reconnaissance des titres de compétences étrangers afin d'aider un plus grand nombre de professionnels de la santé à exercer au Canada
 - Veiller à ce que les Canadiens les plus fortunés paient leur juste part en demandant aux 0,1 % de Canadiens les plus aisés de payer un peu plus
- **SONDAGE :** J'aimerais maintenant que vous sélectionniez les mesures qui auront, selon vous, l'impact le plus positif sur les Canadiens. Vous pouvez en choisir jusqu'à deux. Si vous jugez qu'aucune d'entre elles n'aura un impact positif, n'en sélectionnez aucune.
- Stabiliser le coût des produits d'épicerie
 - Créer un programme national d'alimentation scolaire
 - Sévir contre les frais indésirables et rendre les services Internet et de téléphonie cellulaire plus abordables
 - Lancer un régime national d'assurance médicaments
 - Mettre en œuvre les accords en matière de soins de santé avec chaque province et territoire
 - Mettre en application les mesures relatives à la reconnaissance des titres de compétences étrangers de professionnels de la santé.
 - Demander aux 0,1 % de Canadiens les plus fortunés de payer un peu plus d'impôts
- LE MODÉRATEUR PASSERA EN REVUE LES CHOIX : Pourquoi avez-vous choisi cette mesure?
- Y a-t-il quelque chose dans cette section que le gouvernement du Canada ne devrait pas faire?



Je voudrais maintenant vous parler un peu plus en détail de la proposition du gouvernement de demander aux Canadiens les plus fortunés de payer leur juste part. Pour ce faire, je vais vous lire une citation tirée du discours du budget à la Chambre des communes :

<< Dans l'économie canadienne et d'autres pays du monde, la philosophie du 21e siècle selon laquelle le gagnant remporte tout rend les riches très riches, pendant que trop de Canadiennes et des Canadiens de la classe moyenne arrivent à peine à garder la tête hors de l'eau. Notre régime fiscal doit combattre ces inégalités structurelles : financer des investissements dans la classe moyenne, et en particulier dans les jeunes, en demandant à ceux qui bénéficient de la philosophie du gagnant qui remporte tout de contribuer un peu plus. En ce moment, notre régime d'imposition ne permet pas de faire cela. En ce moment, un menuisier ou une infirmière peut avoir un taux d'imposition (marginal) plus élevé que celui d'un multimillionnaire. Ce n'est pas juste. Il faut que cela change. Et cela va changer. Notre gouvernement porte le taux d'inclusion aux deux tiers sur les gains en capital supérieurs à 250 000 \$ réalisés en une année par un individu. Les nouvelles recettes générées vont contribuer à rendre la vie moins coûteuse pour des millions de Canadiennes et de Canadiens, en particulier les millénariaux et la génération Z. Elles vont aider à financer nos efforts pour accélérer la construction de nouveaux logements. Elles vont soutenir les investissements dans la croissance et la productivité qui vont donner lieu à des retombées dont nous allons profiter dans les années à venir. >>

- Êtes-vous pour ou contre l'approche décrite ici? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
 - Avez-vous des préoccupations concernant l'évasion fiscale?
 - Pensez-vous à d'autres utilisations préférables pour les revenus générés?
- Pensez-vous que l'une ou l'autre de ces mesures permettrait aux jeunes Canadiens de prospérer?

LOGEMENT (40 minutes) Saskatchewan, Lower Mainland C.-B.)

- Avant aujourd'hui, quelqu'un parmi vous avait-il entendu parler de mesures prises par le gouvernement du Canada pour tenter de remédier au problème de l'accessibilité et de la disponibilité des logements?
 - SI OUI : Qu'avez-vous entendu?

En plus des mesures dont nous avons déjà discuté, le gouvernement du Canada a présenté, dans le cadre de son budget, un plan pour résoudre la crise du logement. Ce plan définit une stratégie visant à stimuler la construction de 3,87 millions de nouveaux logements d'ici 2031. Le plan du gouvernement fédéral sur logement comporte trois volets. Nous allons passer en revue chacune d'entre elles et recueillir vos réactions quant à quelques-unes des mesures spécifiques qu'ils comportent.

Voici le premier volet, qui met en lumière certaines des mesures budgétaires que propose le gouvernement du Canada dans le cadre de sa stratégie visant à favoriser la construction de nouveaux logements.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN

- Signature de 179 ententes dans le cadre du Fonds pour accélérer la construction de logements jusqu'à présent afin de réduire les formalités administratives et d'accélérer la construction d'un nombre total approximatif de 750 000 logements au cours de la prochaine décennie.
 - Utilisation de biens fonciers fédéraux, tels que ceux utilisés par Postes Canada, le ministère de la Défense nationale, et les immeubles à bureaux du gouvernement fédéral, pour la construire plus de logements plus rapidement.
 - Favoriser la construction d'un plus grand nombre de logements locatifs en investissant plus de 15 milliards de dollars dans le cadre du Programme de prêts pour la construction d'appartements, qui vise à aider les constructeurs à obtenir les fonds dont ils ont besoin pour réaliser de nouveaux projets.
 - Changer la façon dont les logements sont construits au Canada en investissant dans des technologies comme les usines de logements préfabriqués et des catalogues de conceptions de logements préapprouvés.
 - Rationaliser la reconnaissance des titres de compétences étrangers dans le secteur de la construction et aider les travailleurs qualifiés à construire davantage de logements.
- Que pensez-vous de ces mesures?
 - Pensez-vous que ces mesures auront un impact sur l'offre de logements au Canada?
 - Et sur l'abordabilité des logements?

Voici le deuxième volet qui met en lumière quelques-unes des mesures que propose le gouvernement du Canada pour faciliter votre accès à la propriété ou la location d'un logement.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN

- Sévir contre les locations illégales de courte durée (p.ex., Airbnb)
- Convier les entreprises de technologie financière, les agences d'évaluation du crédit et les prêteurs à élaborer l'écosystème qui donnera aux locataires la possibilité d'inclure leurs antécédents de paiement de loyer dans leur cote de crédit, pour les aider à se qualifier pour un prêt hypothécaire et à obtenir de meilleurs taux d'intérêt.
- Établir une Charte canadienne des droits des locataires afin de protéger les locataires, exiger des propriétaires qu'ils fournissent un historique clair des loyers d'un appartement, sévir contre les rénovictions et établir un contrat de location standard à l'échelle nationale



- Permettre une période d'amortissement de 30 ans pour les acheteurs d'une première propriété nouvellement construite.
 - Prolonger de deux ans l'interdiction d'achat de logements canadiens par des étrangers
 - Limiter l'achat et l'acquisition de maisons unifamiliales existantes par de grandes sociétés d'investissement. Le gouvernement mènera des consultations sur la manière de procéder au cours des prochains mois.
- Que pensez-vous de ces mesures?
 - Auront-elles à votre avis un impact sur l'offre de logements au Canada?
 - Et sur l'abordabilité des logements?
 - Favoriseront-elles l'accès à la propriété?

Et voici le troisième volet qui met en lumière quelques-unes des mesures que propose le gouvernement du Canada pour venir en aide à ceux qui peinent le plus à faire face au coût de la vie.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN

- Fournir 1 milliard de dollars au Fonds pour le logement abordable pour soutenir les fournisseurs de logements sans but lucratif, coopératifs et publics et répondre aux besoins des personnes les plus touchées par la crise du logement
 - Créer un Fonds canadien de protection des loyers pour aider les fournisseurs de logements abordables à acheter des logements et à préserver leur abordabilité à long terme pour éviter qu'ils ne soient reconvertis en condominiums de luxe.
 - Augmenter le financement pour soutenir les organisations ayant pour vocation de prévenir et de réduire l'itinérance
- Que pensez-vous de ces mesures?
 - Quel impact, le cas échéant, ces mesures auront-elles sur l'aide apportée à ceux qui peinent à se loger et à trouver un endroit où se sentir chez eux?
 - Maintenant que vous avez pris connaissance de cette liste des points saillants du budget, j'aimerais que vous pensiez à un mot qui décrit votre réaction générale à l'égard du budget. En d'autres termes, pensez à un mot que vous utiliseriez pour décrire le budget dans son ensemble.
 - LE MODÉRATEUR POSERA LA QUESTION SUIVANTE À CHAQUE PARTICIPANT : Quel mot avez-vous choisi et pourquoi avez-vous choisi ce mot?

Maintenant, en pensant à toutes les mesures dont nous avons discuté aujourd'hui, croyez-vous que l'une d'entre elles puisse aider des particuliers cherchant à acheter leur première propriété et faire

en sorte que toutes les générations – en particulier les jeunes — aient accès à une diversité d’options abordables en matière de logement?

PRIORITÉS (20 minutes) Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, climatofervents et climatosceptiques résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, climatofervents et climatosceptiques résidant dans de grands centres de l’Alberta, climatofervents et climatosceptiques résidant dans le secteur du centre de l’Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador

- Quelle devrait, selon vous, être la priorité absolue du gouvernement du Canada?
 - SI CE N’EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Qu’en est-il en matière de changement climatique? Quel degré de priorité le gouvernement du Canada devrait-il accorder au changement climatique?
 - Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
- Le changement climatique a-t-il des répercussions sur le coût de la vie?
 - SI OUI : Quelles sont-elles? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
- Quels sont les pires impacts du changement climatique?
 - SI AUCUN IMPACT N’EST MENTIONNÉ : Que dire des phénomènes météorologiques extrêmes, des feux de forêt, de la pollution, des catastrophes naturelles ou des sécheresses?
 - Dans quelle mesure ces impacts vous préoccupent-ils, le cas échéant?
 - Qu’est-ce qui vous préoccupe le plus?
- Quels sont, selon vous, les principaux obstacles à la prise de mesures pour lutter contre le changement climatique?
- Dans quelle mesure est-il important, le cas échéant, que le Canada, en tant que tel, et que les Canadiens, à titre individuel, prennent des mesures pour lutter contre le changement climatique?
 - SI IMPORTANT: Pouvez-vous expliquer pourquoi vous estimez cela important?
 - Selon vous, est-il important que le Canada soit un leader mondial en matière de lutte contre le changement climatique? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
 - Dans quelle mesure vous sentez-vous personnellement responsable, le cas échéant, de prendre des mesures pour contribuer à la lutte contre le changement climatique?
 - Et pour protéger l’environnement? Vous sentez-vous responsable, le cas échéant, de prendre des mesures pour protéger l’environnement?

Par habitant, les Canadiens figurent parmi les dix premiers émetteurs de pollution par le carbone dans le monde.



[Climatofervents et climatosceptiques résidant dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador - De tous les principaux émetteurs de gaz carbonique dans le monde, le Canada se classe au deuxième rang pour ce qui est des émissions de gaz à effet de serre par habitant].

- Comment réagissez-vous à cette information? Cela vous fait-il changer d'avis sur la nécessité pour le Canada d'agir pour le climat?

TARIFICATION DU CARBONE (APERÇU) (45 minutes) Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador
- Avez-vous récemment vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de la tarification de la pollution par le carbone, parfois connue sous le nom de « taxe carbone »?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Savez-vous comment fonctionne le système de tarification du carbone au Canada?
 - SI OUI : Comment l'expliqueriez-vous?
- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Qui parmi vous a entendu parler de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone? (À MAIN LEVÉE)
- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Pouvez-vous en expliquer le fonctionnement?



Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Je vais maintenant vous fournir des informations concernant le système de tarification du carbone.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN – Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary

La tarification de la pollution, également connue sous le nom de tarification du carbone, consiste à imposer un prix ou une redevance sur les émissions de carbone.

Cela signifie par conséquent qu'un coût est associé à la pollution dans le but d'encourager les particuliers et les entreprises à rechercher des solutions plus propres, notamment en matière de production énergétique, de chauffage domestique et de transport.

Les recettes résultant de la tarification de la pollution sont reversées aux Canadiens chaque trimestre par le biais de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone (RCC).

- **AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN** – Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador
 - Le gouvernement du Canada a tarifié la pollution par le carbone.
 - Certains réduiront leurs émissions de carbone pour éviter de payer la redevance, tandis que d'autres continueront à émettre comme avant.
 - Tous les fonds recueillis dans le cadre de cette tarification, y compris auprès d'entreprises, sont regroupés et répartis à parts égales entre tous les ménages d'une province, par l'intermédiaire de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone (RCC).
 - Cela signifie que ceux qui réduisent leurs émissions de carbone seront plus avantagés, car ils recevront une remise équivalente à celle accordée à tous les autres habitants de leur province, mais auront payé moins en redevances.
 - Ceux qui ne réduisent pas leurs émissions finissent par payer plus, mais le montant de la remise qu'ils reçoivent est le même que pour tous les autres habitants de leur province.
 - Une fois toutes les recettes (y compris celles provenant d'entreprises) regroupées et réparties à parts égales, environ huit ménages canadiens sur dix obtiennent plus d'argent au titre de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone qu'ils n'en paient en redevances.

- Au fil du temps, alors que de plus en plus de gens chercheront à payer moins en réduisant leurs émissions de carbone, nous assisterons à une diminution globale de la pollution par le carbone.

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Quelles sont vos réactions à ces informations?

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Aviez-vous déjà connaissance de ces informations? Avez-vous appris quelque chose de nouveau?

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Y a-t-il des informations qui ne sont pas claires ou au sujet desquelles vous avez des questions?

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Y a-t-il d'autres informations que vous souhaiteriez avoir, mais qui n'ont pas été fournies?

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Que signifie, à votre avis, le terme « tarification de la pollution »?
 - Et le terme « tarification du carbone »?
 - Ces deux termes ont-ils essentiellement le même sens ou un sens différent?

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Avant de participer à ce groupe de discussion, qui parmi vous avait entendu parler de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone? (À MAIN LEVÉE)



- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary À CEUX QUI AVAIENT ENTENDU PARLER DE LA REMISE CANADIENNE SUR LE CARBONE : Pouvez-vous en expliquer le fonctionnement?
 - Votre ménage a-t-il bénéficié de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone?
 - S'IL EN A BÉNÉFICIÉ : Quand en avez-vous bénéficié?
 - Quel en était le montant?
 - Estimez-vous que le montant qui vous a été versé en vertu de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone était plus élevé que le montant de la redevance que vous avez versée? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
 - Combien estimez-vous avoir payé par rapport à ce que vous avez reçu?
- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Maintenant que vous avez pris connaissance de cette information, pouvez-vous nous dire en résumé comment fonctionne le système de tarification du carbone?

Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Concentrons-nous un peu plus sur la Remise canadienne sur le carbone...

- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Pensez-vous que la Remise canadienne sur le carbone aide les Canadiens à assumer leurs dépenses essentielles?
- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Que pensez-vous du fait que huit ménages sur dix reçoivent plus d'argent dans le cadre de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone que ce qu'ils paient en redevance dans le cadre de la tarification du carbone?
 - Avez-vous des questions concernant ces chiffres?
- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador S'agit-il d'une approche efficace pour les réduire les émissions? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas? Comment le savez-vous?



- Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador S'agit-il d'une approche équitable? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?

Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Je vais maintenant vous afficher d'autres informations au sujet de la tarification de la pollution.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN – Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary

Comme nous l'avons précédemment mentionné, toutes les recettes sont reversées à la province ou au territoire dans lesquels elles ont été perçues.

La plus grande partie des recettes (environ 90 %) est distribuée aux familles par le biais de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone, versée tous les trois mois.

Ces remises permettent à huit ménages sur dix de récupérer plus d'argent qu'ils n'en paient.

Les recettes restantes sont versées aux communautés autochtones et à de petites entreprises.

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Quelles sont vos réactions à ces informations?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Y a-t-il des informations qui ne sont pas claires ou au sujet desquelles vous avez des questions?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Ces informations vous donnent-elles une meilleure opinion, une moins bonne opinion ou n'ont-elles aucun impact sur votre opinion concernant la tarification de la pollution par le carbone?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Que pensez-vous du fait que les recettes de la Remise canadienne sur le carbone soient reversées aux particuliers, aux entreprises et aux populations autochtones?
 - Pensez-vous que ce système aide les Canadiens à assumer leurs dépenses essentielles?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary Que pensez-vous du fait que huit ménages sur dix récupèrent plus d'argent qu'ils n'en dépensent en vertu de la tarification de la pollution?
 - Avez-vous des questions concernant ces chiffres?



- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary S'agit-il d'une mesure efficace pour réduire les émissions? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas? Comment le savez-vous?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary S'agit-il d'une approche équitable? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?

Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Je vais maintenant vous montrer un argument en faveur de la tarification du carbone...

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN — Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador La tarification du carbone constitue un moyen efficace et rentable de lutter contre le changement climatique, tout en laissant aux entreprises et aux Canadiens la possibilité de décider comment opérer leur transition vers des solutions moins polluantes.

L'idée étant que lorsque les entreprises et les Canadiens commenceront à opérer cette transition, ils créeront une demande en technologies propres, ce qui finira par attirer de nouveaux investissements au sein de notre économie, et contribuera ainsi à la création d'emplois et à une croissance économique plus forte.

Diverses organisations internationales affirment que la tarification de la pollution constitue le moyen le plus rentable et le plus soupagement applicable pour réduire les émissions, et plus de 200 économistes basés au Canada soutiennent ce système.

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Que pensez-vous de cet argument?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de



l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Avez-vous déjà entendu cet argument en faveur de la tarification du carbone, ou est-ce la première fois?

- **Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador** Avez-vous des questions concernant cet argument?
- **Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, Personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador** Cet argument vous donne-t-il une meilleure opinion, une moins bonne opinion ou n'a-t-il aucun impact sur votre opinion concernant la tarification de la pollution par le carbone?

Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Il y a un autre argument en faveur de la tarification du carbone dont j'aimerais vous faire part...

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN — **Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador**

La tarification du carbone peut contribuer à protéger notre environnement et le bien-être de générations à venir.

Elle est une composante essentielle du plan climatique du Canada et représente un tiers des objectifs du Canada en matière de réduction des émissions. La tarification du carbone vise à réduire les émissions de gaz à effet de serre (GES), qui sont les principaux responsables des feux de forêt, des sécheresses et des inondations de plus en plus intenses.

- **Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de**



grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Que pensez-vous de cet argument?

- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Aviez-vous déjà entendu cet argument en faveur de la tarification du carbone, ou est-ce la première fois?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Avez-vous des questions concernant cet argument?
- Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente quant à l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador Cet argument vous donne-t-il une meilleure opinion, une moins bonne opinion ou n'a-t-il aucun impact sur votre opinion concernant la tarification de la pollution par le carbone?

MISE À L'ESSAI DE LA TARIFICATION DU CARBONE (40 minutes) Millénariaux résidant dans les Maritimes, membres de la génération Z résidant à Calgary, personnes favorables à la lutte au changement climatique et personnes ayant une position ambivalente à l'égard de l'urgence climatique résidant dans des centres de taille moyenne et de grands centres du Manitoba, de grands centres de l'Alberta et dans le secteur du centre de l'Ontario, Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador

Je vais vous présenter une vidéo du gouvernement du Canada destinée à informer les Canadiens au sujet du système de tarification du carbone. Je vais vous montrer la vidéo deux fois et nous discuterons ensuite de nos opinions à son sujet. N'hésitez pas à prendre des notes pour vous souvenir des aspects de la vidéo qui vous ont plu ou déplu.

MONTER LA VIDÉO. LE MODÉRATEUR MONTRE LA VIDÉO À DEUX REPRISES.

- Après avoir visionné cette vidéo, quelles sont vos premières impressions?
- L'explication était-elle claire?
 - Qu'est-ce qui n'était pas clair ou pourrait être amélioré, le cas échéant?

- La vidéo vous a-t-elle fourni de nouvelles informations dont vous n'aviez pas connaissance avant la tenue de ce groupe de discussion?
 - SI OUI : Qu'avez-vous appris de nouveau?
- Maintenant que vous avez visionné cette vidéo, pouvez-vous résumer le fonctionnement de la tarification de la pollution?
- Avant de visionner cette vidéo, étiez-vous au courant des exemptions accordées aux agriculteurs?
 - Que pensez-vous de ces exemptions?
- Avant de visionner cette vidéo, saviez-vous que les Canadiens vivant au sein de collectivités rurales ou éloignées bénéficient d'un supplément rural de 20 % sur la remise canadienne sur le carbone?
 - Que pensez-vous de cette prime?

Maintenant, en pensant à tout ce dont nous avons discuté jusqu'à présent...

- Êtes-vous d'avis que le prix de la pollution par le carbone constitue un incitatif financier efficace à moins polluer? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
 - Je vous demanderai votre avis concernant d'autres approches dans quelques instants, mais en ce qui concerne le système de tarification du carbone en tant que tel, quelles améliorations y apporteriez-vous, le cas échéant?
- Pensez-vous pouvoir changer vos habitudes quotidiennes afin de réduire vos émissions et donc réduire vos redevances en vertu de la tarification du carbone?
 - SI OUI : Quels types de changements envisageriez-vous?
- Croyez-vous que les gens chercheront des options de rechange aux déplacements en voiture, par exemple en conduisant moins, en faisant du covoiturage, en prenant les transports en commun lorsqu'ils y ont accès, en faisant du vélo lorsque possible, ou d'autres moyens de ce genre pour de réduire leur contribution à la taxe sur la pollution? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
- D'après votre compréhension du système de tarification du carbone, le recours à un système de chauffage domestique plus efficace réduirait-il vos coûts liés à la tarification du carbone?
 - Connaissez-vous des programmes du gouvernement fédéral visant à améliorer l'efficacité du chauffage domestique?
 - Votre opinion du système de tarification du carbone changerait-elle si vous saviez que le gouvernement du Canada subventionnait le chauffage à haut rendement énergétique?

Et maintenant, en pensant aux différentes approches du système de tarification de la pollution au Canada...

- Pourquoi croyez-vous que certaines provinces appliquent le système de tarification de la pollution du gouvernement fédéral alors que d'autres adoptent leur propre système provincial?
- Préfereriez-vous que votre province adhère au système fédéral de tarification de la pollution, ait son propre système de tarification provincial ou n'ait aucun système? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
 - À CEUX QUI ONT RÉPONDU « AUCUN SYSTÈME » : Estimez-vous qu'on devrait pouvoir émettre du carbone gratuitement, qu'une taxe devrait être imposée, ou avez-vous d'autres solutions à proposer?
 - À CEUX QUI ONT RÉPONDU « QUELQUE CHOSE D'AUTRE » : Quelles solutions de rechange proposeriez-vous?
 - Pensez-vous que ce système serait plus efficace que le système de tarification de la pollution actuel? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?

PRIORITÉS ET PERFORMANCE – [ENJEUX ET INDUSTRIES LOCAUX /LOGEMENT] (20-25 minutes)

Montérégie, Montréal 2ELGBTQI+, Laurentides Québec, Hamilton

- Montérégie, Montréal 2ELGBTQI+, Laurentides Québec, Hamilton Qu'est-ce que le gouvernement du Canada fait de bien?
- Montérégie, Montréal 2ELGBTQI+, Laurentides Québec, Hamilton Sur quel plan le gouvernement du Canada doit-il s'améliorer?
- Montérégie, Montréal 2ELGBTQI+, Laurentides Québec, Hamilton À votre avis quels sont les principaux enjeux auxquels le gouvernement du Canada devrait accorder la priorité?
 - Montérégie Quels sont les principaux enjeux au sein de votre communauté auxquels le gouvernement devrait tout particulièrement accorder la priorité?
 - Montérégie Le gouvernement du Canada a-t-il fait quoi que ce soit pour résoudre ces problèmes?
 - Montréal 2ELGBTQI+, SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Qu'en est-il du coût de la vie?
Laurentides Québec, Hamilton Qu'en est-il du logement?
 - Montréal 2ELGBTQI+ Qu'avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu récemment au sujet du travail accompli par le gouvernement du Canada pour faire face au coût de la vie et à la pénurie de logements?
 - Montréal 2ELGBTQI+ Comment pensez-vous que le coût de la vie aura évolué dans un an? Pensez-vous que la situation sera meilleure, pire ou la même qu'à l'heure actuelle? Pourquoi?
 - Laurentides Québec, Hamilton Quels sont les principaux enjeux en matière de logement sur lesquels devrait se pencher le gouvernement du Canada?



- **Laurentides Québec, Hamilton** SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Aider les Canadiens à acheter leur première propriété fait-il partie des principaux enjeux?
- **Laurentides Québec, Hamilton** SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Et la construction d'un plus grand nombre de logements?
- **Laurentides Québec, Hamilton** Qu'avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu au sujet du récent travail effectué par le gouvernement du Canada en matière de logement?
 - **Laurentides Québec, Hamilton** Que pensez-vous de ce que vous avez vu, lu ou entendu?
- **Montréal** Quels sont les secteurs d'activité et les industries les plus importants pour votre communauté?
 - **Montréal** Quels sont les secteurs et les industries de votre communauté qui, pour vous, ont le plus besoin d'aide?
 - **Montréal** SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Qu'en est-il de l'agriculture?
 - **Montréal** Le gouvernement du Canada a-t-il fait quoi que ce soit pour soutenir ces secteurs d'activité et ces industries?
 - **Montréal** Et en pensant au secteur agricole en particulier, quelles sont les initiatives que vous souhaiteriez que prenne le gouvernement du Canada, le cas échéant, pour venir en aide à ce secteur?

LE GOUVERNEMENT DU CANADA DANS L'ACTUALITÉ (5 minutes) **Personnes 2ELGBTQI+ résidant en Montréal et à Montréal, Lower Mainland C.-B., Laurentides (Québec), Hamilton**

Montréal Et pensons de manière plus générale...

Personnes 2ELGBTQI+ résidant en Montréal et à Montréal, Lower Mainland C.-B., Laurentides (Québec), Hamilton Qu'avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu au sujet du gouvernement du Canada au cours des derniers jours?

- **Personnes 2ELGBTQI+ résidant à Montréal** Quelles sont vos réactions à ces nouvelles?
- **Personnes 2ELGBTQI+ résidant à Montréal** Quelles sont vos principales sources d'actualités? (Nouvelles télévisées, radio, médias sociaux, ami ou famille)

VÉHICULES ÉLECTRIQUES (20 minutes) **Montréal**

- Quelqu'un a-t-il eu connaissance de nouvelles d'actualité concernant le gouvernement du Canada et les véhicules électriques?

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN :

Les gouvernements fédéral et du Québec ont annoncé l'automne dernier un investissement conjoint de 7 milliards de dollars dans la société Northvolt Batteries North America pour la construction d'une nouvelle usine de fabrication de batteries pour véhicules électriques à Saint-Basile-le-Grand et à McMasterville, au Québec. Les batteries produites dans ces installations seront parmi les plus écologiques au monde, et l'usine créera jusqu'à 3 000 emplois dans la région. On estime également que cet investissement créera directement et indirectement des milliers d'emplois partout au pays.

- Quelles sont vos réactions à cela? Quels seront, selon vous, les impacts de cet investissement? En quoi cet investissement impactera-t-il l'économie du Québec?
 - AU BESOIN : Et sur le plan de la création d'emplois? Croyez-vous que vous, quelqu'un que vous connaissez ou votre collectivité bénéficiez, directement ou indirectement, de la création d'emplois liée à l'implantation de la nouvelle usine de Northvolt?
 - SI NON : Croyez-vous que vous, que quelqu'un que vous connaissez, ou que votre collectivité puissiez en bénéficier autrement?
 - SI OUI : Comment?
- Avez-vous des questions concernant cet investissement?

EMPLOI (30 minutes) Montérégie, Hamilton

Montérégie J'aimerais parler du marché de l'emploi de manière plus générale...

Hamilton Passons à un autre sujet...

- **Montérégie** Comment évalueriez-vous la situation sur le marché de l'emploi au Canada? Est-elle bonne, mauvaise ou entre les deux? Pourquoi?
 - **Montérégie** Dans quelle mesure a-t-il été facile de vous trouver un emploi dans le domaine qui vous intéresse? Avez-vous été confronté(e) à des difficultés ou à des obstacles lorsque vous cherchiez un emploi ou pendant que vous travailliez?
 - Existe-t-il suffisamment de possibilités d'emploi dans votre région?
 - **Montérégie** Les pénuries de main-d'œuvre posent-elles problème au sein de votre collectivité?
 - SI OUI : Quels sont les impacts de ces pénuries de main-d'œuvre dans votre région?
- **Hamilton** Comment décririez-vous généralement la gestion du gouvernement du Canada de l'économie?

- Est-il généralement sur la bonne voie ou sur la mauvaise voie? Pourquoi dites-vous cela?
- **Hamilton** Quels sont, à votre avis, les enjeux économiques les plus importants?
- **Hamilton** Considérez-vous que vos salaires suivent l'évolution du coût de la vie et de l'inflation? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
- **Hamilton** Globalement, comment évalueriez-vous la situation sur le marché de l'emploi à l'heure actuelle? Est-elle bonne, mauvaise ou ni bonne ni mauvaise? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
- **Montérégie, Hamilton** En pensant à ce que sera la situation sur le marché de l'emploi dans cinq ans, pensez-vous qu'elle sera pire, meilleure ou la même? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
- **Montérégie, Hamilton** Vous projetant dans cinq à dix ans, quelle sera, selon vous, la situation sur le marché de l'emploi au Canada?
 - Quels seront, selon vous, les secteurs qui connaîtront la plus forte croissance?
 - Quelles sont les compétences qui, selon vous, seront les plus recherchées?
 - Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous confiant(e), le cas échéant, de pouvoir avoir un bon emploi à l'avenir? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
- **Montérégie, Hamilton** Diriez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada est sur la bonne voie ou sur la mauvaise voie lorsqu'il s'agit de s'assurer que les travailleuses et les travailleurs obtiennent les formations axées sur les compétences nécessaires au maintien de leur compétitivité?
- **Montérégie, Hamilton** Diriez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada est sur la bonne voie ou sur la mauvaise voie en ce qui concerne la création d'emplois de qualité au Canada?
- **Montérégie, Hamilton** Avez-vous connaissance de ce que fait le gouvernement du Canada pour aider à créer des emplois, à fournir des formations axées sur des compétences ou pour soutenir les travailleurs?
 - Que devrait faire le gouvernement du Canada pour aider?

IMMIGRATION (25 minutes) Montérégie, Laurentides (Québec)

Passons encore à un autre sujet...

- Avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit récemment au sujet de l'immigration au Canada ou au Québec?



- Que pensez-vous de ce que vous avez vu, lu ou entendu?
- Globalement, comment décririez-vous l'état actuel du système d'immigration au Canada?
- Quels sont, selon vous, les avantages liés au fait d'accueillir de nouveaux immigrants au Canada?
- Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous d'accord ou en désaccord avec l'énoncé suivant :
« Le Canada doit accueillir davantage de nouveaux immigrants pour contrer les pénuries de main-d'œuvre et contribuer à la croissance de l'économie. »?
 - Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
- Avez-vous de quelconques appréhensions concernant l'accueil de nouveaux immigrants?
 - SI OUI : Quelles sont vos appréhensions?
 - Que devrait faire le gouvernement du Canada pour répondre à ces préoccupations?
- Pensez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada devrait augmenter, réduire ou maintenir le taux d'immigration à peu près au même niveau? Pourquoi?
 - SI AUGMENTER OU RÉDUIRE : Quels impacts cela aurait-il au Canada, que ce soit sur le plan social ou économique?
- Avant de conclure, avez-vous d'autres réflexions dont vous voudriez nous faire part concernant le système d'immigration canadien?

2ELGBTQI+ (70 minutes) Personnes 2ELGBTQI+ résidant à Montréal

- Les personnes 2ELGBTQI+ ont différentes opinions et expériences de vie, et il peut parfois être difficile d'aborder de manière générale les enjeux qui les concernent. Cela dit, de votre point de vue personnel, quels sont certains des problèmes les plus pressants qui ont un impact sur les personnes 2ELGBTQI+?
 - Le cas échéant, quel est le rôle du gouvernement du Canada dans la résolution de ces problèmes?
 - Le cas échéant, quel travail le gouvernement du Canada a-t-il accompli en vue de résoudre ces problèmes?
- Comment qualifieriez-vous le niveau d'acceptation, de soutien et d'inclusion de la société canadienne à l'égard de la communauté 2ELGBTQI+? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
 - Les niveaux d'acceptation, de soutien et d'inclusion ont-ils changé au fil du temps?
 - SI OUI : En quoi ont-ils changé? À quoi ce changement est-il dû?

- SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Le niveau de haine à l'égard des membres de la communauté 2ELGBTQI+ a-t-il changé au fil du temps?
 - SI OUI : En quoi a-t-il changé? À quoi ce changement est-il dû?
 - Que faudrait-il faire pour promouvoir l'acceptation, le soutien et l'inclusion des personnes 2ELGBTQI+ au sein de la société canadienne?
- Comment décririez-vous la situation actuelle concernant les droits et libertés des personnes 2ELGBTQI+?
 - SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Et les droits et libertés des personnes 2ELGBTQI+ en milieu scolaire? En milieu de travail? Au sein du système de soins de santé?
 - La situation concernant les droits et libertés des personnes 2ELGBTQI+ a-t-elle changé plus récemment?
 - SI OUI : En quoi a-t-elle changé? À quoi ce changement est-il dû selon vous?
 - Quelles sont vos plus grandes préoccupations concernant la situation en matière de droits et de libertés des personnes 2ELGBTQI+ au Canada aujourd'hui?
 - Que devrait faire le gouvernement du Canada pour promouvoir et protéger les droits et libertés des membres de la communauté 2ELGBTQI+?
- En ce qui concerne la promotion et la protection des droits et libertés des personnes 2ELGBTQI+, diriez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada est généralement sur la bonne voie ou sur la mauvaise voie? Pourquoi dites-vous cela?
 - SI SUR LA MAUVAISE VOIE : Que pourrait faire le gouvernement du Canada pour se remettre sur la bonne voie?
- Avez-vous connaissance de démarches entreprises par le gouvernement du Canada pour protéger et promouvoir les droits et libertés des membres de la communauté 2ELGBTQI+ au Canada?
 - Plus généralement, avez-vous connaissance de démarches entreprises par le gouvernement fédéral pour soutenir la communauté 2ELGBTQI+? Quels sont vos réactions, vos sentiments ou vos réflexions à ce sujet?
 - SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Êtes-vous au courant de l'investissement de 75 millions de dollars pour les organisations qui défendent les droits et offrent des services aux communautés 2ELGBTQI+?
 - SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Et de l'adoption du projet de loi C-16, une loi visant à reconnaître l'expression et l'identité de genre comme un droit de la personne et à protéger les personnes de genre différent contre la discrimination et la propagande haineuse?
 - SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Et du projet de loi C-4, une loi visant à modifier le Code criminel dans le but d'interdire la thérapie de conversion?

- SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Et que Santé Canada a levé l'interdiction du don de sang qui visait les hommes ayant des rapports sexuels avec d'autres hommes?

- Que devrait faire le gouvernement du Canada pour améliorer ces relations avec la communauté 2ELGBTQI+?
 - Êtes-vous d'accord ou en désaccord avec l'énoncé selon lequel le gouvernement du Canada est à l'écoute, se préoccupe et répond aux besoins des membres de communautés 2ELGBTQI+? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?

- Lorsque vous pensez à votre avenir au Canada, qu'est-ce qui vous rend optimiste?
FEUX DE FORÊT (15 minutes) Lower Mainland, en Colombie-Britannique

- SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de la réponse du gouvernement du Canada aux feux de forêt?
 - Comment décririez-vous la réponse du gouvernement du Canada aux feux de forêt?

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN :

L'approche du gouvernement du Canada en matière de gestion des feux de forêt consiste à aider les communautés à se préparer, à fournir des informations par le biais d'une surveillance en temps réel et à offrir un soutien aux collectivités et aux personnes impactées par les feux de forêt.

Dans le budget 2024, le gouvernement du Canada s'est engagé à prendre plusieurs mesures supplémentaires pour venir en aide aux personnes impactées par les feux de forêt, à savoir :

- **Doubler les crédits d'impôt pour les pompiers volontaires et les volontaires en recherche et sauvetage**, qui passeront de 3 000 dollars à 6 000 dollars en 2024, ce qui permettra aux pompiers volontaires d'économiser jusqu'à 450 dollars supplémentaires par année.
- **Investir 800 000 dollars de plus pour renforcer la capacité de lutte contre les feux de forêt** et contribuer à élargir le programme de formation aux pompiers afin que ces derniers puissent lutter contre les feux de forêt qui touchent des zones urbaines. Ce financement s'ajoute aux fonds déjà alloués pour soutenir l'engagement du gouvernement fédéral à former 1 000 pompiers forestiers.
- Travailler en partenariat avec les Autochtones pour sauver des vies et mieux protéger les collectivités contre les feux de forêt en plus des mesures suivantes :
 - Investir plus de 145 millions de dollars pour aider les communautés des Premières Nations à se préparer à des situations d'urgence.



- Investir 20,9 millions de dollars pour la prévention des incendies dans les communautés autochtones.
- Engager 9 millions de dollars pour venir en aide aux gouvernements autochtones directement impactés par les feux de forêt survenus dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest en 2023.
- Quelles sont vos réflexions initiales au sujet de ces mesures?
 - Le gouvernement du Canada en fait-il assez pour venir en aide aux collectivités impactées par des feux de forêt?
 - Que devrait encore faire le gouvernement du Canada?

GAINS EN CAPITAL (15 minutes) Lower Mainland C.-B.

- SI AUCUNE MENTION DES GAINS EN CAPITAL N’A ÉTÉ FAITE CI-DESSUS, POSER LA QUESTION SUIVANTE : Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de la proposition de modifier l’impôt sur les gains en capital?

AFFICHER À L’ÉCRAN

Les gains en capital sont les profits que réalisent les gens en vendant des actifs de valeur pour un montant supérieur à celui qu’ils ont initialement payé pour les acquérir. Des gains en capital peuvent être réalisés suivant la vente ou l’achat de biens de valeur, comme des biens immobiliers, des actions et obligations, des fonds communs de placement, des métaux précieux, des œuvres d’art et objets de collection, des cryptomonnaies, des véhicules ainsi que des biens personnels, entre autres.

Au Canada, les gains en capital sont imposables. Toute personne qui vend un bien de valeur à un prix supérieur à son coût initial doit payer des impôts sur le gain en capital. Il convient de noter que la vente d’une résidence principale n’est pas assujettie à l’impôt sur les gains en capital; en d’autres termes, l’impôt sur les gains en capital ne s’applique que lorsqu’une personne possède plusieurs biens immobiliers et vend ceux qu’elle n’habite pas.

Le gouvernement du Canada propose de taxer davantage certains des Canadiens les plus fortunés en augmentant l’impôt sur les gains en capital supérieurs à 250 000 dollars. Le gouvernement estime que ce changement ne concernerait que 0,1 % des Canadiens chaque année.

- Que pensez-vous de ce changement proposé?



- Qui ce changement impactera-t-il, selon vous?
- Pensez-vous que ce changement proposé vous fera payer plus d'impôts, moins d'impôts ou qu'il ne vous impactera pas?
 - À CEUX QUI S'ATTENDENT À PAYER PLUS : Pourquoi pensez-vous payer plus d'impôts?

OPIOÏDES (30 minutes) Lower Mainland C.-B.

Passons à un autre sujet ...

- Diriez-vous que la dépendance aux opioïdes constitue un problème important, un problème mineur ou un problème inexistant dans votre communauté?
- Comment ce problème a-t-il évolué au fil du temps? S'est-il amélioré ou a-t-il empiré?
- Avez-vous bon espoir qu'il y aura des progrès dans ce dossier au cours des prochaines années? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
- Qu'a fait le gouvernement du Canada, le cas échéant, pour lutter contre la dépendance aux opioïdes en Colombie Britannique?
- Qu'est-ce qui vous vient à l'esprit en entendant les termes « approvisionnement plus sécuritaire » et « sites de consommation supervisée »?

CLARIFIER:

L'approvisionnement plus sécuritaire consiste à fournir des médicaments prescrits aux personnes qui présentent un risque élevé de surdose. Des services d'approvisionnement plus sûrs peuvent contribuer à prévenir les surdoses, à sauver des vies et à mettre les personnes faisant usage de drogues en contact avec d'autres services sociaux et de santé.

Les sites de consommation supervisée offrent un espace sûr et propre où les personnes qui consomment peuvent apporter leur propre drogue et en faire usage sous la supervision d'un personnel formé. Ils permettent ainsi d'éviter les surdoses accidentelles et de réduire la propagation de maladies infectieuses. Ils proposent également des services de réduction des méfaits

- Quelles sont vos réactions en entendant ces définitions?
- Dans quelle mesure est-il important, le cas échéant, que les personnes aux prises avec une dépendance aux opioïdes puissent avoir accès à des sites d'approvisionnement et de consommation sûrs ? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?

- Selon vous, le gouvernement du Canada a-t-il un rôle à jouer en ce qui concerne les services d'approvisionnement plus sécuritaire et les sites de consommation supervisée?

CLARIFIER: Par l'intermédiaire du Programme sur l'usage et les dépendances aux substances (PUDS), le gouvernement du Canada finance des projets visant à contrer les méfaits associés à l'usage de substances.

Dans le cadre de ce programme, le gouvernement du Canada finance plus particulièrement des sites d'approvisionnement et de consommation plus sûrs, ainsi que des projets axés sur la prévention des surdoses, la sensibilisation, le soutien à la désintoxication, le soutien par les pairs, l'action sociale, le mentorat et le soutien en matière de santé mentale, entre autres initiatives.

- Que pensez-vous du fait que le gouvernement du Canada investisse dans des projets de réduction des méfaits ?
 - Quels seront, à votre avis, les impacts de ces projets, le cas échéant?

L'année dernière, le gouvernement du Canada a accordé une exemption à la Loi réglementant certaines drogues et autres substances afin de supprimer les sanctions pénales en cas de possession d'un maximum de 2,5 grammes de certaines drogues illégales en Colombie-Britannique. Le gouvernement fédéral a récemment approuvé la demande de la Colombie-Britannique de récriminaliser l'usage de drogues illicites dans les lieux publics. Les adultes seront toujours autorisés à avoir en leur possession de petites quantités de drogues illicites et à les consommer en privé, mais pourront être arrêtés s'ils les consomment en public.

- - Quels seront les impacts, le cas échéant?
 - Cette approche contribuera-t-elle à réduire la criminalité en Colombie-Britannique ?? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis?
- Quelles sont les autres mesures que vous souhaiteriez que prenne le gouvernement du Canada pour résoudre ces problèmes?

SOINS DE SANTÉ (20 minutes) Laurentides (Québec)

- SI LES SOINS DE SANTÉ ONT PRÉCÉDEMMENT ÉTÉ MENTIONNÉS COMME PRINCIPAL ENJEU : Certains d'entre vous ont indiqué que les soins de santé sont l'un des principaux enjeux auxquels sont confrontés les Québécois.



- SI LES SOINS DE SANTÉ N'ONT PAS PRÉCÉDEMMENT ÉTÉ MENTIONNÉS COMME PRINCIPAL ENJEU : Parmi les principaux enjeux que vous avez identifiés comme étant les plus importants aux yeux des Québécois, quelle importance accordez-vous à la santé? Est-elle plus importante, moins importante ou tout aussi importante que les autres enjeux mentionnés?
- Comment évalueriez-vous la qualité du système de soins de santé là où vous résidez? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
- Et comment évalueriez-vous l'accès aux services de soins de santé? Qu'est-ce qui vous fait dire cela?
- Quels sont les plus grands défis liés aux soins de santé dans votre région?
- Est-ce que quelqu'un a entendu parler de récents engagements ou d'annonces faites par le gouvernement du Canada en matière de soins de santé?
 - SONDER : Avez-vous entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet des négociations entre les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux sur le financement des soins de santé?
 - SI OUI : Qu'avez-vous entendu? Quelles ont été vos impressions concernant ces négociations?
- En ce qui concerne les soins de santé, le gouvernement du Canada est-il généralement sur la bonne voie ou sur la mauvaise voie? Pourquoi dites-vous cela?
 - SI SUR LA MAUVAISE VOIE : Que pourrait faire le gouvernement fédéral pour se mettre sur la bonne voie?

PROTECTION ET PROMOTION DE LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE (35 minutes) Laurentides (Québec)

Passons à un autre sujet...

- Dans quelle mesure la protection et la promotion de la langue française devraient-elles constituer une priorité majeure?
- Que pensez-vous de la situation concernant la langue française au Canada?
- Que fait le gouvernement du Canada, le cas échéant, pour aider à protéger et à promouvoir la langue française?

- SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : Est-ce que quelqu'un a vu, lu ou entendu quelque chose au sujet du Plan d'action pour les langues officielles du gouvernement du Canada?

Le gouvernement du Canada a annoncé son Plan d'action pour les langues officielles. Le Plan d'action propose plus de 30 mesures visant à atteindre quelques objectifs clés. Je vais d'abord vous faire part des principaux objectifs du Plan et vous donner quelques exemples des mesures proposées, et je vous demanderai ensuite de me faire part de vos impressions.

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN UNE À LA FOIS :

Favoriser une plus grande immigration francophone au Canada

Exemples de mesures :

- Créer une nouvelle politique d'immigration francophone;
- Élargir le travail de promotion et de recrutement à l'échelle mondiale dans les pays francophones; et
- Investir dans la formation linguistique des nouveaux arrivants.

Favoriser des possibilités d'apprentissage du français tout au long de la vie

Exemples de mesures :

- Élargir l'offre de programmes dans les écoles francophones en milieu minoritaire à l'extérieur du Québec;
- Investir dans les programmes de français langue seconde partout au Canada;
- Investir dans des centres de la petite enfance francophones partout au Canada.

Appuyer les organismes communautaires francophones

Exemples de mesures :

- Bonifier le financement des organismes communautaires francophones;
- Accorder des subventions pour des projets qui visent à renforcer l'attachement à la langue française et à la culture francophone;
- Accorder des subventions aux artistes francophones.

Créer un centre au sein de Patrimoine Canada pour appuyer le gouvernement du Canada à prendre des mesures supplémentaires pour soutenir les communautés francophones en situation minoritaire.

- Quelles sont vos réactions quant à chacun de ces objectifs et chacune de ces mesures?
- Lesquels auront, selon vous, le plus d'impact sur la promotion et la protection de la langue française? Pourquoi?



- Parmi ces éléments, y a-t-il quelque chose que le gouvernement du Canada ne devrait pas faire? Pourquoi?
- Que devrait encore faire le gouvernement du Canada pour promouvoir et protéger la langue française?

SÉCURITÉ COMMUNAUTAIRE (25 MINUTES) Hamilton

Passons maintenant à la sécurité communautaire...

- Direz-vous que votre communauté est sécuritaire? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
- D'après ce que vous savez, le taux de criminalité dans votre communauté a-t-il augmenté, diminué ou s'il est demeuré stable?
 - S'IL A AUGMENTÉ : Qu'avez-vous remarqué plus particulièrement?
 - À quoi attribuez-vous la hausse de la criminalité? Quelles sont les causes?
- À qui revient principalement la responsabilité de lutter contre la criminalité?
 - Quel est le rôle du gouvernement du Canada en matière de lutte contre la criminalité?
- Le gouvernement du Canada a-t-il fait quoi que ce soit dans les dernières années pour lutter contre la criminalité? Fait-il quelque chose maintenant?
 - SI CE N'EST PAS MENTIONNÉ : A-t-il fait quelque chose en matière de contrôle des armes à feu?
 - SI AU COURANT : Que pensez-vous de ces initiatives?
- Pensez-vous à d'autres mesures que le gouvernement du Canada pourrait prendre pour prévenir la criminalité?
 - SONDER : Augmenter les services en santé mentale? Donner accès à des traitements contre les dépendances? Augmenter l'offre de logements?
 - De telles mesures auraient-elles un impact? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
 - Devraient-elles constituer une des priorités du gouvernement fédéral?
- Que devrait encore faire le gouvernement du Canada pour contribuer à réduire la criminalité?

VOL DE VÉHICULES (30 minutes) Hamilton

J'aimerais maintenant que nous nous concentrons tout particulièrement sur le vol de véhicules...



- Avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu quoi que ce soit au sujet de mesures du gouvernement du Canada visant à lutter contre le vol de véhicules?
 - SI OUI : Qu'avez-vous, vu, lu ou entendu à ce sujet? Où avez-vous vu, lu ou entendu cette information? Que pensez-vous de ce que vous avez appris à ce sujet?

En plus des mesures prises par le gouvernement fédéral il y a quelques mois, de nouvelles mesures ont été annoncées dans le budget fédéral.

Je vais maintenant vous en montrer quelques-unes (incluant celles qui sont déjà mises en œuvre)...

AFFICHER À L'ÉCRAN

Le gouvernement du Canada s'attaque au vol de véhicules en rendant plus difficiles les vols de ce type ainsi que l'exportation de véhicules volés, notamment :

- **En ayant l'intention de modifier le Code pénal**, y compris :
 - **En y ajoutant de nouvelles infractions pénales** liées au vol de véhicules impliquant :
 - Le **recours à la violence** ou des liens avec le **crime organisé**.
 - La possession ou la distribution d'un **appareil électronique ou numérique** dans le but de commettre des vols de véhicules;
 - Le **blanchiment de produits de la criminalité** au profit d'une organisation criminelle.
 - L'introduction d'un nouveau facteur aggravant lors de la détermination de la peine **si un délinquant a impliqué un jeune** dans la perpétration d'une infraction au Code criminel.
- **En ayant l'intention de modifier la *Loi sur la radiocommunication*** pour réglementer la vente, la possession, la distribution et l'importation d'appareils utilisés pour le vol de véhicules. Cela **conférera aux organismes d'application de la loi les pouvoirs qui l'habiliteront à retirer du marché canadien les appareils** dont on a raison de croire qu'ils servent à voler des véhicules.
- **Renforcer la capacité de l'Agence des services frontaliers du Canada (ASFC) à détecter les conteneurs renfermant des véhicules volés et à les contrôler** ainsi qu'à **tester des technologies** susceptibles de faciliter le travail des agents des services frontaliers.
- **Allouer 15 millions de dollars** aux corps policiers provinciaux, territoriaux et municipaux **pour sévir contre le vol de véhicules**, et renforcer les mécanismes de maintien de l'ordre pour **réprimer le crime organisé international**.
- Quelles sont vos premières réactions à la lecture de ces mesures?
- Parmi les mesures énumérées, y en a-t-il qui, selon vous, sont particulièrement importantes?



- Parmi les mesures mentionnées dans la liste, y en a-t-il qui, selon vous, ne devraient pas y figurer? Pourquoi dites-vous cela?
- Dans l'ensemble, prévoyez-vous que ces mesures auront un impact majeur, mineur ou aucun impact dans la lutte au vol de véhicules au Canada? Pourquoi?
- Diriez-vous que vous êtes pour, contre, ou ni pour ni contre les plans du gouvernement du Canada pur lutter contre le vol de véhicules? Pourquoi?

CONCLUSION (5 minutes) Tous les lieux

- Avant de conclure, y a-t-il autre chose que vous souhaiteriez dire au gouvernement fédéral? Il peut s'agir de précisions sur les sujets abordés aujourd'hui ou d'un sujet que vous jugez important, mais dont nous n'avons pas discuté.

Appendix C – Advertising Concepts

Government of Canada Carbon Pricing Video Testing



The clip above is an animated video that is 1 minute and 23 seconds long. The transcript of the video is as follows:

Pollution pricing. What is it? And how does it work? When greenhouse gasses or carbon pollution are emitted, they trap heat in the atmosphere. This heat is causing the earth to warm and the climate to change. Putting a price on carbon pollution creates a financial incentive for people and businesses to pollute less. Several provinces and territories have their own pollution pricing systems that meet Canada's standards and their individual needs. In others, the federal system applies, or a combination. All the money from the federal price on pollution charged to fuels goes directly back to benefit Canadians, their families, businesses and Indigenous groups in the same province or territory where it was collected, so they can afford to buy the things they need.

Where the federal system is used eight out of 10 households actually get more money back than they spend on the fuel charge with lower income households benefiting the most. There are also exemptions and support for farmers and a bonus for people who live in rural and remote areas.

By biking, driving an electric car or heating homes more efficiently, Canadians can benefit even more. Pollution pricing in Canada; putting money back in the pockets of families and fighting climate change. Learn more at Canada.ca/climateaction.