

**"The livelihood of hundreds of communities on the West Coast depend on these stocks."**

Overall participants agreed with this statement although they tended to believe that the focus of the campaign should be on saving the salmon rather than on the economic well-being of the communities. It was also pointed out that the message is somewhat outdated - communities that depend on the salmon stocks have already been hurt.

**"The salmon is a resource we share. To preserve the salmon fishery we must manage it together wisely and fairly in the interests of present and future generations of Canadians and Americans."**

Although participants agreed with this message, they found it too lengthy and somewhat condescending. It was also described as being too generic: it could equally be applied to any environmental resource. Some participants also felt that the focus should be on a *global* resource rather than simply a North American one.

## **REACTION TO THE ADVERTISEMENTS**

From the two focus groups there are two clear observations. Firstly, the participants *want to know* what the state of the fishery is. They are curious about the lengths to which both Canada and the U.S. have gone to protect the salmon stocks. In particular, they feel that their own government has done little to inform the public about what policies have been implemented, to what extent their government is upholding their end of the bargain, or whether Canada or the U.S. is doing "more" to protect the resource. Secondly, they do not want to be told by the Canadian government what the U.S. should be doing. They objected to the tone of both ads, feeling that the information was, at best, patronizing and, at worst, little better than propaganda.

Together, these two observations lead to a clear conclusion. An ad campaign advocating Canada's position *could be* very effective. It must be seen to be unbiased, providing either independent sources of information or providing sources of information