

REACTION TO CANADIAN MESSAGES

Several possible "sound-bites" expressing Canada's position were offered to the two groups. The reactions to each were as follows:

"From California to British Columbia and north to Alaska, salmon is our shared interest and responsibility"

Participants agreed with this message although some felt it was somewhat condescending. One participant wondered why California was included and then postulated that it was because there are 53 electoral votes there.

"Canada acted last year to reduce its fish catch (Chinook by 50%). This year we will be taking even more drastic measures to further reduce the catch"

Participants were not convinced by this message. They found the 50% figure suspect and pointed out that Chinook salmon is only one type of salmon in the fishery.

Nevertheless, if the statement were true, most participants would be impressed by Canada's actions. Although this message was not convincing, it did arouse curiosity: "is this part of the treaty?", "has the U.S. followed suit?". To be an effective message, *independent* sources of information were required (for example Washington State government sources).

"The U.S. must match Canada's efforts. Canada cannot do it alone. We need to work together to ensure a sustainable future."

Participants did not react positively to this message. They found the word "must" too demanding, too inflammatory. The implication is that the U.S. is not doing *anything* while Canada is. One participant said,

"Did we ever expect Canada to do it alone?"

Nevertheless, there was some agreement that Canada was, in fact, doing more to protect the fishery in the long run, and it was effective in commanding the participants' attention.