

nationals; 3:2 Canadians said that Canada should do so as well. Reflecting the high numbers who said 'don't know', no single type of supplementary payment predominated amongst the choices offered. Some respondents used 'other' to identify types of supplementary payments or benefits that might be provided to them.

Respondents feel ignored, unrecognized and not appreciated by their country. Not even 1 in 15 feel that Canada takes advantage of their talent and knowledge; in contrast, 9 in 10 said that other countries make better use of their nationals.

When asked to identify such countries, more than half declined, while the remainder named 24 countries or groupings which provide supplementary benefits, and 29 countries or groupings which make better use of the knowledge and talents of their nationals. The countries in *Table 2* are named frequently:

Table 2: Treatment of Nationals

Country	Supplementary Payments	Making better use
Germany	67 ^a	35
USA	49	39
Japan	49	33
France	25	37

a. All figures are times identified

Should Canada do more for its nationals? Yes, say more than 70 percent, while 15 per cent feel that the *status quo* was satisfactory, and another 15 per cent felt that no support was appropriate.

Nearly 60 per cent of the Canadians in professional levels at IO responded 'yes' that they have purposely selected or promoted Canadian goods or services in their work. Likewise, 70 per cent do not consider such activity a conflict of interest, given equal quality, price, and availability.

In their comments, respondents report that they consider supplementary payments to be

morally repugnant, and to set a double standard that creates two types of employees. Essentially rejecting supplementary payments, respondents note that the playing field which should be level is not; the GOC can neither take the moral high ground, nor can it ignore the reality of the situation.