DECIMA

FREE TRADE

ISSUES STUDY

#1890

JULY 1986

VOLUME I

ANALYSIS

DECIMA RESEARCH LIMITED One Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4P 3A1 (416) 483-1724

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Continued

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. The Meaning of Freer Trade

For Canadians, it is "freer trade if possible, but not necessarily free trade with the United States." Overall perceptions of the importance of trade to Canada's economic future remained high in the the period between April and June, and the clear majority (78%) of all Canadians continue to believe that it is a good idea to enter into some type of more open trade agreement with the United States. The data indicate a slight movement from the extreme positive pole of assessment (-6) since April 1986.

Table 1

POSITIONS ON A MORE OPEN TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES

	TOTAL %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
A Very Good Idea	12	-6
A Good Idea	66	+6
A Bad Idea	19	-3
A Very Bad Idea	2	-2

Freer trade, however, does not necessarily imply a specific agreement with the United States. Assessments of the larger impacts of free trade with the United States on Canada remain divided. In general, 53% of all Canadians would argue that free or freer trade could increase export opportunities, create jobs and stimulate the expansion of the Canadian economy, comparable to 55% of a similar view in April of 1986. The balance -- 44% (+2) -- think that not having free trade is better for the Canadian economy.

Despite high levels of awareness of the cedar shakes and shingles controversy (81%) Canadians continue to be unconvinced by the need for urgency in negotiating the general shape of any more open trade agreement. The majority (57%) have remained consistent in their view that there is little or no immediate urgency.

Positions on the impact of free trade on job creation indicated a slight softening since April, with 37% (-3) contending that a freer trade agreement would generate more jobs. Another 33% think that job losses arising from free trade will be offset by about the same number of new jobs created. More Canadians (+8 or 58%) indicate that free trade would not result in any lower prices for American goods and services than for their Canadian counterparts.

As a function of heightened awareness of the process of free trade talks, there appears to be a growing consensus that the United States should provide a focus for our future trade efforts. When asked where Canada should try to sell its goods and services, the narrow plurality (46%) indicated the United States. This represents a gain of +13 over measures in April of 1986. The following table profiles the regional orientations to world trading areas.

Table 2

WHERE CANADA SHOULD TRADE BY REGION

	UNITED STATES		PACIFIC		EUROPE		OTHER	
	%	Net	%	Net	%	Net	%	Net
REGION								
British Columbia	39	(+11)	39	(-5)	11	(-10)	11	(+4)
Alberta	45	(+10)	29	(-2)	12	(-12)	15	(+5)
Saskatchewan/Manitoba	47	(+17)	19	(-5)	19	(-7)	15	(+3)
Ontario	49	(+20)	18	(-10)	18	(-7)	15	(±0)
Quebec	50	(+13)	20	(±0)	17	(-9)	15	(±0)
Atlantic	60	(+25)	12	(-10)	14	(-13)	14	(+2)
National Average	46	(+13)	20	(-7)	15	(-4)	16	(-7)

Note: Net change reports variations over measures in April 1986.

Table 2 demonstrates a growing priority attached to the importance of future trade with the United States. But the corollary to this is not an erosion in support for trade diversification. Canadians do not necessarily see the world trade map in exclusionary terms. The majority in the West continues to place greater emphasis on diversified economic relationships.

B. Attitudes Toward the United States

As previous tracking of attitudes toward free trade has revealed, the central Canadian fact is recognition of the pervasive influence the United States has on most aspects of Canadian life. For most Canadians, this is not a source of disquiet. It is quite simply a fact -- one which conditions the way Canadians view the world.

Not surprisingly when asked what form Canadian residents would like bilateral relations to take, preference splits virtually evenly between friendly/close and cool/independent measures. But what is notable is the reluctance to adopt extreme positions. Just one in 10 Canadians, for example, would advocate that Canada be "the warmest and closest of friends" with the United States. The jury favours a businesslike but neighbourly tone (43%) over any more moderate characterization as close friends and trading partners (37%).

There have been few net changes either in this personal preference or in perceptions of the federal government's ideal model for bilateral relations in the period from April to July of 1986. Portrayal of the current relationship indicates that it has cooled somewhat in the intervening period. Table 3 details these perceptions of Canada-U.S. relations.

Table 3

BILATERAL RELATIONS

KEY: (1) Wave II (2) Net Change from Wave I

	PERSONAL PREFERENCE		CANADIAN GOVERNMENT'S IDEAL		CURRENT RELATIONS	
	(1) %	(2)	(1) %	(2)	(1) %	(2)
Cool and Independent	7	+1	7	+2	24	+9
Businesslike but Neighbourly	43	-3	29	-4	42	-2
Close Friends and Trading Partners	37	+1	41	+1	24	-9
Warmest and Closest of Friends	12	-1	21	±0	8	-4

The data substantiate a proposition generated from the first wave of this study. The Canadian public continue to believe that the government's ideal type for bilateral relations is out of step with public desires. Overall, 49% of Canadians want to be close trading partners, but 62% perceive this to be the goal of the federal government. The actual state of current relations, however, is described in this manner by 32%.

Again, the probable rationale for this conception of the appropriate bilateral strategy appears to spring from the conviction that "Americans, while they may like us, don't do us any special favours when it comes to trade and economics" among 75% of the sample (+2% over April).

C. Assessments of Freer Trade

Respondents were asked a series of questions to determine overall perceptions of the principal beneficiaries of a free trade agreement. The first inquired "if trade barriers...(for) goods and services were removed across the Canada-U.S. border" would Canada benefit or lose a great deal?

The overall belief that the country will benefit persists among 55% of all Canadians, a proportion which has held steady since April. The following tables profile the regional variations, both to this perception, as well as the perception of benefit to the province.

Table 4

BENEFIT/LOSS TO CANADA OF THE REMOVAL OF TRADE BARRIERS BY PROVINCE

PROVINCE	BENEFIT %	NEITHER BENEFIT NOR LOSE %	LOSE %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
British Columbia	58	10	32	-3
Alberta	67	6	27	-6
Saskatchewan	57	6	33	+14
Manitoba	44	11	41	+1
Balance Ontario	48	12	40	+11
Metropolitan Toronto	49	8	43	+10
Quebec	55	11	34	+2
New Brunswick	57	7	35	+25
Nova Scotia	53	11	32	±0
Prince Edward Island	54	5	38	±0
Newfoundland	71	7	23	-5
National Average	55	9	35	+1

Note: Percentages for the first three columns sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." The Net Change column provides data on the change since April 1986 based on a measure of those saying "benefit" minus those saying "lose."

The data suggest that the case for the net benefits of freer trade to Canada has been gaining ground in New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, and the Ontario region outside of Metropolitan Toronto. Overall, positive assessment of the potential benefits to the nation persists in Newfoundland, Alberta and British Columbia with only minor erosion.

Table 5 outlines perceptions of the benefits and losses from freer trade in provincial terms.

Table 5

BENEFIT/LOSS TO THE PROVINCES OF THE REMOVAL OF TRADE BARRIERS

PROVINCE	BENEFIT MORE %	ABOUT THE SAME %	BENEFIT LESS %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
British Columbia	64	19	17	-13
Alberta	61	21	16	-16
Saskatchewan	47	27	19	+2
Manitoba	33	37	27	-7
Balance Ontario	46	26	28	+12
Metropolitan Toronto	52	23	24	+7
Quebec	42	31	26	-6
New Brunswick	55	17	28	-9
Nova Scotia	52	28	19	-3
Prince Edward Island	51	22	24	+7
Newfoundland	55	23	23	+12
National Average	50	26	23	-6

Note: Percentages for the first three columns sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." The Net Change column provides data on the change since April 1986 based on a measure of those saying province would "benefit more" minus those saying "less."

This table shows that there continues to be a stronger belief that one's own province will benefit more from freer trade than the country as a whole. But the underlying optimism identified in the first wave of this study in April appears to be abating. Particularly in the three provinces identified as supporters for freer trade -- Newfoundland, British Columbia, and Alberta -- there is a diminishing certainty of provincial benefit. By contrast, residents of Metropolitan Toronto are more likely to identify Ontario's net benefit in the event of free trade.

To test for regional differences in orientation to trade, a question asking "how important trade is to our country" was posed. Significant differences persist. Residents of Ontario and the West continue to be more likely to say that it is important, while Quebec residents are significantly less inclined to consider that the issue is salient. Interpolating positions on the importance of trade and assessments of the benefits of trade confirm the central finding of the first wave of this study: there must be three regionally sensitive communications themes.

British Columbia and Alberta residents share the view that trade is critical and that Canada would benefit from freer trade with the United States. Any communications strategy must thus continue to emphasize the value of freer trade to these provincial economies. In Quebec and the Maritimes, where awareness of the importance of trade is comparatively low, but conviction of the benefits from freer trade with the United States high, the central thrust needs to enhance the importance of trade. The relevance of the current talks to the larger trade strategy continues to seem the appropriate course for Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, where there is dubious assessment of the net benefits from any free trade agreement with the United States.

To further test regional views on free trade, one question was replicated from the first wave of this study. Respondents were asked to indicate the intensity of their agreement or disagreement with the proposition that "freer trade with the United States would help Ontario industry more than industry in other provinces."

Table 6

REGIONAL VARIATIONS OF ONTARIO'S
BENEFIT FROM FREER TRADE
WITH THE UNITED STATES

	FREE TRADE WILL HELP ONTARIO INDUSTRY		
	Disagree %	Depends %	Agree %
REGION			
British Columbia	34	15	52
Prairies	36	13	51
Ontario	36	13	51
Quebec	30	16	54
Atlantic Canada	38	11	51

Note: Percentages sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

This table points out three important facts. First, there is very little regional differentiation — everyone agrees that Ontario industry will be helped more than industry in other provinces. Second, the perception of Ontario as a winner is losing ground. Finally, the irony in these data means that there continues to be the potential to have the worst of all possible worlds: a consensus that Ontario benefits from freer trade, and thus the possibility of a mild anti-Ontario feeling being generated, without winning the support of Ontario.

Given the overall positive assessment of the net benefits of free trade, what are the specific sectoral economic effects? Table 7 demonstrates that the chief beneficiaries will be the banking and the financial service and forestry sectors. The single casualty most often identified is the textile and clothing industry. Tracking comparison with April data reveals a net growth in perception of benefits free trade may bring to the cultural industries.

Table 7

SECTORAL IMPACTS

	HELPED %	NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED %	HARMED %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
Banks/Financial Services	43	31	23	N/A
Forestry	54	12	33	-17
Farming/Agriculture	48	16	35	+4
Fishing	45	22	31	+2
Auto Industry	44	19	36	+5
Cultural Industries	44	18	37	+10
Textile/Clothing	42	15	43	+3

Note: Percentages for the first three columns sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." The Net Change column provides data on the change since April 1986 based on a measure of those saying "helped" less those saying "harmed."

More importantly, where the forest industry is concerned, the data suggest that the cedar shakes and shingles controversy may have persuaded a minority of Canadians that a free trade agreement could inflict further harm.

Finally, respondents were asked how long they thought it would be before the effects of free trade would be felt. Just one in five felt that the effects would make themselves felt immediately. Thirty-nine percent (39%) believe the first effects will become apparent in two to three years; another 27% think that they will take from three to five years.

D. Evaluation of Federal Management of the Trade Talks

Two questions were put to respondents to elicit perceptions of the comparative bargaining skills brought to the table. First, are Americans perceived to be better bargainers? The majority (57%) of Canadians continue to be confident that Canadians can bargain firmly and effectively with the Americans and get the best deal possible. This level of confidence appears to have eroded somewhat (-4) in the period since April of 1986.

The second question asked for an assessment of whether the federal government pushes its own point of view strongly enough before the United States. The majority (58%) are of the view that the government does not advocate the Canadian position with sufficient vigor. There has been little material change since April. Further probing tested for assessment of the federal government's management of the negotiations. Again, the majority (57%) of all Canadians think that the government is not managing the negotiations well. Assessment tends to be more positive in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Newfoundland.

Two views were then presented. One scenario held that because the federal government has staked so much of its credibility on succeeding in the trade talks, it would agree to anything to keep them from failing. The alternative hypothesized that the government would call the talks off if they did not prove in the best interests of Canada. The clear majority (68%) are of the view that the federal government puts the interests of Canada ahead of its own political expediency. This consensus does not vary across regions. Residents of Metropolitan Toronto are less convinced that the government would walk away from the table (58% compared to a national average of 68%).

Awareness of who is Canada's chief trade negotiator is reasonably high by most standards: 30% of all Canadians claim to have heard of Mr. Reisman. Among these Canadians, there is a reasonably positive assessment of Mr. Reisman's performance. Sixty-five percent (65%) of those aware of him (or 20% of all Canadians) contend that Mr. Reisman is doing a good job at representing Canada's interests. Just 16% (5% of all Canadians) think that he is doing a bad job overall.

Finally, Canadian residents were asked whether the cabinet shuffle would improve or harm the way the government manages the talks. The minority (39%) feel that the shuffle will improve overall management of bilateral negotiations. Forty-six percent (46%) do not think there will be any effect. Just one in 10, however, are of the view that the shuffle will have a negative impact on the trade talks. Skepticism is particularly marked in Ontario outside of Metro Toronto (+15 compared to a net of +31 for all of Canada).

Conceptions of federal-provincial co-operation and responsibility to the Canadian electorate were also probed. Just one in 10 Canadians would argue in favour of a unilateral federal initiative. Fully 42% think that any such agreement must be ratified by all provinces. Another 40% think that it should meet the approval of most of the provinces. But Canadians recognize that it will be difficult to negotiate a deal which is satisfactory to provincial, labour and business interests. Almost six in 10 think that it is not likely that the government will be able to satisfy all of these interests.

The final process dimension asked whether the government has a responsibility to inform Canadians about what it is prepared to negotiate with the Americans. Fully 68% adopt this view.

E. Cedar Shakes and Shingles

Overall awareness of the United States tariff on Canadian cedar "shakes and shingles" is high at 81%. The consensus among 44% of all Canadians is that the federal government response was too weak. Another 32% think that the response was neither strong nor weak. No significant regional differences emerge on this dimension. More importantly, 54% argue that the shakes and shingles controversy had no material impact on their views about free trade. About one in five (23%) conceded that the controversy made them more likely to feel that the free trade agreement might be a bad idea. A similar proportion reported the opposite effect.

Comparative tracking of forestry as a sectoral winner or loser from free trade indicates moderate erosion in perceptions of net benefit (-17) in the period since April. Residents from Ontario show more concern than their western counterparts about potential harm, with 39% saying the industry will be harmed, compared to 23% in British Columbia or Newfoundland.

F. Thematic Analysis

Tracking of overall intensity of agreement on an eleven-point scale for a series of thematic issue statements indicates a slight increase in the number of Canadians who feel that the United States might take advantage of Canadian friendliness, that free trade may matter to business but not the average worker, and that any free trade initiative might lead to increased domestic tension.

An examination of the correlation between the various thematic issues and levels of overall support for the trade initiative continues to suggest that views are being formed on the basis of emotional concerns rather than pragmatic ones. The dominant question is still not one of competition, enhanced productivity or trade balance, but achieving a middle ground in our relationship with the United States. The following table indicates the principal issues which correlate with positions on free trade.

Table 8

ISSUE STATEMENT	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
There may be economic dislocation and short-term problems if Canada enters into free trade arrangements, but we will have to have free trade in order to ensure that there will be more jobs in the future.	0.4297
I'm really concerned that the free trade issue is only going to create tensions and frustrations in Canada, just as things were getting better.	0.3143
People who oppose a free trade agreement with the United States just don't have enough confidence in Canada.	0.2934
If our economy becomes any more closely tied to the American economy we will lose our political independence.	0.2771

In sum, the dominant issues in the free trade debate for the period since April 1986 remain similar in order of priority for most Canadians. But a slight drop in correlation coefficient values indicates that any one issue has less influence on individual positions on free trade. This phenomenon may be a reflection of a broadening awareness of the complexity of issues at stake.

C. Conclusions

- Levels of overall support for free trade, while remaining stable since April 1986, indicate a slight softening of resolve among supporters and opponents.

- Canadians feel that bilateral relations have cooled. While the majority continue to be confident that Canadians can bargain effectively with the Americans, the level of confidence is eroding. The federal government is not perceived to be managing negotiations well. The consensus among 44% of all Canadians was that the federal response to the United States tariff on Canadian cedar "shakes and shingles" was not strong enough. The controversy, however, has little impact on overall views of free trade.

- The strongest provincial supporters for free trade continue to be British Columbia, Alberta, and Newfoundland. The weakest supporters are found in Manitoba and Ontario -- particularly Metropolitan Toronto. The case for free trade appears to be gaining ground in Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and the Ontario region outside of Toronto. While the provincial consensus continues to be that Ontario industries will gain more from free trade than industry in other provinces, the perception of Ontario as an automatic winner is losing ground.

- The need for a national communications program with three distinctive regional themes is confirmed by the second wave of this study. The themes are defined in terms of perceived importance of trade and net benefits from any free trade agreement with the United States for:

  - British Columbia and Alberta;
  - Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan; and
  - Quebec and Atlantic Canada.

- Allaying fear that free trade talks might jeopardize federal provincial relations or accord among groups in Canada remains key to any communications strategy.

- National themes should continue to focus on the initiative's fundamental role in planning for Canada's future success in world markets. The priority should be on reinforcing Canadian confidence in future economic prospects.

- In each province, every effort should be made to demonstrate the potential for the leading industries to reap benefits from a Canada-United States trade agreement.

I. INTRODUCTION

The following report provides tracking data on Canadian attitudes toward freer trade in general, and particularly toward an agreement with the United States. It replicates central questions about the current Canada-United States trade situation first reported in a survey conducted for McLauchlan, Mohr, Massey in April of 1986 (reference number 1686). This report is based on the results of a nation-wide sample of 1500 respondents. The interviewing for the second wave was conducted in the period between July 4 and July 14, 1986.

The first section of the report explores general orientations to cultural nationalism and the United States. Chapter II delves into what freer trade means to most Canadians. It also includes an analysis of prescriptions for future trading partners. Section III examines general attitudes towards the United States. The following chapter explores who is seen as the winner and who the loser in the event of a more liberal trade agreement with the United States. The study then turns to an evaluation of federal management of the trade talks and the specific impact of the cedar shakes and shingles controversy. It concludes with a profile of the dominant issues of the debate which are important in animating support for or opposition to free trade.

A. Indices of Nationalism

The first wave of this study constructed four indices from a series of questions to identify orientations to Canada's trading relationship with the United States. One was replicated for tracking purposes. The index created was labelled "cultural nationalism." Respondents were asked which view of two best represented their own. The first stated that some people felt Canada's television, publishing and performing arts industries should be included in the negotiations because it would provide them with new markets and opportunities. The opposite view stated that others felt these industries should be protected from American competition because sooner or later our cultural identity will be seriously threatened. Those who adopted the position that the industries should not be included were further asked if their position would change if Canada would have to compensate by making concessions in other areas which could cause the loss of jobs.

B. The Cultural Nationalist Index

Just under a majority of Canadians (49%) hold that cultural industries should not be included in any free trade negotiations with the United States. This represents a slight increase (+4) over measures conducted in April of 1986. But it should be underlined that roughly one-in-three of those nationalists could be characterized as cultural nationalists. If the exclusion of cultural industries could trigger a domino effect of concessions in other areas which could cost Canada jobs, then just 17% of all Canadians would continue to insist on their being kept off the bargaining table. Forty-nine per cent of all Canadians favour negotiating any free trade agreement to cover cultural industries due to the prospects of expanding into new markets. The following table charts net change, if any, over the period since April.

Table 1

THE CULTURAL NATIONALIST INDEX

	APRIL 1986 %	JULY 1986 %	NET CHANGE %
Cultural Nationalists	28	32	+4
"No-cost" Nationalists	17	17	+-0
"Non"-Nationalists	54	49	-5

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding and the exclusion of the "no opinion" category.

The demographic profile of cultural nationalists remains unchanged in the intervening period. Those 65 years or older, and those with at least some university education are more likely to resist the inclusion of the cultural industries in free trade talks. Overall, residents of Newfoundland, British Columbia and Alberta are more likely (+10) to argue in favour of free trade for the cultural sector. Finally, Quebec residents are more inclined (+14) than the national average to insist on categorical exclusion. Manitoba and Saskatchewan residents, on the other hand, are more likely to be "no-cost" nationalists.

If the number of cultural nationalists has increased slightly (+4) in the period since the last study, this may be offset by a moderate increase in the belief that the cultural industries may experience a net gain in the event of a free trade agreement with the United States. Table 2 outlines this development.

Table 2

EFFECT OF FREER TRADE ON THE CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

	APRIL 1986 %	JULY 1986 %	NET CHANGE %
CULTURAL INDUSTRIES WOULD BE:			
Helped a Great Deal	16	18	+3
Helped A Bit	23	26	+3
Neither	19	18	-1
Harmed a Bit	20	19	-1
Harmed A Great Deal	22	18	-4

II. THE MEANING OF FREER TRADE

For Canadians, it is "freer trade if possible, but not necessarily free trade with the United States." But what does free trade represent to Canadians? Respondents were asked how they would characterize their overall understanding of how tariffs or non-tariff barriers such as government regulations work in international trade. The majority of Canadians (60%) think that they have a reasonably good understanding. This level has remained constant since the first wave of the study in April of 1986. Key regional and demographic variations persist. Confidence in understanding continues to be higher (71%) in the Metro Toronto area. There is a wide gender gap in self-styled levels of comprehension. Men are more likely to claim expertise (66%) than women (54%). Interestingly, age does not seem to correlate with insight into how tariff barriers operate. But education plays a key role. Those who have graduated from university are more likely to claim higher levels of understanding (+10) than their less educated counterparts. Income also rises with understanding; those reporting annual household incomes of $50,000 or over are marked in their comparative confidence (+13). In sum, self-styled understanding of the barriers at stake in free trade does not appear to have grown with the greater exposure to the debate since April. It continues to be directly related to higher socio-economic indicators.

A. The Importance of Trade

Overall perceptions of the importance of trade to Canada's economic future remain high. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of Canadians consider trade to be very important to Canada -- a level unchanged since Wave I. There are interesting provincial variations in this perceived importance. In general, western provinces are more aware of the critical importance of trade to their national as well as personal well-being. Saskatchewan residents are more likely (+12 over the national average) to say that it is very important. In Quebec, on the other hand, just 53% of all residents consider trade to be key. Again, positive perceptions of the importance of international trade to Canada's economy rises with education.

B. Canada's Trading Partners

To determine perceptions of Canada's position in global trading, respondents were asked where Canada should focus future efforts in selling goods and services. In the first wave of this study, the data suggested a majority consensus that a multilateral approach was Canada's best option. Since that time, there appears to be a growing feeling that the United States should provide the focus of future trade efforts. This may reflect a heightened awareness of Canada-U.S. trade relations during the intervening process of free trade talks. Still just a narrow plurality (46% or + 13 over Wave I) indicate that the United States is where Canada should focus future trading efforts. Despite this shift, however, most Canadians do not necessarily see Canada's role in international trade in exclusionary terms. The western provinces in particular continue to emphasize a multilateral trade strategy. Table 3 outlines regional variations on Canada's future trade picture.

Table 3

WHERE CANADA SHOULD TRADE BY REGION

	UNITED STATES		PACIFIC		EUROPE		OTHER	
	%	Net	%	Net	%	Net	%	Net
REGION								
British Columbia	39	(+11)	39	(-5)	11	(-10)	11	(+4)
Alberta	45	(+10)	29	(-2)	12	(-12)	15	(+5)
Saskatchewan/Manitoba	47	(+17)	19	(-5)	19	(-7)	15	(+3)
Ontario	49	(+20)	18	(-10)	18	(-7)	15	(±0)
Quebec	50	(+13)	20	(±0)	17	(-9)	15	(±0)
Atlantic	60	(+25)	12	(-10)	14	(-13)	14	(+2)
National Average	46	(+13)	20	(-7)	15	(-4)	16	(-7)

Note: Net change reports variations over measures in April 1986.

Table 3 demonstrates a growing priority attached to the importance of future trade with the United States. But the corollary to this is not an erosion in support for trade diversification. Canadians do not necessarily see the world trade map in exclusionary terms. The majority in the West continues to place greater emphasis on diversified economic relationships.

Among demographic variables, age is the sole one of interest. In general, younger Canadians appear to be more United States-centred in their perceptions of international trade (+7) while those over 45 are less so (-7).

C. Overall Orientation to Freer Trade

If Canadians are multilateral in their orientation to future Canadian markets, what is their position on Canada's entry into some type of more open trade agreement with the United States? The overwhelming majority (78%) of Canadians continue to believe that it is a good idea to liberalize trade across the 49th parallel. While this level has remained constant since April of 1986, the data indicate a shift (-6) from the most positive pole of assessment.

Table 4

POSITIONS ON A "MORE OPEN TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES"

	JULY 1986 %	APRIL 1986 %	CULTURAL NATIONALIST JULY 1986 %	CULTURAL NATIONALIST APRIL 1986 %
A Very Good Idea	12	18	8	11
A Good Idea	66	61	60	55
A Bad Idea	19	16	32	26
A Very Bad Idea	2	4	32	7

Note: Percentages sum vertically and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." Cultural-Nationalists are defined as those who do not feel that Canada's television, publishing or performing arts industries should be included in any negotiations with the United States.

No significant demographic variations emerge. In provincial terms, Ontario and particularly the areas outside of Metropolitan Toronto continue to be less supportive of the concept (-8). Cultural nationalists and those who advocate more distant relations with the United States are also less inclined to favour the idea of some form of free trade agreement(-10 and -17 respectively). While this large majority of Canadians express support for "freer trade" with the United States at the level of principle, it is clear that this opinion is offered without deliberation about the pros or cons by the respondent.

A subsequent question, which introduced some of the putative downside associated with such an agreement, elicited a strikingly different result. Canadians are divided in their assessments of the larger impacts of free trade on Canada. In general, 53% of all Canadians argue that free or freer trade could increase export opportunities, create jobs and stimulate the expansion of the Canadian economy. This compares with 55% of a similar view in April of 1986. Forty-four percent think that the absence of free trade is better for the Canadian economy. The balance express no opinion. Indices of cultural nationalism -- defined in terms of willingness to include cultural industries in negotiations -- bear a significant influence in adopting positions on this dimension. Table 5 indicates the impact of nationalism on perceptions of free trade.

Table 5

PERCEPTIONS OF FREER TRADE IN RELATION TO NATIONALISM

	FREE TRADE GOOD FOR CANADA %	NO FREE TRADE BETTER %
Canadian Average	53	44
Cultural Nationalism		
Nationalist	38	58
No-cost Nationalist	47	50
Non-Nationalist	66	32
Relations with the United States		
Colder than Government	40	56
Cooler than Government	44	53
Same	60	39
Closer	61	38

Note: Percentages exclude no opinion. For an explanation of the nationalist indices, consult the technical appendix.

D. Provincial Views on Freer Trade

The strongest provincial supporters for free trade on this dimension are Newfoundland, Alberta, and British Columbia although there is still erosion in support among residents of these provinces, of not less than 5% with the exception of Alberta, since April. The opponents remain Manitoba and Ontario -- particularly the area outside of Metro Toronto.

The following table presents the level of support for free trade by province and the net change, if any, from Wave I.

Table 6

PERCEPTIONS OF FREE TRADE BY PROVINCE

	FREE TRADE GOOD FOR CANADA %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL %
REGION		
British Columbia	61	-5
Alberta	67	+1
Saskatchewan	50	+-0
Manitoba	44	-3
Balance Ontario	44	-5
Metro Toronto	52	+6
Quebec	55	-1
New Brunswick	56	+5
Nova Scotia	56-	3
Prince Edward Island*	67*	*+21
Newfoundland	68	-5
National Average	53	-2

* Note: Interpret percentage changes since April with caution due to the small sample size.

Age emerges as an important variable affecting views on whether free trade would be good or not for Canada's future economic prospects. Those respondents 18 to 24 and 35 to 44 are more likely to consider the overall effect to be good. Those 55 to 64 years of age, on the other hand, are less likely (-9) to think so, as are their seniors.

Finally, assessment on this dimension is affected by one's views on cultural nationalism and the appropriate relationship with the United States.

E. Attitudes Towards the United States

To determine overall views about the United States, three questions were asked about personal preference regarding the form the bilateral relationship should take, the current state of affairs, as well as descriptions of what the government sees as the ideal relationship with the United States.

Table 7 outlines the perceived current bilateral relationship and compares the results with those previously obtained in April 1986.

Table 7

CANADA - UNITED STATES RELATIONS
BILATERAL RELATIONS

KEY: (1) July 1986 (2) Net Change from April 1986

	PERSONAL PREFERENCE		CANADIAN GOVERNMENT'S IDEAL		CURRENT RELATIONS	
	(1) %	(2)	(1) %	(2)	(1) %	(2)
Cool and Independent	7	+1	7	+2	24	+9
Businesslike but Neighbourly	43	-3	29	-4	42	-2
Close Friends and Trading Partners	37	+1	41	+1	24	-9
Warmest and Closest of Friends	12	-1	21	±0	8	-4

Personal preference and perceptions of what the federal government wants in terms of bilateral relations have remained constant in the period since April 1986. Preference between friendly/close and cool/independent measures overall are split virtually evenly. What is remarkable is the reluctance to adopt extreme positions. Just one in ten Canadians, for example, advocate that Canada become "the warmest and closest of friends" with our neighbour to the south. The public marginally favours a businesslike but neighbourly tone.

The data substantiate a key proposition from the first wave of this study. The Canadian public continues to believe that the government wants a relationship much closer than is deemed appropriate. Overall, 49% of Canadians want to be close trading partners, but 62% see this as the central federal goal. The actual state of the current relationship is characterized in this way by 32%. The prairie provinces are less likely to say that the relationship at present is close, particularly in Saskatchewan where just 24% adopt this view.

By way of summary, then, the data for the second wave of this study reinforce the warning to the federal government that Canadians want a friendly but businesslike bilateral relationship. Canadians seem to regard friendship and business as two distinct spheres in bilateral relations. The majority feel that they want to remain friends with Americans. At the same time, Canadians are aware that friendship does not necessarily imply business advantage. Indeed, there is a widespread recognition that Americans are single-minded about protecting or enhancing their economic interests. Fully 75% of all Canadians (or +2 over April) share the view that "Americans, while they may like us, don't do us any special favours when it comes to trade and economics." The appropriate Canadian response is a friendly, but firm assertion of Canadian business interests. On this front, Canadians seem to feel the federal government is remiss. It seems to want a closer friendship with the United States than is appropriate. Canadians are not convinced the federal government is firm enough in advancing its business interests. Positions on the appropriate note for Canada-U.S. relations continue to be related to perceptions of free trade. If one considers free trade to be good for Canada, then the preference is for a close trading relationship.

III. ASSESSMENTS OF FREER TRADE

To establish the context for specific assessments of free trade, respondents were asked how important a trading partner Canada is to the United States. Fully 57% consider Canada to be an important partner to the United States, a level unchanged since April of 1986. Quebec residents are the least likely to attach very great importance to Canada's role. On the other hand, residents in British Columbia are more apt to value the Canadian importance to the American trade picture more highly (+7).

A. Winners and Losers

Respondents were then asked a series of questions to determine overall perceptions of who would win and who would lose in the event trade barriers for goods and services over the border were removed. Since April the overall belief among 55% of all Canadians has consistently been that the country will benefit from any free trade agreement with the United States. The following table profiles regional variations in perceptions of benefits or losses to Canada.

Table 8

BENEFIT/LOSS TO CANADA OF THE REMOVAL OF TRADE BARRIERS BY PROVINCE

PROVINCE	BENEFIT %	NEITHER BENEFIT NOR LOSE %	LOSE %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
British Columbia	58	10	32	-3
Alberta	67	6	27	-6
Saskatchewan	57	6	33	+14
Manitoba	44	11	41	+1
Balance Ontario	48	12	40	+11
Metropolitan Toronto	49	8	43	+10
Quebec	55	11	34	+2
New Brunswick	57	7	35	+25
Nova Scotia	53	11	32	±0
Prince Edward Island	54	5	38	±0
Newfoundland	71	7	23	-5
National Average	55	9	35	+1

Note: Percentages for the first three columns sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." The Net Change column provides data on the change since April 1986 based on a measure of those saying "benefit" minus those saying "lose."

The case for free trade appears to be gaining ground in some regions of Canada. New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and the area of Ontario outside of metropolitan Toronto appear to be rising in terms of perceived net benefits. Positive assessment persists in Newfoundland, Alberta and British Columbia.

Interesting demographic variations emerge. Women are more likely to perceive Canada will win more (58% said "benefit") than it will lose (32%) than men. So too are the very young between 18 and 24 years of age and those between 35 to 44 years of age, more positive in their net assessments. Finally, respondents at either end of the household income scale, whether under $10,000 or over $50,000, are also more positive. Not surprisingly, cultural nationalists and those who prefer an arms-length relationship with the United States are more negative in their assessments.

But what are views of the net benefit to one's home province compared to others? The second wave of this study confirms a central finding in the first. Canadians continue to believe that their own province will do better under a free trade agreement than the country as a whole. But the optimism about provincial impacts appears to be abating somewhat. Newfoundland, British Columbia and Alberta residents are less positive in their net assessments, while still well above the national average. By contrast, Metro Toronto residents are becoming more persuaded that Ontario will gain in the event of free trade. The following table portrays perceptions of benefits or losses to the provinces if trade barriers against Canada-U.S. goods and services are removed.

Table 9

BENEFIT/LOSS TO THE PROVINCES OF THE REMOVAL OF TRADE BARRIERS

PROVINCE	BENEFIT MORE %	ABOUT THE SAME %	BENEFIT LESS %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
British Columbia	64	19	17	-13
Alberta	61	21	16	-16
Saskatchewan	47	27	19	+2
Manitoba	33	37	27	-7
Balance Ontario	46	26	28	+12
Metropolitan Toronto	52	23	24	+7
Quebec	42	31	26	-6
New Brunswick	55	17	28	-9
Nova Scotia	52	28	19	-3
Prince Edward Island	51	22	24	+7
Newfoundland	55	23	23	+12
National Average	50	26	23	-6

Note: Percentages for the first three columns sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." The Net Change column provides data on the change since April 1986 based on a measure of those saying province would "benefit more" minus those saying "less."

Again, positions on this dimension are strongly influenced by one's views concerning cultural nationalism or the appropriate relationship with the United States. Assessment is more pessimistic as age and education levels rise. It does not vary by gender or household income.

Canadians continue to be unconvinced of the need for urgency in negotiating any agreement despite wide awareness of the cedar shakes and shingles controversy since April of 1986. The majority (57%) do not see the need for any hurry. While free trade appears to be a good idea, divided opinion on the net benefits indicates that, for most Canadians, it is an idea whose time has not yet necessarily come.

B. Macro Economic Effects

If Canada and the United States were to reach some kind of an agreement on trade, how long do Canadians feel it would take before the effects would be felt? Just one in five think that the effect would be immediate. Thirty-nine percent (-6 from April) estimate that it will take two to three years. Another 27% contend that effects will not work their way through the system for three to five years, with the balance stating more than five.

To determine just what these effects might be, respondents were asked a series of questions about the specific impacts on Canadian companies, jobs and prices. Table 10 details these effects.

Table 10

PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF FREER TRADE ON JOBS AND PRICES

	PERCENTAGE	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL
CANADIAN COMPANIES		
Would be more profitable	54	-1
Would be overwhelmed	44	+1
JOB CREATION		
Fewer jobs	29	+2
The same number of jobs	33	+0
More jobs	37	-3
CONSUMER PRICES		
Prices would be lower	41	-8
Prices no lower	58	+8

Note: Percentages do not sum to 100% due to the exclusion of "no opinion."

Table 11 demonstrates that the majority (70%) of Canadians think that there will be more jobs as a result of free trade or that the number of jobs lost will be offset by the number of new jobs created. This view has not been materially altered since April. Prices, on the other hand, are more likely to be perceived to be unchanged in the event of free trade in July than they were in April.

C. Regional Impacts

There are interesting demographic variations in terms of the perceived impact of free trade. First, Quebec residents are more likely (+8) to argue that Canadian companies will be overwhelmed by their American counterparts. Those over 65 years of age are also less likely to think the prospect of free trade a positive one. Once again, middle income households are skeptical of the overall gains to be made by Canadian companies.

As for job creation, the same demographic trends are apparent. Men, those 18 to 24 and 35 to 44 years of age, as well as middle income families with incomes between $30,000 to $49,999 are more likely to think that the price of goods will fall below the national average after a free trade agreement.

What becomes interesting in terms of the regional orientations to free trade, is the effect of interpolating overall awareness of the importance of trade in general and net assessments of the benefits of free trade to the nation. The three main groups identified in April of 1986 still remain. British Columbia and Alberta residents share the view that trade is critical and that Canada stands to gain in any agreement. Quebec and the Maritimes appear to share this conviction about the positive impacts of free trade, but consider trade overall to be a less important issue. Finally, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan share a dubious assessment of the benefits of any free trade strategy, but an awareness of trade's overall importance.

The clear inference continues to be that there must be three regionally sensitive strategies. The one for Alberta and British Columbia is reasonably straightforward and must continue to point out the gains to be made for their respective provincial economies from an agreement. The additional message for Quebec and the East is to enhance the awareness of the importance of trade. Finally, any communications strategy for those provinces opposed to free trade must be to point out how any agreement fits in with long-term economic planning.

D. Sectoral Impacts

In general, Canadians appear to know little about any specific effects a freer trade agreement might have on certain sectors. The majority are of the view that the principal winners will be the banking and financial service as well as forestry sectors. The single casualty most often identified is the textile and clothing industry. The following table profiles perception of sectoral impacts and net growth, if any, since April 1986.

Table 11

SECTORAL IMPACTS

	HELPED %	NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED %	HARMED %	NET CHANGE FROM APRIL 1986
Banks/Financial Services	43	31	23	N/A
Forestry	54	12	33	-17
Farming/Agriculture	48	16	35	+4
Fishing	45	22	31	+2
Auto Industry	44	19	36	+5
Cultural Industries	44	18	37	+10
Textile/Clothing	42	15	43	+3

Note: Percentages for the first three columns sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion." The Net Change column provides data on the change since April 1986 based on a measure of those saying "helped" less those saying "harmed."

What demographic patterns emerge? First, men are less likely to consider any particular sector a winner than are women. So too are those aged 55 or over more critical in their assessment of the net impact free trade might have on that sector. In general, those Canadians between the ages of 18 to 24 or with little formal education appear more convinced that any of the seven sectors surveyed will hold their own and indeed gain under any more liberal trade scenario.

The sector of specific interest, given the cedar shakes and shingles controversy which erupted in the period since April 1986, is forestry. Note that most Canadians are of the view that the forestry sector will be more helped than harmed (+21 "helped" minus "harmed") by a Canada-U.S. trade agreement. Canadians aged 18 to 24 are more likely (+36) to consider forestry a winner. By contrast, those aged 55 to 64 are not (-1). Gender variations are slight, with women slightly less likely to award a positive net assessment. There are no significant variations on education or income.

In terms of cultural industries, there are interesting demographic variations in assessments. Men are more skeptical (-7 "helped" minus "harmed") than women about prospects for the cultural sector in the event of freer trade. As well, those residents between 25 to 34 years of age appear more positive (+15) about the effects on book publishing, television and the performing arts.

By contrast, those 65 or older are more negative (-16). So too are those with university educations (-22), or household incomes over $40,000 (-14) more concerned about potential harm to the industries at the heart of the cultural sector.

The following table presents regional breakdowns on sectoral impacts. As in the first wave of this study, the data suggest that Ontario residents are generally more concerned about potentially negative sectoral impacts. British Columbia residents are more positive in their assessment of net benefits to the forest sector under free trade, albeit in smaller numbers than in April compared to their counterparts in other provinces. Residents from the prairie provinces think that the financial, forestry and farm sectors will be the principal winners. Quebec respondents seem to contend that the banks and auto sector will benefit most under any free trade scenario with the United States. The forestry and fishing sectors are those most often identified as the beneficiaries in the Atlantic region.

Table 12

BENEFITS/LOSSES OF FREER TRADE WITHIN REGIONS BY SECTOR

	BRITISH COLUMBIA		PRAIRIES		ONTARIO		QUEBEC		ATLANTIC	
	Benefit %	Lose %	Benefit %	Lose %	Benefit %	Lose %	Benefit %	Lose %	Benefit %	Lose %
Banks/Financial Services	41	20	43	19	40	29	46	22	45	20
Forestry Industry	70	23	58	30	46	41	52	31	60	29
Farming/Agriculture	50	33	54	30	44	40	47	34	55	31
Fishing Industry	43	29	49	26	40	38	45	28	39	28
Auto Industry										
Cultural Industries	53	30	48	32	40	39	40	43	50	34
Textile/Clothing Industry	50	32	45	40	41	46	38	46	45	39

There has been a marked movement in assessments of sectoral impacts since April. Overall, evaluations of the net benefits to the forestry sector appear less positive than in April, even in British Columbia. Net declines in perceptions of the fortunes of the forestry industry under free trade are especially apparent in Quebec. Despite overall erosion in assessments of the benefits to the Canadian economy in general, those supportive regions, particularly British Columbia and the Prairies, indicate net gains in perceived benefits across most sectors. By contrast, there is a tendency to be more negative in July than in April among Quebec respondents. Ontario respondents, while still overall not supportive of free trade, appear slightly more positively inclined to assess the net benefits to the textile, cultural and farming sectors. Finally, while the textile sector is universally perceived to be the sector most at risk in the Canadian economy, this view appears to be softening somewhat.

Table 13

NET CHANGE IN PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFIT SINCE APRIL 1986 WITHIN REGIONS BY SECTOR

	BRITISH COLUMBIA %	PRAIRIES %	ONTARIO %	QUEBEC %	ATLANTIC %
Forestry Industry	-11	-3	-19	-30	-6
Farming/Agriculture	+19	+9	+7	-10	+2
Fishing Industry	+1	+17	-2	-5	+1
Auto Industry	+20	+13	-2	+13	+1
Cultural Industries	+23	+17	+11	+2	-4
Textile/Clothing Industry	+41	+16	+13	±0	+10

IV. EVALUATION OF FEDERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE TRADE TALKS

The starting point for any evaluation of federal management of the trade talks is overall perceptions of comparative advantages, if any, in negotiating skills brought to the bargaining table. Two questions were put to respondents to elicit views on this dimension. Are Americans perceived to be better bargainers? How well does the federal government advocate the Canadian position?

The majority of Canadians (57%) continue to be confident that Canadians can bargain effectively with Americans and get the best deal possible. However, the data suggest a slight (-4) erosion in this confidence in the period since April. Those respondents 65 years of age or older or those who have graduated from university appear more nervous about the negotiations. Positions on bilateral relations and cultural nationalism have a direct effect on expectations about comparative disadvantage in bargaining with the United States as one might expect. When it comes to provincial variations, confidence is more marked among supporters of free trade. In British Columbia, however, while overall support remains high, there is more insecurity about the negotiations (-8) compared to other supporters such as Alberta, as well as a decline in confidence since April.

The second dimension probed for assessments of whether the federal government generally "pushes its own point of view too strongly, noT strongly enough, or has the right balance." The majority (58%) are of the view that it does not push strongly enough. Nor has there been much material change in this lack of confidence in the federal government's advocacy since April. There are no significant demographic variations to this view. Not surprisingly, perceptions of the capacity for bargaining are directly related to overall positions on free trade. Proponents tend more often to state that the government is achieving the right balance than opponents, but even a majority of this group expressed dissatisfaction in this regard.

Table 14

PERCEPTIONS OF GOVERNMENT ADVOCACY BY SUPPORT FOR FREE TRADE

	PRO FREE TRADE IDEA %	ANTI FREE TRADE IDEA %
Government pushes too strongly	10	11
Has the right balance	37	24
Does not push strongly enough	52	65

Note: Percentages sum vertically and may not sum to 100% due to the exclusion of "no opinion."

In general, residents of Quebec seem more likely to think that the government is achieving the right note as composed to their provincial counterparts. Those Ontario respondents outside of the Metro Toronto area, on the other hand, are more often of the view that the federal government is pushing its point of view strongly.

Further questions asked for an assessment of the quality of the federal government's management of negotiations. Again, the majority (57%) of all Canadians think that the government is not managing negotiations well. Assessments tend to be marginally more positive in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Newfoundland. The following table details these measures by province.

Table 15

EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT OF TRADE TALKS BY REGION

	CANADIAN GOVERNMENT		
	Pushes Too Strongly %	Has Right Balance %	Doesn't Push Strongly Enough %
REGION			
British Columbia	10	32	58
Prairies	8	31	60
Ontario	14	22	63
Quebec	10	44	46
Atlantic Canada	8	32	59

Note: Rows sum horizontally and may not sum to 100% due to rounding and exclusion of "no opinion."

A. Perceived Legitimacy

Two scenarios were then presented to test for perceived legitimacy of the federal mandate in the talks. One hypothetical case stated that because the federal government had staked so much of its credibility on succeeding in the trade talks, it would "bargain away everything -- including the kitchen sink" in order to prevent their failure. The alternative hypothesized that the government would call the talks off if they did not prove in the best interests of Canada. The clear majority (68%) are of the view that the federal government puts the interests of Canada ahead of its own credibility. This reasonably high level of perceived legitimacy does not vary across region to any significant degree with the exception of metropolitan Toronto, where residents appear less convinced than the national average (-10) that the government would walk away from the table in the event of a bad deal.

By way of summary, then, while there is some dissatisfaction with federal leadership during the trade talks, there is no particular perception that this failure to assert Canadian views as vigorously as the public might like may amount to an impeding sell-out.

B. Awareness of the Chief Trade Negotiator

Overall, about one in three Canadians identified Mr. Reisman as Canada's chief trade negotiator. This is a reasonably high measure of awareness for a Canadian public figure. More importantly, among those Canadians who have heard of Mr. Reisman, the majority (20% of all Canadians) contend that he is doing a good job representing Canada's interests. Just 5% of all Canadians think that he is doing a bad job.

Respondents were also asked why they assessed Mr. Reisman's representation of Canada's interests the way they did. The following unaided responses were offered.

Table 15

ASSESSMENT OF REISMAN'S PERFORMANCE

	PERCENTAGE (n=349)
A Good Negotiator	23
Stands for Canada/Canadians	18
Good Background/Abilities	29
Other: Good Job	18
Poor Negotiator	2
Doesn't Stand up for Canada	3
Doing Nothing/A Poor Job	4
Americans are in Control	2

Awareness of Mr. Reisman is higher among men, and rises with the standard socio-economic indicators of education and income. Awareness of the chief negotiator is lower (-12) in Quebec.

C. Impact of the Cabinet Shuffle

Canadian residents were asked whether the cabinet shuffle would have any effect on the way the government manages the trade talks. A minority (39%) feel that the change in ministerial portfolios will improve the management of Canada-U.S. relations. On the other hand, few (11%) feel the change will hurt the talks. The plurality (46%) feel the shuffle will neither improve nor harm the negotiations. Indeed, net assessment -- subtracting harm from improvement -- is positive (+31). Those who have graduated university (-4) as well as those who reside in Ontario (-9) are less likely to be positively impressed by the action. Skepticism is particularly marked in Metro Toronto (net measure of +15 compared to the national average of +31). This would tend to suggest a general feeling that the shuffle amounted to an improvement in the prospects for government performance generally.

D. Normative Concerns

Conceptions of the importance of the provincial role in trade negotiations -- ostensibly an exclusive federal jurisdiction -- were also probed. There is a remarkable consensus that the importance of any free trade agreement is so high that it ought to involve the provinces. Just one in 10 Canadians would argue in favour of a unilateral federal initiative even if the provinces were opposed, for example. There is a slight weakening (-3) in support for this position since April. Fully 42% think that the pursuit of any such agreement must be approved by all provinces. This represents a gain of +5 since April. Another 40% (-3) think that it should meet the approval of a majority of provinces in some way. This view is more strongly held in Quebec (+6), but there is a pragmatic recognition that this may be easier said than done. Canadians recognize that it will be difficult to negotiate a deal which is satisfactory to all the provincial, labour and business interests involved. Almost 6 in 10 are skeptical that the government will ever be able to please everyone.

A second process concern had to do with any fiduciary responsibility to inform Canadians about what the government is prepared to negotiate. Fully 68% concur that the government should keep them informed, despite any potential advantage accrued to the Americans. Thirty-one percent (31%) on the other hand, think that the government should keep fairly quiet about its negotiations. This consensus appears to extend across all provinces. Men, or those who have graduated from university, are somewhat more likely (+8) to concede that there may be grounds for secrecy than their counterparts.

E. The Cedar Shakes and Shingles Controversy

The key event to intervene since the April tracking has been the controversy over the imposition of a tariff on Canadian cedar "shakes and shingles" in the United States. Overall awareness of the tariff is high at 81%. As one might expect, awareness is virtually universal (+14) among residents of British Columbia. It is markedly lower in Newfoundland (-12) and Quebec (-9) and rises with age and income. As well, men seem more likely to have heard of the debate.

What are perceptions of the federal management of the controversy? The consensus among 44% of all Canadians is that the federal government's response was not strong enough. Another 32% think that the response can be characterized as neither strong nor weak. There are no significant regional or demographic variations upon this theme. In sum, just 17% of all Canadians think the federal government's subsequent response was too strong.

What emerges from the data, is that the cedar shakes and shingles issue has had some impact on overall positions on free trade. The majority (54%) contend that the dispute had no material impact on their views. About one in four (23%) concede that the controversy may have made them more likely to feel that the free trade agreement might be a bad idea. A similar proportion (19%) reported the opposite effect. The sole regional or demographic variation on this dimension occurs among those 55 to 64 years of age. This group is more likely (+10) to report that they are inclined to consider the effects of free trade bad for Canada on the evidence of the cedar shakes and shingles controversy.

Canadians are also less likely to perceive forestry as a sectoral winner since April. There has been an erosion in perceptions of net benefit (-14). In general, British Columbia residents remain convinced about the virtues of free trade (+47), as do supporters in Newfoundland. Ontario residents, on the other hand, demonstrate more concern about potential harm, with net benefit scores of +5. Overall, forestry, like financial services, still remains among the industries most often identified by Canadians as likely to gain in the event of a freer trade agreement. For a minority of Canadians, however, the cedar shakes and shingles controversy, rather than confirming the need for freer trade, appears to call it into question.

V. THEMATIC ANALYSIS

The foregoing analysis establishes the skeletal outline of free trade support in Canada in July of 1986. What it does not address is the question of why Canadians adopt the positions that they do. The object here is to capture what concerns the free trade opponent or proponent. Respondents were presented with a number of issue propositions in order to partially determine what drives the formation of their views on free trade. The following table ranks the issues in order of consensus.

Table 16

ISSUE STATEMENT

	JULY 1986 $\overline{X}$	NET CHANGE SINCE APRIL 1986	PERCENT AGREE
Americans, while they may like us, don't do us any special favours when it comes to trade and economics.	2.23	+.24	75
Canada must maintain entirely independent social, cultural, and foreign policies even if they lead to problems in our economic and trade relations with the United States.			
There may be economic dislocations and short-term problems if Canada enters into free trade arrangements, but we will have to have free trade in order to ensure that there there will be more jobs in the future.	1.15	+.05	61
Even if it costs consumers a lot more to remain distinctly Canadian, that's a price I'm willing to pay.	1.00	N/A	60
If Canada appears to be too friendly with the United States, the Americans will take advantage of us.	.99	+.45	60
Unless we can manage a free trade agreement with the United States, then the Americans are going to place more and more tariffs on Canadian goods and we will lose our markets.	.91	N/A	57

Table 16 -- Continued

ISSUE STATEMENT

	JULY 1986 X	NET CHANGE SINCE APRIL 1986	PERCENT AGREE
I'm now convinced that if we did not try to get a trade agreement with the Americans, they would do things to make it more and more difficult to sell our goods and services to them.	.74	N/A	56
In the years ahead our exports will probably be more in the areas of information, services, and research rather than in natural resources or manufactured goods.	.61	+.28	54
Free trade with the United States would help Ontario industry more than industry in other provinces.	.54	-25	52
I believe that the federal government has a pretty clear sense of what it wants to gain and what it's prepared to give up in the trade talks.	.46	N/A	52
Because the government is focusing on Canada-United States trade, it's tending to ignore trading opportunities with the rest of the world.	.46	N/A	52
People who oppose a free trade agreement with the United States just don't have enough confidence in Canada.	.22	-.08	50
I'm concerned that the government is so committed to getting a trade deal, that even if they can only get a bad deal, they will go ahead and sign it to avoid embarrassment.	.15	N/A	49
Because Canada is small compared to the United States, Canadian companies would never survive if there were no trade barriers between the two countries.	.13	+.31	48

Table 16 -- Continued

ISSUE STATEMENT

	JULY 1986 $\bar{X}$	NET CHANGE SINCE APRIL 1986	PERCENT AGREE
I'm really concerned that the free trade issue is only going to create tensions and frustrations in Canada, just as things were getting better.	.11	+.35	46
Today, very few Canadian companies develop and manufacture world class products which can compete internationally.	-.06	+.31	48
If our economy becomes any more closely tied to the American economy we will lose our political independence.	-.09	+.04	46
All the discussions about free trade may matter to businesses, but free trade won't make any difference to the average Canadian worker.	-.78	+.42	37
I think a free trade deal with the Americans is important enough that we should be prepared to change our basic social system including things like unemployment insurance and health insurance.	-1.40	N/A	31

Note: N/A indicates that these were new issues statements and tracking data is not available.

The data suggest an overwhelming -- and increasing -- consensus (75%) that the United States will not do Canada any special favours. So too is the suspicion that Americans may be out to take advantage of us gaining ground. Conviction that Canada must maintain her independence remains strong for 67% of all Canadians. Tracking data indicate that the overall consensus about the top issues defining the debate remains relatively unchanged. The belief that Canadians must suffer short term adjustments for long term benefits in the event of any freer trade agreement persists (61%). At the same time, there is virtually equivalent conviction that if it costs consumers more to remain distinctively Canadian, then this is a price most are willing to pay.

However, there has been slight movement on certain issues. Agreement that the free trade issue may create tensions in Canada, or that free trade may make a difference to the average Canadian worker, appears to be growing since April.

A. Support for Freer Trade

An examination of the correlation between the various thematic issues and levels of overall support for the idea that the free trade initiative would be good for Canada continues to underline the importance of emotional concerns, as identified in the first wave. The dominant issues do not appear to be strictly economic ones, whether competition, enhanced productivity or trade balance. There is, instead, a resolve not to be caught napping by the Americans; a recognized need for vigilance, since Canadians will not get any special consideration from the United States.

At the same time, the majority of Canadians think that it is imperative to continue to assert political, cultural and economic independence from our southern neighbour.

Table 17 illustrates the degree of correlation between each of the issue statements and the position on whether "freer trade would be good for Canada" or whether "not having freer trade would be better."

Table 17

ISSUE STATEMENT	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT APRIL 1986	JULY 1986
Short-term problems, but free trade beneficial.	.4401	.4297
Free trade will create domestic tensions.	.3305	.3143
Those opposed lack confidence in Canada.	.2786	.2934
Canada will lose political independence.	.3103	.2851
Will pay the price to remain Canadian.	N/A	.2483
Government will sign anything.	N/A	.2380
Canada can't compete with Americans.	.3018	.2273
United States will take advantage of our friendship.	.2583	.2264
Canada ignoring other trading opportunities.	N/A	.1562
Must change our basic social system.	N/A	.1286
United States won't do us any favours.	.1142	.1171
Canada must remain independent.	.1059	.1143

Table 17 -- Continued

	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	APRIL 1986	JULY 1986
Government has a clear sense of talks.	N/A	.1039
Americans will place more tariffs on our goods.	N/A	.0702
Americans will make it more difficult to sell.	N/A	.0261
Future exports will be information and services.	.0637	.0076
Free trade will help Ontario more.	.0392	.0067
No difference for average Canadian worker.	.0131	.0038
Few Canadian world class products.	.0211	.0020

The dominant issues shaping support for free trade in July of 1986 have narrowed somewhat from the six identified in April. Furthermore, diminishing correlation coefficient values mean that any one issue statement has less influence on formation of individual positions on whether free trade may be good for Canada. This phenomenon may be a reflection of a broadening awareness of the complexity of the issues at stake.

By way of summary, then, Canadians remain concerned about the prospects of short term adjustment problems to free trade, and about the jeopardy these may pose to domestic harmony. But there persists a confidence in Canada's capacity to emerge unscathed from any agreement in the long term, as long as political independence continues to be strongly asserted. This conviction is bolstered by the view among the majority (70%) that any agreement will not necessarily eliminate jobs for Canadians and that their own province will benefit from freer trade overall.

B. Factor Analysis: Attitudes Toward Free Trade

In order to determine the interrelationships among these issue statements and, hence, the predominant combinations of opinion which comprise overall attitudes on the trade issue, factor analysis was conducted on the 19 issue propositions. Twelve of these propositions were duplicated from the first wave of the study, while the remaining seven issue statements appeared in the second wave only.

Factor analysis, by sorting a series of issue orientations into correlated groups or clusters, provides manageable information for understanding Canadian's attitudes towards trade and the formulation of a free trade strategy. These "factors" typically describe an underlying cluster of viewpoints and help to explain how overall opinion about the issue is structured.

1. Comparison with Wave I

As noted above, 12 of the issue statements were replicated from Wave I in April, 1986. A factor analysis on this subset of propositions was undertaken in order that a direct comparison could be made with the earlier results.

The current factor analysis shows a stability in the structure of attitudes since the results in April. At that time, the analysis identified four sets of issues defining Canadians in terms of their general attitudes towards freer trade as follows: raw nationalists — those who would prefer to distance Canada from the United States; optimistic traditionalists — those who believe freer trade would benefit Canada; wary optimists -- those who are wary of the United States, but not opposed to free trade; and inferiority complex -- those with little confidence in Canada's economic survival without the support of the United States. In the current analysis, the same attitudes are again loading into these four distinct factors, thereby confirming the persistence of the earlier structure of public attitudes on free trade.

In essence, then, while the free trade debate has perhaps become more engaged and the salience among the general public regarding this issue has increased, the underlying structure of beliefs which are driving public attitudes remain unchanged.

2. Wave II factor analysis

With the introduction of additional issue statements to the battery, the current factor analysis now identifies five factors. The factors define the same kinds of attitudes which were apparent in the earlier study with the inclusion of additional attitudinal elements.

Factor I

SOCIO-CULTURAL NATIONALISTS

PROPOSITION	FACTOR LOADING	EXCLUSIVE/SHARED
Canada must maintain independent social, cultrual and foreign policies	.777	exclusive
Willing to pay price to remain distinctly Canadian	.546	shared
Americans don't do us any favours	.454	shared

The factor loading refers to the correlation between the issue proposition and the factor as a whole; factor loadings are presented in order of their value from highest to lowest with values indicating the importance of the proposition as a component of the factor. The exclusive/shared column indicates which propositions appear only in this factor (exclusive) and those which also appear in another factor (shared).

As with the defensive nationalists (see below), this group clearly prefers to remain distinctly Canadian even if it costs consumers more as a result. However, this group looks at the free trade issue and its consequences from a socio-cultural point of view, preferring to endure difficulties in our economic and trade relations with the United States in order to maintain independent social, cultural and foreign policies.

Factor 2

DEFENSIVE NATIONALISTS

PROPOSITION	FACTOR LOADING	EXCLUSIVE/SHARED
Free trade will create tensions	.689	exclusive
Canada will lose political independence	.680	exclusive
United States will take advantage of our friendship	.574	shared
Canada can't compete with Americans without trade barriers	.569	shared
Short-term problems, but free trade beneficial	-.455	shared
Willing to pay price to remain distinctly Canadian	.450	shared
Government may commit to bad deal	.429	shared

This group is similar to the raw nationalists which appeared in the earlier study with some modifications. They view the free trade issue with an overriding concern for the retention of Canada's independence and with slightly more attention to the economic effects of dismantling trade barriers as compared to the socio-cultural nationalists. However, their concern is primarily for the tensions that would be created and the potential loss of Canada's independence. The predominant attitude here is that Canada cannot stand up to the United States without the assistance of protection at the border.

Factor 3

ECONOMIC CHANGE AGENTS

PROPOSITION	FACTOR LOADING	EXCLUSIVE/SHARED
Future exports will be information and services	.678	shared
Few Canadian world-class products	.666	exclusive
Should be prepared to change basic social system	.541	shared

As in the previous study, there is a group of Canadians which exhibit a concern for Canada's future viability given our current economic structure. Their prediction that future Canadian exports will be in information and services rather than in our traditional exports of manufactured goods, which they view as non-competitive on world markets, underlies their belief that we should be prepared to put our social system on the table in order to reach a free trade agreement.

Factor 4

GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS

PROPOSITION	FACTOR LOADING	EXCLUSIVE/SHARED
Government has a clear sense of what it wants to gain	.795	exclusive
Government may commit to bad deal	-.551	shared
Government ignoring other trading opportunities	-.451	shared

These Canadians have placed their faith and trust in the federal government to approach the negotiations with a well thought out strategy and arrive at a deal which will be in Canada's best interests. Additionally, they feel that the government is maintaining a balance between its discussions with the United States and trade opportunities elsewhere.

Factor 5

ALL OUT FREE TRADE PROPONENTS

PROPOSITION	FACTOR LOADING	EXCLUSIVE/SHARED
Without free trade, Americans will increase tariffs	.752	exclusive
Americans will make it more difficult for Canadian exports	.747	exclusive
Those opposed, lack confidence in Canada	.464	shared

These Canadians exhibit no skepticism or qualms about entering into a free trade agreement with the United States. In fact, they forecast a more difficult trading relationship between Canada and the United States if an agreement is not reached and attribute this to a trend toward increasing protectionism by the U.S. government.

3. The Factors

Tables 18 through 22 present the demographic breakdown of those who comprise the five factor types. This tells us which demographic groups are positively or negatively associated with each of the factors, in other words, who is most likely to fall into each of the groups and where they stand on specific issues.

Table 18

Factor I

SOCIO-CULTURAL NATIONALISTS

	POSITIVE ASSOCIATION	NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION
DEMOGRAPHICS	Residents of Quebec	Residents of B.C., the Prairies and Atlantic Canada
	Older people	
		Upper income ($50,000 +)
	Francophones	
POLICY ISSUES	Prefer cooler relation with U.S.	
	Personally lose if trade barriers removed	
	Bad idea to enter into free trade agreement	
SUPPORT/OPPOSITION TO FREE TRADE	No free trade better for Canada	

This factor tends to be associated with older persons. They are more likely to reside in Quebec. Socio-cultural nationalists do not believe that free trade would be a good idea and would prefer that Canada distance itself somewhat from the United States.

Table 19

Factor 2

DEFENSIVE NATIONALISTS

	POSITIVE ASSOCIATION	NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION
DEMOGRAPHICS	Residents of Ontario and Quebec	Residents of B.C. and the Prairies
	Men	Women
	Over 55 years of age	35-44 years of age
	Less educated	University graduates
	Francophones	
POLICY ISSUES	Prefer cooler relation with U.S.	
	Personally lose if trade barriers removed	
	Bad idea enter into free trade agreement	
SUPPORT/OPPOSITION TO FREE TRADE	No free trade better for Canada	

Defensive nationalists are similar to the socio-cultural nationalists primarily being associated with older people and those living in Quebec. However, this factor also includes men, the less educated and residents of Ontario. As with the socio-cultural nationalists, defensive nationalists would also prefer a cooler relationship with the United States and view free trade as a bad idea for Canadians.

Table 20

Factor 3

ECONOMIC CHANGE AGENTS

	POSITIVE ASSOCIATION	NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION
DEMOGRAPHIC	Residents of Quebec	Residents of Atlantic Canada, the Prairies and B.C.
	Women	Men
	$20,000-$30,000	$40,000-$50,000
	Less educated	
	Francophones	
POLICY ISSUES	Non-nationalist	Cultural nationalist
	Personally benefit a great deal from removal of barriers	
	Negotiations very urgent	
SUPPORT/OPPOSITION TO FREE TRADE	Free trade good for Canada	

Women, and the downscale, those of low socio-economic status, along with those living in Quebec tend to agree that Canada's economic basis must be restructured. This group also sees free trade as a good idea for Canada and an agreement an urgent priority for the Canadian government.

Table 21

Factor 4

GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS

	POSITIVE ASSOCIATION	NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION
DEMOGRAPHIC	Residents of Atlantic Canada	Residents of B.C.
	Men	Women
	45-54 Years of Age	25-34 Years of Age
	Lower income	
	Less educated	Students
	Non-union members	
POLICY ISSUES	Non-nationalist	Cultural nationalist
	Personally benefit from removal of barriers	
	Negotiations urgent	
SUPPORT/OPPOSITION TO FREE TRADE	Free trade good for Canada	

People in this group tend to be downscale, middle-aged and residents of the Atlantic provinces. Additionally, they tend also to have no union affiliation. Clearly, their faith in the government's expertise on the free trade issue dominates their views. For them, it will be good for Canada because the government supports it.

Table 22

Factor 5

ALL OUT FREE TRADE PROPONENTS

	POSITIVE ASSOCIATION	NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION
DEMOGRAPHIC	Women	Men
		18-24 years of age
	High school graduates	Some university
	Non-union members	
POLICY ISSUES	Non-nationalist	
	Prefer closer relation with U.S.	
	Personally benefit from removal of barriers	
	Good idea enter agreement	
	Negotiations urgent	
SUPPORT/OPPOSITION TO FREE TRADE	Free trade good for Canada	

People in this group tend to be women, high school graduates and those who are not union members. As with those who place their trust in the government on this issue, this group is even more strongly in favour of free trade and preferring a closer relationship between Canada and the United States. They also see how such an arrangement could be beneficial to them personally.

4. Summary

As in the previous study, the issues which continue to drive support or opposition to a free trade agreement continue to have their origin more in nationalist sentiments rather than in assessments of economic consequences. However, there now appears to be a subtle differentiation between socio-cultural and defensive nationalists, with those in the latter group expressing a fear of free trade based on the economic consequences for Canadian companies. Nevertheless, both socio-cultural and defensive nationalists exhibit vehement opposition to free trade. The remaining groups express varying degrees of support for free trade with government supporters trusting the federal government to make a good deal for Canada, while economic change agents see free trade as part of an inevitable economic restructuring -- part of a natural process. All out free trade proponents show no skepticism whatsoever in entering a free trade agreement with the United States.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Tracking data illustrate a slight softening of resolve among both supporters and, to a lesser extent, opponents of free trade in the period from April to July, 1986. This pattern is apparent even among those provincial residents from Newfoundland, Alberta and British Columbia most likely to endorse a freer trade agreement. In an interesting departure from the expected, this softening of support does not translate into a hardening of cultural nationalist positions. While there has been a slight increase in the number of Canadians who are not prepared to negotiate an agreement which would include the cultural industries, this has been counterbalanced by a growing belief that the cultural sector may indeed benefit from a free trade agreement.

At the same time, the principal intervening controversy over the American imposition of the tariff on cedar shakes and shingles, has not precipitated any significant movement on overall positions. Forestry and the financial service sectors are widely identified as the principal beneficiaries from a freer trade agreement. The perception that one's own province may benefit slightly more than Canada as a whole persists among most residents outside of Ontario.

Grounds for such confidence appear to lie in the conviction among the majority of Canadians, that despite the high likelihood of short-term economic dislocations, there will be no net loss in jobs.

Where do the major social groups fall on the issue of free trade? Tracking data in July of 1986 confirm the major regional and socio-demographic differences in patterns of support on opposition to free trade. Provincial supporters and opponents remain unchanged, although it appears the case for free trade is marginally gaining ground in Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and in Ontario, with the exception of metropolitan Toronto. Differences in perceptions of the relative importance of trade and benefits from freer trade continue to suggest the need for three distinctive regional subthemes in any national communications strategy. The communications strategy for Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, where there is more tendency to negative assessment of net benefits from freer trade, should stress the reliance of the current talks to the larger economic strategy to enhance trade. British Columbia and Alberta residents share the conviction that trade is critical and that Canada would benefit from any freer trade agreement with the United States. Any communications strategy for this region should emphasize the specific value of freer trade for their respective provincial economies. In Quebec and the Maritimes, the central thrust of any communications strategy must enhance perceptions of the importance of trade. For these provincial residents, overall awareness of the importance of trade is low, but there is a positive evaluation to the benefits from freer trade.

Age and education are important variables in determining views about free trade. Older Canadians are more convinced about the importance of trade, but more certain that there are significant risks involved in the initiative than their younger counterparts. Any national communications strategy should thus reinforce the importance of trade to Canada's overall economic growth and promote inter-regional benefits. So too are those with university education less positively oriented. But in this case, standard socio-economic status categories do not reinforce each other. Those Canadians at upper income levels, or those between 34 to 55 years of age who tend more often to be social activists, appear more positively oriented in their assessments of the prospects of free trade. The data do not suggest the need for a separate communication strategy for political activists. Those Canadians with high incomes, for example, appear to favour the initiative, while those with higher levels of education oppose it. The point to be made here is that these "movers and shakers" appear to divide fairly evenly on the trade issue.

Women appear less confident in their knowledge about the issues, but more likely to cite benefits at the sectoral level. As a result a gender-specific communication scheme is probably not warranted. On the other hand, women are more concerned about exacerbating intra-regional tension in the course of the negotiations.

If it may be said Canadians are favourably oriented to the concept of freer trade, this does not necessarily imply support for an immediate agreement with the United States. There is no perception of specific urgency associated with the agreement, although there is a recognition that overall relations with the United States have cooled since April.

There is also a recognition that the United States is not going to do Canada any favours, and indeed, may accelerate its protectionism. Canadians, therefore, support the need for continued vigilance on the part of Canada's negotiating team.

But while there is a recognition that the United States will continue to grow in importance as a future trading partner, there is not the view that this relationship should be exclusive. Even amongst the provincial constituencies most supportive of the concept of freer trade, a preference for a multilateral trade strategy persists.

Cognizance of the need for vigilance does not translate into support for the federal management of the trade talks. It is clear that Canadians still feel the government wants a closer relationship with the United States than most would prefer. The majority of Canadians feel that the federal government has not been strong enough in its negotiations to date, especially over the cedar shakes and shingles issue. On the other hand, the legitimacy of the federal mandate remains at reasonably high levels. Few would argue that the present administration would sacrifice Canada's interests for its own political fortunes. Awareness levels and assessments of Reisman are reasonably positive.

The data suggest Canadians want a firmer, businesslike federal approach to the talks, a natural corollary to any continuing assertion of Canada's political independence, but they do not want domestic harmony sacrificed. The majority advocate consensus-building among the provinces as a prerequisite for the agreement. As well, Canadians want a more open approach to the process -- one which will keep them apprised of all critical developments.

What is remarkable about the issues which determine positions on freer trade is their domestic orientation. Canadians are concerned about short-term problems and domestic tension arising from the process of hammering out an agreement. Other key determinants range from a desire to have confidence in Canada's capacity to enter head-to-head competition with the United States, to the need to maintain political independence. Singularly absent are the macro-economic issues.

For Canadians, then, it is freer trade if possible, but not necessarily free trade now with the United States. Sixty percent (60%) of all respondents agree that even if it costs consumers a lot more to remain distinctly Canadian it is a price they are willing to pay.

TECHNICAL APPENDIXES

APPENDIX

A. SURVEY OVERVIEW

Bruce Anderson and Catherine Murray were the Senior Research Consultants and principal investigators for this study and were assisted in the various phases of research and analysis by Donna Nixon.

1. Sample Selection

The population consists of all Canadian residents. Male and female respondents were selected in the same proportion as the general population, on a 50/50 sex quota. A total of 1500 interviews were completed.

Effective survey research must be based on a sample truly representative of the universe of interest. A multi-stage sampling technique was employed to gather the data for this study. The essential feature of this procedure is that individual respondents are predetermined by the selection procedure itself. That predetermination is made by careful speculation of a series of controlled choices.

The sampling technique produced a systematic random sample with probability of selection disproportionate to size at the national level. The first step in the sampling procedure was the division into 11 strata or "regions." (Table A)

Table A presents the total population of Canada represented in each region, followed by the percentages of the total population in each region. The third column presents the disproportionate sample actually completed followed by the weights used in each region. The fifth column represents the effective number of cases in each strata after the weighting was applied.

Table A

SAMPLE STRATA

REGIONS	TOTAL POPULATION	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION	DPS N	WEIGHTS	WEIGHTED N
British Columbia	2,900,400	11.45	186	.9247	172
Alberta	2,357,600	9.31	150	.93	140
Saskatchewan	1,020,100	4.03	95	.632	60
Manitoba	1,072,100	4.23	95	.663	63
Balance Ontario	6,947,100	27.43	243	1.6872	410
Metro Toronto	2,164,000	8.54	132	.9697	128
Quebec	6,597,700	26.05	337	1.1543	389
New Brunswick	719,400	2.84	75	.56	42
Nova Scotia	883,400	3.49	75	.71	53
Prince Edward Island	127,700	0.50	37	.22	8
Newfoundland	581,100	2.29	75	.46	35

Within each of these regions, a sampling procedure was employed which is based upon mapping the linkage between the geographic location of individual telephone exchanges and Statistics Canada's fundamental building block for the census -- the enumeration area (EA).

Telephone companies divide their service regions into smaller areas served by a single switching centre. Within each switching centre area, all telephone numbers begin with the same two digits. We refer to these mutually exclusive exchange areas as NNXs (NNX representing the first three digits of a telephone number). Using census data, together with maps showing the geographic boundaries of NNXs, it is possible to determine exact population figures for each NNX and determine the appropriate number of respondents to be surveyed in each NNX.

Primary sampling units (groups of NNXs) and secondary sampling units (individual NNXs) were selected on the basis of probability proportionate to population size. Telephone numbers were then generated using a computerized random number generation program employing random start and fixed interval methods.

3. Field Procedures

The questionnaires were printed, consecutively numbered, and assembled into field packs of three interviews -- two males and one female or two females and one male. This procedure ensured that the 50/50 sex quota would be met by preselecting half males and half females before the interviewing began.

The interviews took place between July 4 and July 14, 1986 and weekday interviewing was conducted between the hours of 5:30 and 10:00 p.m. Weekend interviewing was conducted between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The questionnaire contained 85 questions and took approximately 29 minutes to complete. Fifteen percent (15%) of all interviews were monitored while in progress for procedure and content from an extension monitor. All interviews were carefully edited as soon as they were completed to ensure that no questions were omitted and that skip-patterns were followed correctly.

Experienced telephone interviewers were used to collect the data. A briefing was held by the Field Supervisor and the Research Analyst was present to answer questions or clarify procedures. The Field Supervisor first read the questionnaire to the interviewers, thereby ensuring that pronunciation would be correct and uniform, and secondly, interviewer-respondent role-playing was used to illustrate skip and rotation patterns. The interviewers then had an opportunity to ask questions.

On the first evening in the field, the Research Analyst listened to the interviewers on an extension monitor. The monitor prevents the interviewer and respondent from knowing they are being listened to. This ensured that the skip and rotation patterns were followed correctly and that there were no questions causing interviewers any particular difficulty. When an error was caught, the interviewer was briefed again and the respondent was called back in order to correct the questionnaire.

All work was edited by the Senior Field Supervisor, checked for completeness, quality, and skip-pattern adherence. Then, 15% of each interviewer's work was verified; that is, respondents were contacted by telephone and were asked to verify that the interview actually took place. Respondents were also asked to answer a few questions from the questionnaire in order to check the accuracy of the data collected.

4. Coding

The questionnaires were coded and the data were entered by experienced Decima personnel. The following standard procedures were followed:

- An initial briefing;
- Supervision of trained staff; and
- Verification of 15% of each coder's work.

Using the first 25% of completed questionnaires in each stratum, codes were constructed for the open-end questions by sorting and writing out the responses into independent categories. The Research Analyst checked all categories for completeness and consistency.

5. Data Processing

The entry and processing of the data were carried out on-site using Decima's Digital PDP 11/44 computer. Decima's interactive software system, designed specifically for survey analysis, has a robust data entry facility, which permits cleaning of the data, including out-of-range values and skip-pattern errors, as well as other logic errors. The fully cleaned data were then summarized into aggregate tables. Further analysis of the data included crosstabulation tables, measures of association, regression analysis, and factor analysis.

6. Confidence Limits and Validation

The sample of 1500 cases produces results which are accurate for the population of as a whole within ±2.6 percentage points 95 out of 100 times.

In order to validate the sample, we compared our data for the age categories of the population with figures provided by Statistics Canada. Table B outlines the percentage of respondents in each age category for the sample, and the corresponding population figures. As these figures suggest, the sample drawn for this study reflects the more general characteristics of the adult population.

Table 8

SAMPLE VALIDATION

	SAMPLE (n=1500) %	UNIVERSE [1] (N=18,445,000) %
AGE		
18-19 Years	4.2	4.8
20-24 Years	11.5	13.0
25-29 Years	15.4	12.5
30-34 Years	16.9	11.4
35-39 Years	11.1	10.3
40-44 Years	8.0	8.1
45-49 Years	6.4	6.9
50-54 Years	6.1	6.8
55-59 Years	6.6	6.5
60-64 Years	5.1	6.0
65 Years and other	8.7	13.5

1 Adult population of Canada.
Source: Post Census Annual Estimates Age, Sex and Components of Growth of Canada, Provinces and Territories June 1, 1984, Catalogue 92-210.

It should be noted that age has been validated for Canadians who are 18 years of age or older. As well, the sample is only representative of residents in the provinces who have direct dialing telephone services. Therefore, Canadians who are accessible only by a telephone servicing a large number of people, such as senior citizen homes, hospitals, and Indian Reserves, and those who have only radio-telephone service or no telephone service at all, are automatically excluded from the sample. Any further questions the reader has about sampling should be referred to the Research Consultant.

While the most sophisticated procedures have been used to collect and analyze the information presented herein, it must be remembered that surveys are not predictions. They are designed to measure public opinion within identifiable statistical limits of accuracy at specific points in time. This survey is in no way a prediction of opinion or behaviour at any future point in time.

B. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

A.	Are you 18 years of age or older and a resident of Canada?	YES (CONTINUE)................A NO (ASK TO SPEAK TO ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT, IF STILL "NO," THANK AND TERMINATE)........B	
B.	Have I reached you at your home phone number?	YES (CONTINUE)................A NO (ASK TO SPEAK TO ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT, IF STILL "NO," THANK AND TERMINATE)........B	
C.	Do you, or does anyone in your vamily or household work in the following kinds of business ...a market research firm, advertising agency, public relations firm, or the news media?	YES (THANK AND TERMINATE -- RECORD INCIDENCE ON CALL RECORD SHEET)................A NO (CONTINUE)................B	
1.	Thinking generally about the trading that Canada does with other countries, how important would you say this trade is to our country...very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?	VERY IMPORTANT................1 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT............2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT............3 NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL..........4 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(68%) (28%) (3%) (2%) (*)
2.	And what about the importance of Canada's international trade to you personally? In other words, how important is Canada's international trade to the well-being of the company you work for, or if you are not working, the company that the principal wage earner in your household works for...very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?	VERY IMPORTANT................1 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT............2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT............3 NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL..........4 NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD WORKING (VOLUNTEERED)...............5 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(37%) (34%) (12%) (11%) (6%) (*)

Note 1: Responses may not sum to 100% due to rounding throughout the Technical Appendixes.

2: (*) denotes a percentage value greater than 0 but less than 0.5 throughout the Technical Appendixes.

3.	Thinking about the future and where Canada should try to sell more of the goods and services we produce, what country or area of the world do you think our efforts should be focused on? (ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE...DO NOT READ LIST)	FRANCE......................01	(1%)
		ENGLAND/UNITED KINGDOM.......02	(2%)
		PACIFIC RIM (JAPAN, KOREA CHINA, AUSTRALIA)..........03	(20%)
		EUROPE......................04	(15%)
		UNITED STATES...............05	(46%)
		THIRD WORLD.................06	(2%)
		WORLD WIDE..................07	(1%)
		AFRICA......................08	(1%)
		MIDDLE EAST.................09	(1%)
		RUSSIA......................10	(1%)
		CANADA......................11	(1%)
		SOUTH AMERICA...............12	(1%)
		ASIA........................13	(1%)
		GERMANY.....................14	(*)
		SOUTH AFRICA................15	(*)
		NICARAGUA...................16	(*)
		COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.........17	(*)
		NORTH AMERICA...............18	(*)
		SCANDINAVIA.................19	(*)
		CARIBBEAN...................20	(*)
		DENMARK.....................21	(0%)
		OPEC NATIONS................22	(0%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).....23	(6%)

4.	Which of the following best describes how you personally would like Canada's relationship with the UNITED STATES to be (READ AND ROTATE)...the warmest and closest of friends, close friends and trading partners, businesslike but neighbourly, or cool and independent?	WARMEST AND CLOSEST OF FRIENDS.....................1	(12%)
		CLOSE FRIENDS AND TRADING PARTNERS....................2	(37%)
		BUSINESSLIKE BUT NEIGHBOURLY.................3	(43%)
		COOL AND INDEPENDENT..........4	(7%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(*)

5.	And which of those four do you think the Canadian government sees as the ideal relationship with the United States...(READ AND ROTATE)?	WARMEST AND CLOSEST OF FRIENDS.....................1	(21%)
		CLOSE FRIENDS AND TRADING PARTNERS....................2	(41%)
		BUSINESSLIKE BUT NEIGHBOURLY.................3	(29%)
		COOL AND INDEPENDENT..........4	(7%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(2%)

6.	And which do you think best describes the way the relationship is at the present time between our two countries...(READ AND ROTATE)?	WARMEST AND CLOSEST OF FRIENDS....................1	(8%)
		CLOSE FRIENDS AND TRADING PARTNERS..................2	(24%)
		BUSINESSLIKE BUT NEIGHBOURLY.................3	(42%)
		COOL AND INDEPENDENT..........4	(24%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(2%)

7.	Thinking about the amount of trade Canada does with the United States, I'd like you to tell me, to the best of your knowledge, how important a trading partner we are to them. Would you say we are their most important trading partner, a fairly important trading partner, about as important as other trading partners, not too important, or not at all important to the Americans as a trading partner?	MOST IMPORTANT................1	(18%)
		FAIRLY IMPORTANT..............2	(39%)
		ABOUT AS IMPORTANT AS OTHER TRADING PARTNERS............3	(30%)
		NOT TOO IMPORTANT.............4	(12%)
		NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT..........5	(1%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(*)

As you may know, trade in goods and services between countries is not always completely free and open. Many countries place import taxes called tariffs or duties on certain goods and services coming into their country. There are also non-tariff barriers such as government regulations. These tariffs and other non-tariff barriers make the imported goods and services more costly to consumers, and thereby encourage them to buy goods and services produced in their own country.

8.	Compared to most other people you know, would you say your understanding of how these trade barriers work is very good, good, not so good, or not good at all?	VERY GOOD.....................1	(12%)
		GOOD..........................2	(49%)
		NOT SO GOOD...................3	(33%)
		NOT GOOD AT ALL...............4	(6%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(0%)

9.	Some people say that free or freer trade would be good for Canada because the removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers would increase our export opportunities and ultimately create jobs and stimulate the Canadian economy. Other people say that not having free or freer trade is better for Canada's economy and job situation because by keeping trade barriers in place more people buy Canadian products and services. Which one of these two points of view best represents your own?	FREE TRADE GOOD................1 NO FREE TRADE BETTER..........2 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......3	(53%) (44%) (3%)
10.	Actually, there are a fair number of barriers put in place by each country. If these barriers were all removed, and goods and services were able to flow more freely across the Canada-U.S. border, do you think Canada would benefit a great deal, benefit somewhat, neither benefit nor lose, lose somewhat, or lose a great deal?	BENEFIT A GREAT DEAL..........1 BENEFIT SOMEWHAT..............2 NEITHER BENEFIT NOR LOSE......3 LOSE SOMEWHAT.................4 LOSE A GREAT DEAL.............5 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(16%) (37%) (10%) (22%) (13%) (1%)
11.	And how about your family and the wage earners in your family, do you think they would benefit a great deal, benefit somewhat, neither benefit norlose, lose somewhat, or lose a great deal?	BENEFIT A GREAT DEAL..........1 BENEFIT SOMEWHAT..............2 NEITHER BENEFIT NOR LOSE......3 LOSE SOMEWHAT.................4 LOSE A GREAT DEAL.............5 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(10%) (34%) (37%) (12%) (5%) (1%)

12. Compared to other provinces, do you think your province would benefit a lot more, a little more, about the same, a little less, or a lot less if all trade barriers were removed?

A LOT MORE	1	(19%)
A LITTLE MORE	2	(30%)
ABOUT THE SAME	3	(26%)
A LITTLE LESS	4	(14%)
A LOT LESS	5	(10%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	6	(1%)

I'd like to read you a list of industries and ask you to tell me for each one, how you think that a freer trade agreement would affect those industries in Canada. For each one, please tell me whether you think that industry would be helped a great deal, helped a bit, neither helped nor harmed, harmed a bit, or harmed a great deal. How about...(READ AND ROTATE Q13 TO Q19).

13. farming and agriculture

HELPED A GREAT DEAL	1	(17%)
HELPED A BIT	2	(32%)
NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED	3	(16%)
HARMED A BIT	4	(20%)
HARMED A GREAT DEAL	5	(15%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	6	(1%)

14. the forestry industry

HELPED A GREAT DEAL	1	(24%)
HELPED A BIT	2	(30%)
NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED	3	(12%)
HARMED A BIT	4	(16%)
HARMED A GREAT DEAL	5	(17%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	6	(1%)

15. the fishing industry

HELPED A GREAT DEAL	1	(15%)
HELPED A BIT	2	(30%)
NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED	3	(22%)
HARMED A BIT	4	(18%)
HARMED A GREAT DEAL	5	(13%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	6	(2%)

16.	banks, insurance companies, and other financial service industries	HELPED A GREAT DEAL...........1	(14%)
		HELPED A BIT..................2	(29%)
		NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED.....................3	(31%)
		HARMED A BIT..................4	(16%)
		HARMED A GREAT DEAL...........5	(7%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(3%)

17.	cultural industries, such as book publishing, television, and the performing arts	HELPED A GREAT DEAL...........1	(18%)
		HELPED A BIT..................2	(26%)
		NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED.....................3	(18%)
		HARMED A BIT..................4	(19%)
		HARMED A GREAT DEAL...........5	(18%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(1%)

18.	the textile and clothing industry	HELPED A GREAT DEAL...........1	(15%)
		HELPED A BIT..................2	(27%)
		NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED.....................3	(15%)
		HARMED A BIT..................4	(23%)
		HARMED A GREAT DEAL...........5	(20%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(1%)

19.	the Canadian automobile industry	HELPED A GREAT DEAL...........1	(16%)
		HELPED A BIT..................2	(28%)
		NEITHER HELPED NOR HARMED.....................3	(19%)
		HARMED A BIT..................4	(20%)
		HARMED A GREAT DEAL...........5	(17%)
	END OF ROTATION	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(1%)

Now, I'm going to read you a list of statements different people have made recently about Canada-U.S. relations and ask you to tell me, for each of them, whether you agree or disagree. You can do this by giving me a number between -5 and +5, where -5 means you totally disagree with the statement, and +5 means you totally agree with the statement. Many people's opinions fall somewhere in between these two points depending on how they feel about the statement. The first statement is...(ROTATE STATEMENTS 20 THROUGH 38 ...READ FIRST STATEMENT...REPEAT SCALE INSTRUCTIONS IF REQUESTED) Where would you place yourself on this scale?

TOTALLY DISAGREE					DEPENDS					TOTALLY AGREE
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

		MEAN RATING
20.	Americans, while they may like us, don't do us any special favours when it comes to trade and economics.	2.23
21.	In the years ahead our exports will probably be more in the areas of information, services, and research rather than in natural resources or manufactured goods.	0.61
22.	Because Canada is small compared to the United States, Canadian companies would never survive if there were no trade barriers between the two countries.	0.13
23.	If Canada appears to be too friendly with the United States, the Americans will take advantage of us.	0.99
24.	Today, very few Canadian companies develop and manufacture world class products which can compete internationally.	-0.06
25.	There may be economic dislocations and short-term problems if Canada enters into free trade arrangements, but we will have to have free trade in order to ensure that there will be more jobs in the future.	1.15
26.	Free trade with the United States would help Ontario industry more than industry in other provinces.	0.54
27.	All the discussions about free trade may matter to businesses, but free trade won't make any difference to the average Canadian worker.	-0.78

		MEAN RATING
28.	If our economy becomes any more closely tied to the American economy we will lose our political independence.	-0.09
29.	People who oppose a free trade agreement with the United States just don't have enough confidence in Canada.	0.22
30.	Canada must maintain entirely independent social, cultural, and foreign policies even if they lead to problems in our economic and trade relations with the United States.	1.62
31.	I'm really concerned that the free trade issue is only going to create tensions and frustrations in Canada, just as things were getting better.	0.11
32.	Even if it costs consumers a lot more to remain distinctly Canadian, that's a price I'm willing to pay.	1.00
33.	I believe that the federal government has a pretty clear sense of what it wants to gain and what it's prepared to give up in the trade talks.	0.46
34.	Unless we can manage a free trade agreement with the United States, then the Americans are going to place more and more tariffs on Canadian goods and we will lose our markets.	0.91
35.	I think a free trade deal with the Americans is important enough that we should be prepared to change our basic social system including things like unemployment insurance and health insurance.	-1.40
36.	Because the government is focusing on Canada-United States trade, it's tending to ignore trading opportunities with the rest of the world.	0.46
37.	I'm now convinced that if we did not try to get a trade agreement with the Americans, they would do things to make it more and more difficult to sell our goods and services to them.	0.74
38.	I'm concerned that the government is so committed to getting a trade deal, that even if they can only get a bad deal, they will go ahead and sign it to avoid embarrassment.	0.15

END OF ROTATION

39. There has been some talk about whether or not Canada's cultural industries such as television, book publishing, and the performing arts should be included in our trade negotiations with the United States. Some people say that Canada's cultural identity has been growing stronger and that we should include cultural industries in the negotiations because it would provide them with new markets and opportunities. Other people say that cultural industries should not be included in the negotiations because if we do not protect these industries from American competition, sooner or later our cultural identity will be seriously threatened. Thinking of these two points of view, which <u>one</u> best reflects your own?	SHOULD INCLUDE CULTURAL INDUSTRIES (SKIP TO Q41)....1*	(49%)
	SHOULD NOT INCLUDE CULTURAL INDUSTRIES IN NEGOTIATIONS (GO TO Q40)................2	(51%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......3	(1%)

IF "SHOULD NOT INCLUDE CULTURAL INDUSTRIES IN NEGOTIATIONS" TO Q39, ASK:

40. What if not including cultural industries in our trade negotiations with the United States meant that we would have to make concessions in other areas which could cause the loss of jobs? Would you then favour or oppose including cultural industries in our trade negotiations with the United States?	FAVOUR.....................1	(33%)
	OPPOSE.....................2	(63%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)....3	(3%)

41. Some people say that they are nervous about Canada entering into freer trade negotiations because they feel that the Americans are better bargainers than Canadians and therefore we will end up with a poor deal.

Others say that they are confident that we will bargain firmly and effectively with the Americans and will get the best deal possible.

Thinking of these two points of view, which one best reflects your own?

NERVOUS ABOUT ENTERING FREER TRADE NEGOTIATIONS	1	(43%)
CONFIDENT IN BARGAINING FIRMLY AND EFFECTIVELY	2	(57%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	3	(1%)

Many people have different views about the effects of entering into some form of free trade agreement with the United States. I'd like to read you a list of contrasting points of view and ask you to tell me for each set, which point of view best reflects your own. The first two statements are...(READ QUESTIONS 42 - 43, ROTATING ORDER) Which view is closest to your own?

42. Canadian companies would create more jobs and be more profitable because of the access to a new, larger market.

Canadian companies would be overwhelmed by the strength of larger, richer American competitors.

WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS AND BE MORE PROFITABLE	1	(54%)
WOULD BE OVERWHELMED BY THE STRENGTH	2	(44%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	3	(2%)

---

43. Canadian consumers would be able to buy American made goods and services at lower prices than they now pay.

Prices of American goods and services probably would not be any lower than prices for the same Canadian goods and services.

END OF ROTATION

PRICES WOULD BE LOWER	1	(41%)
PRICES WOULD BE NO LOWER	2	(58%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	3	(1%)

---

44. If Canada entered into some form of more open trade agreement with the United States, some people have suggested that some of our industries would probably not be able to survive the competition with similar American industries, and jobs would be lost.

Others say that even if some jobs were lost in certain industries, about as many new jobs would be created in other industries where we can out-compete the Americans.

Still others say that such an agreement would cost some jobs, but even more new ones would be created.

Thinking about these three points of view, do you think there would be fewer jobs, the same number, or more jobs as a result of this type of agreement?

FEWER JOBS	1	(29%)
THE SAME NUMBER	2	(33%)
MORE JOBS	3	(37%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	4	(1%)

45. Do you think that in its dealings with the United States, the Canadian government pushes its own point of view too strongly, does not push its own point of view strongly enough, or has the right balance?

PUSHES ITS OWN POINT OF VIEW TOO STRONGLY	1	(11%)
HAS THE RIGHT BALANCE	2	(31%)
DOES NOT PUSH ITS OWN POINT OF VIEW STRONGLY ENOUGH	3	(58%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	4	(1%)

A lot of people talk about free trade and what it would mean for Canadians. I am going to read to you a list of various people and, for each one, I want you to tell me two things: How much influence does what they say about free trade have on your views, and how much their priorities and concerns about free trade are the same as yours.

The first one is the Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney.

ROTATE QUESTIONS 46 - 47

46. How much influence does what he says about free trade have on your views... (READ LIST)?	A GREAT DEAL..................1	(9%)
	A FAIR AMOUNT.................2	(30%)
	NOT VERY MUCH.................3	(41%)
	NONE..........................4	(19%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(1%)

47. How much are his priorities and concerns about free trade the same as yours... (READ LIST)?	EXACTLY THE SAME..............1	(3%)
	USUALLY THE SAME..............2	(39%)
	USUALLY DIFFERENT.............3	(43%)
	ALWAYS DIFFERENT..............4	(13%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(2%)

Your provincial premier.

ROTATE QUESTIONS 48 - 49

48. How much influence does what he says about free trade have on your views...(READ LIST)?	A GREAT DEAL..................1	(9%)
	A FAIR AMOUNT.................2	(32%)
	NOT VERY MUCH.................3	(40%)
	NONE..........................4	(18%)
	NO OPINION)...................5	(2%)

49. How much are his priorities and concerns about free trade the same as yours...(READ LIST)?	EXACTLY THE SAME..............1	(4%)
	USUALLY THE SAME..............2	(42%)
	USUALLY DIFFERENT.............3	(38%)
	ALWAYS DIFFERENT..............4	(11%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(5%)

Well known people in the field of entertainment like actors and singers.

ROTATE QUESTIONS 50 - 51

50. How much influence does what they say about free trade have on your views...(READ LIST)?

A GREAT DEAL	1	(5%)
A FAIR AMOUNT	2	(15%)
NOT VERY MUCH	3	(41%)
NONE	4	(36%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(3%)

51. How much are their priorities and concerns about free trade the same as yours...(READ LIST)?

EXACTLY THE SAME	1	(3%)
USUALLY THE SAME	2	(29%)
USUALLY DIFFERENT	3	(41%)
ALWAYS DIFFERENT	4	(19%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(9%)

The leader of the NDP, Ed Broadbent.

ROTATE QUESTIONS 52 - 53

52. How much influence does what he says about free trade have on your views...(READ LIST)?

A GREAT DEAL	1	(9%)
A FAIR AMOUNT	2	(31%)
NOT VERY MUCH	3	(36%)
NONE	4	(22%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(2%)

53. How much are his priorities and concerns about free trade the same as yours...(READ LIST)?

EXACTLY THE SAME	1	(5%)
USUALLY THE SAME	2	(40%)
USUALLY DIFFERENT	3	(38%)
ALWAYS DIFFERENT	4	(14%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(4%)

People who run large Canadian publishing and broadcasting companies.

ROTATE QUESTIONS 54 - 55

54. How much influence does what they say about free trade have on your views...(READ LIST)?

A GREAT DEAL	1	(9%)
A FAIR AMOUNT	2	(33%)
NOT VERY MUCH	3	(40%)
NONE	4	(16%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(2%)

55.	How much are their priorities and concerns about free trade the same as yours...(READ LIST)?	EXACTLY THE SAME..............1	(3%)
		USUALLY THE SAME..............2	(41%)
		USUALLY DIFFERENT.............3	(40%)
		ALWAYS DIFFERENT..............4	(11%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(6%)

The leader of the Liberals, John Turner.

ROTATE QUESTIONS 56 - 57

56.	How much influence does what he says about free trade have on your views....(READ LIST)?	A GREAT DEAL..................1	(4%)
		A FAIR AMOUNT.................2	(30%)
		NOT VERY MUCH.................3	(41%)
		NONE..........................4	(24%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(1%)

57.	How much are his priorities and concerns about free trade the same as yours...(READ LIST)?	EXACTLY THE SAME..............1	(3%)
		USUALLY THE SAME..............2	(37%)
		USUALLY DIFFERENT.............3	(43%)
		ALWAYS DIFFERENT..............4	(14%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(4%)

Thinking about each of the people or groups we have just talked about, I would like you to tell me, for each one, whether you think they support or oppose free or freer trade with the United States. The first one is (READ AND ROTATE Q58 TO Q63). Does he/they strongly support, support, oppose, or strongly oppose free or freer trade?

58.	The Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney?	STRONGLY SUPPORT..............1	(57%)
		SUPPORT.......................2	(35%)
		OPPOSE........................3	(4%)
		STRONGLY OPPOSE...............4	(2%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(2%)

59.	Your provincial premier?	STRONGLY SUPPORT..............1	(13%)
		SUPPORT.......................2	(55%)
		OPPOSE........................3	(22%)
		STRONGLY OPPOSE...............4	(4%)
		NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(7%)

60. Most of the people who run large Canadian publishing and broadcasting companies.

STRONGLY SUPPORT	1	(6%)
SUPPORT	2	(36%)
OPPOSE	3	(41%)
STRONGLY OPPOSE	4	(8%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(9%)

61. The Liberal leader, John Turner?

STRONGLY SUPPORT	1	(4%)
SUPPORT	2	(42%)
OPPOSE	3	(43%)
STRONGLY OPPOSE	4	(5%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(7%)

62. Most of the well-known people in the field of entertainment like actors and singers?

STRONGLY SUPPORT	1	(4%)
SUPPORT	2	(38%)
OPPOSE	3	(37%)
STRONGLY OPPOSE	4	(8%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(13%)

63. The NDP leader, Ed Broadbent?

STRONGLY SUPPORT	1	(4%)
SUPPORT	2	(29%)
OPPOSE	3	(45%)
STRONGLY OPPOSE	4	(17%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(6%)

END OF ROTATION

64. If the federal government were able to negotiate an agreement with the American government, should it pursue such an agreement only if (ROTATE)...all of the provinces approved of the agreement, most of the provinces approved, about half of the provinces approved, or in the face of opposition from most provinces, should the federal government pursue such an agreement if it is convinced that it would be in the best interests of Canada?

ALL OF THE PROVINCES	1	(42%)
MOST OF THE PROVINCES	2	(40%)
HALF OF THE PROVINCES	3	(7%)
PURSUE EVEN IF PROVINCES OPPOSE	4	(11%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(*)

65. How likely do you think it is that the federal government will be able to negotiate a deal which is satisfactory to the American government and also to the provincial governments, the labour union movement, and business in Canada? Would you say it is very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not likely at all?	VERY LIKELY....................1 SOMEWHAT LIKELY................2 NOT TOO LIKELY.................3 NOT LIKELY AT ALL..............4 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).......5	(6%) (35%) (42%) (17%) (*)
66. In your view, if Canada and the United States were able to reach an agreement on trade, how long do you think it would be before the effects would be felt in Canada...almost right away, two to three years, three to five years, five to ten years, or more than ten years?	ALMOST RIGHT AWAY..............1 TWO TO THREE YEARS.............2 THREE TO FIVE YEARS............3 FIVE TO TEN YEARS..............4 MORE THAN TEN YEARS............5 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).......6	(20%) (39%) (27%) (10%) (4%) (1%)
67. Do you recall hearing or reading anything in the news lately about the United States placing a tariff on Canadian cedar wood products known as "shakes and shingles?"	YES............................1 NO.............................2 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).......3	(81%) (19%) (*)
68. In your view, did the Canadian government respond to the tariff much too strongly, too strongly neither strongly nor weakly, too weakly, or much too weakly?	MUCH TOO STRONGLY..............1 TOO STRONGLY...................2 NEITHER STRONGLY NOR WEAKLY....3 TOO WEAKLY.....................4 MUCH TOO WEAKLY................5 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).......6	(3%) (14%) (32%) (32%) (12%) (7%)
69. Did the controversy about cedar shakes and shingles make you more likely to feel the government's attempt to negotiate a freer trade agreement with the United States is a good idea, a bad idea, or did it not really change your view?	GOOD IDEA......................1 BAD IDEA.......................2 DID NOT REALLY CHANGE VIEW.....3 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED).......4	(19%) (23%) (54%) (4%)

70. To the best of your knowledge, which of these men is Canada's chief trade negotiator in this initiative (ROTATE LIST)... Simon Reisman (REESE-MAN), Peter Murphy, or Chris Martyn?	SIMON REISMAN (GO TO Q71).....1	(30%)
	PETER MURPHY (SKIP TO Q73)....2*	(28%)
	CHRIS MARTYN (SKIP TO Q73)....3*	(16%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......4	(26%)

IF "SIMON REISMAN" TO Q70, ASK:

71. Is it your impression that Mr. Reisman is doing a very good, good, bad, or a very bad job representing Canada's interests?	VERY GOOD....................1	(8%)
	GOOD.........................2	(65%)
	BAD..........................3	(14%)
	VERY BAD.....................4	(2%)
	NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)....5	(11%)

72. What is the main reason why you feel that way? (PROBE ... ACCEPT ONLY ONE RESPONSE...ANSWER MUST BE AT LEAST TEN WORDS)

GOOD NEGOTIATOR	01	(10%)
FOR CANADA/CANADIANS	02	(11%)
BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE	03	(6%)
GOOD SPEAKER/SPEAKS MIND	04	(1%)
CAPABLE/BEST FOR JOB	05	(5%)
FROM WHAT SEEN/HEARD	06	(5%)
NOT GIVE IN TO AMERICA	07	(6%)
KNOWS WHAT HE'S DOING	08	(5%)
GOOD POINT OF VIEW	09	(2%)
DOING A GOOD JOB	10	(9%)
KNOWS WHAT HE WANTS	11	(2%)
NO MISTAKES	12	(1%)
TALKS ARE GOING WELL	13	(1%)
SHAKES/SHINGLES	14	(2%)
NOT DONE ANYTHING YET	15	(2%)
OTHER -- GOOD JOB	16	(4%)
AMERICANS IN CONTROL	17	(2%)
NOT FOR CANADA/CANADIANS	18	(3%)
SHAKES/SHINGLES	19	(2%)
DOING NOTHING	20	(1%)
NOT SEEN/HEARD ANYTHING	21	(4%)
POOR JOB -- GENERAL	22	(2%)
NOT FAVOUR OF FREE TRADE	23	(*%)
POOR NEGOTIATOR	24	(2%)
NOT REP SPECIAL INTEREST	25	(*%)
GOVERNMENT POSITION UNCERTAIN	26	(*%)
OTHER -- POOR JOB	27	(1%)
OTHER	28	(0%)
DON'T KNOW	29	(7%)
NO RESPONSE	30	(5%)

REFER TO APPENDIX C FOR COMPLETE VERBATIM RESPONSES

73. Some people say that the government has a responsibility to tell Canadians quite a bit about what they are prepared to negotiate with the Americans. Others say that if the government speaks publicly about what it's prepared to negotiate, this will only give the Americans an advantage over us so that the government should keep fairly quiet about its approach to these negotiations. Which <u>one</u> of these two points of view best reflects your own?	HAVE RESPONSIBILITY TO TELL CANADIANS WHAT THEY ARE NEGOTIATING.................1 KEEP FAIRLY QUIET ABOUT NEGOTIATIONS................2 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......3	(68%) (31%) (1%)
74. As you may know, there have recently been news reports that public opinion polls say some people feel the government has not been managing the trade negotiations very well. In general, would you say the government is managing the negotiations very well, well, not too well, or not well at all?	VERY WELL.....................1 WELL..........................2 NOT TOO WELL..................3 NOT AT ALL WELL...............4 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......5	(4%) (39%) (43%) (12%) (2%)
75. As you may be aware, the Prime Minister recently announced a cabinet shuffle which included changes in the people responsible for the trade negotiations. Based on what you have heard or read, is it your view that these changes will greatly improve the way the government manages the negotiations, improve it somewhat, neither improve nor harm it, harm it somewhat, or greatly harm the way the government manages these talks?	GREATLY IMPROVE...............1 IMPROVE SOMEWHAT..............2 NEITHER IMPROVE NOR HARM......3 HARM SOMEWHAT.................4 GREATLY HARM..................5 NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)......6	(3%) (37%) (46%) (9%) (3%) (3%)

76. Some people say that because the federal government has staked so much of its credibility on succeeding in these trade talks they will agree to anything to keep them from failing.

Others say that the government would never agree to a freer trade deal that was not in Canada's best interests and they would say that the talks had failed and call them off rather than agreeing to a bad deal.

Which one of these two points of view best reflects your own?

AGREE TO ANYTHING	1	(31%)
WOULD CALL TALKS OFF	2	(68%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	3	(1%)

77. Overall, would you say it would be a very good idea, a good idea, a bad idea, or a very bad idea to enter into some type of more open trade agreement with the United States?

VERY GOOD	1	(12%)
GOOD	2	(66%)
BAD	3	(19%)
VERY BAD	4	(2%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(1%)

78. Would you say the need to negotiate such an agreement is very urgent, urgent, not too urgent, or not urgent at all?

VERY URGENT	1	(7%)
URGENT	2	(36%)
NOT TOO URGENT	3	(47%)
NOT URGENT AT ALL	4	(10%)
NO OPINION (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(1%)

Now, I have a few final questions for statistical purposes...

79. What is your age, please? (IF RESPONDENT REFUSES, OFFER TO READ CATEGORIES AND HAVE HIM/HER TELL YOU WHICH CATEGORY HE/SHE FALLS INTO)

18-19 YEARS	01	(4%)
20-24 YEARS	02	(12%)
25-29 YEARS	03	(15%)
30-34 YEARS	04	(17%)
35-39 YEARS	05	(11%)
40-44 YEARS	06	(8%)
45-49 YEARS	07	(6%)
50-54 YEARS	08	(6%)
55-59 YEARS	09	(7%)
60-64 YEARS	10	(5%)
65 YEARS OR OLDER	11	(9%)

80. Which of the following income groups includes your annual household income? (READ CHOICES)

LESS THAN $ 5,000	01	(2%)
$ 5,000 - $ 9,999	02	(7%)
$10,000 - $14,999	03	(11%)
$15,000 - $19,999	04	(12%)
$20,000 - $24,999	05	(12%)
$25,000 - $29,999	06	(12%)
$30,000 - $34,999	07	(11%)
$35,000 - $39,999	08	(8%)
$40,000 - $44,999	09	(7%)
$45,000 - $49,999	10	(5%)
$50,000 AND OVER	11	(13%)

81.A Are you currently attending school, college, or university as a full-time student?

YES (SKIP TO Q82)	6*	(7%)
NO (GO TO Q81B)	A	

IF "NO" TO Q81A, ASK:

81.B What is the highest level of schooling that you have completed?

PUBLIC/ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADE 1-8)	1	(6%)
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	2	(19%)
GRADUATED HIGH SCHOOL (GRADE 12 OR 13)	3	(33%)
VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL/ COLLEGE/CEGEP	4	(15%)
SOME UNIVERSITY	5	(5%)
GRADUATED UNIVERSITY	7	(15%)

82.	Do you or does any other member of your family belong to a labour union?	RESPONDENT....................1	(14%)
		OTHER.........................2	(17%)
		BOTH (VOLUNTEERED)............3	(4%)
		NONE..........................4	(65%)
83.	Are you currently employed outside the home?	YES...........................1	(67%)
		NO............................2	(33%)
84.	Sex. (BY OBSERVATION)	MALE..........................1	(50%)
		FEMALE........................2	(50%)
85.	Language of questionnaire.	ENGLISH.......................1	(77%)
		FRENCH........................2	(23%)

C. VERBATIM RESPONSES

Question 72

Is it your impression that Mr. Reisman is doing a very good, good, bad, or a very bad job representing Canada's interests?

What is the main reason why you feel that way?

GOOD JOB

01. Good Negotiator -- He is a strong negotiator. / Because we really haven't had any stories to say differently that he's a good negotiator. / Mr. Reisman is a very good negotiator. / Reisman's doing his best to negotiate a settlement. / Good negotiator. Preliminary comments were good. / I think he's a competent negotiator. / As a negotiator he is doing okay. / Very good bargainer. / Difficult to say since he hasn't accomplished anything yet but we need a strong negotiator. We can't back down and get nothing. Reisman's a strong person. / From what I've heard he's a real fighter and he'll do a lot for our interests. / I think he's a good negotiator. I like what I see of him. / I like his act. He is a good bargainer. / He's pushing very hard to make a good deal. / He's aggressive with the United States' negotiations. / Has a businesslike approach. / Very politically minded -- doesn't give us any information, that is why he's good.

02. For Canada/Canadians -- He's trying to do a good job. Trying for Canadian interests. / Very sharp in trade and can represent Canada in a very good way. / I think he's representing Canada firmly. / He's got Canada's interests at heart. Not listening to the President like Mulroney is. / He will fight for Canada. /I haven't heard anything bad. He should know what we want because he listens to people. / Mainly because he is taking everybody's point of view into account. / I think he is going after Canadian interests. / Because he is doing his best for Canada's best interest. / He seems to be with the people of Canada and not with vested interests. / He seems to take the concerns of the people into account. / He has a very strong overall knowledge of the workings of our country. / He's acting in the best interests of all Canadians.

03. Background/Experience -- Able to negotiate firmly and strongly -- good background in negotiations and government. / He's a very intelligent man who has done good work in the past. / Based on his past performance I think he could do it. / He has a lot of previous experience in this sort of thing. / He is a good negotiator. He's doing this before he gave us a good deal with the auto pact. / Pretty good with auto pact -- help Ontario. / He is a good negotiator. He was a good negotiator in the auto pact. / He is a good man in the government. / His general experience. / His background -- I think it's prepared him for the job. / He has a good strong personality. He has a lot of experience.

Question 72 -- Continued

Is it your impression that Mr. Reisman is doing a very good, good, bad, or a very bad job representing Canada's interests?

What is the main reason why you feel that way?

04. Good Speaker/Speaks His Mind -- Certainly speaks his mind. / He is a very commanding speaker and a powerful figure. / He's a little outspoken and seems to know what we want from the talks. / He is a good speaker and will do a good job for Canada. / Because he is a man who speaks his mind and lays everything out on the line.

05. Capable/Best For The Job -- Because he wouldn't be picked if he wasn't capable of doing it. / Believe he's best for job. / He is a good man for the job. We need more coverage of him in the west. / He would lose his credibility if he didn't do a good job. He's sincerely trying. / I feel he does his job and deserves a good credit for it. / He is acting to the best of his abilities. / He's a capable man. / He's well qualified but has to listen to the government. / He is trying to be positive and is as diplomatically forceful as he can be. / I think he is making an honest effort. / He knows what he's up against, therefore, he is honest and knows what to do.

06. From What I've Seen/Heard -- News reports, comments by him, television reports of him -- basically all that I've seen and heard of what he does. / I say this only from what I've heard as I don't really know. / The general impression I have and the letter I have read about him. / Based on what I've seen or heard of him he's doing a good job in providing a solution. / Through articles read in different journals. That is the reason for Mr. Reisman doing a good job. / Nothing specific just his overall capabilities from what I've heard. / He should come across well on television and he seems to be a good worker by observation. / I've seen him on television, and I've also read about him, and I like what he's doing so far. / Seen his interview on television. He seems to debate well.

07. Not Giving In To Americans -- He's not backing down to the Americans. / He hasn't given the store away yet and is doing a very good job. / He's holding his own ground; he is not giving in. / He hasn't really given anything away yet which is good. / Staying with it. Not backing down. Holding his own and stating our case with strength. / Well the fact that he's taking his time, not too impulsive, not selling us out. / We're holding our own. / As long as he doesn't let them pull the wool over our eyes. As long as he doesn't knuckle under. / He stated that the things that would be on the table they were discussing. / He's presenting things to Americans they don't like, like the protection of our social services.

Question 72 -- Continued

Is it your impression that Mr. Reisman is doing a very good, good, bad, or a very bad job representing Canada's interests?

What is the main reason why you feel that way?

08. Knows What He's Doing -- I like the way he talks about the issue, seems to know what he is doing. / He knows what he is doing. He is very knowledgeable about trade. / He does a good job at it. He seems to know what he is talking about. / He is doing what he thinks is necessary. / I think he is honest. He tells it like it is and is generally doing a good job. / Trying to do the best he can. Too early to tell. / Knows both sides of the story.

09. Good Point of View -- Because I believe in his point of view. / Statements he has made directly. I feel his views relate to mine.

10. Doing A Good Job -- Seems to be doing an alright job. / He is a good friend of John Turner and he knows what he is doing. / Because he is a very organized person and is doing things quietly. / Doing what he's supposed to do. / At the present time he is doing a competent job. / We have not heard too much about him here but I think what he is doing is adequate. / I guess he's doing the best he could. / Feel he has pressure on him to do a good job. / Not rushing, taking his time and being a diplomat. / He hasn't said a lot because he's studying it and looking into it. / Because he's getting the attention of the people he's trying to reach. / He is American employed by Canada. He is alright.

11. Knows What He Wants -- He's sticking to his guns, he knows what he wants. / Tough with his issues. / Sounds like he knows what he's talking about.

12. No Mistakes -- It is a feeling I have. I can't put my finger on anything. He has not blundered. / He seems to be doing alright so far. No big mistakes. / They haven't made any major blunders. / He hasn't fallen on his face so far. They've just begun.

13. Talks Are Going Well -- I feel that the talks good. Off to a good start. / A lot of talk, no fighting or bickering, friendly gestures.

14. Shakes/Shingles -- Both sides are still talking even after the "shingles" incident. / He's taking precautions like when the shakes and shingles problem came up. / Through his reaction to the Unites States government placing the tariffs on Canadian imports. / They way they put tariffs back on the United States; we will get the United States back if they get Canada.

Question 72 -- Continued

Is it your impression that Mr. Reisman is doing a very good, good, bad, or a very bad job representing Canada's interests?

What is the main reason why you feel that way?

15. Hasn't Done Anything Yet -- Has not done enough yet to really know. / It hasn't gone that far yet. / No real negotiating has taken place on trade issues. / Because they haven't reached an agreement. / Have not expressed anything in the public forum yet.

16. Other -- Good Job -- The economy is still strong and vibrant. / The whole issue is very complex. Hope people involved know what they are doing. / He's been elected, he will. / He barks as loud as the Americans that what he accomplishes is worth $1,000 a day. / No one else is doing anything. / Somebody has to talk.

POOR JOB

17. Americans In Control -- They are taking no initiative on anything and just letting the Americans dictate everything. / Because everything Canada asks for, the Americans turn down the proposition. / Americans seem to have the upper hand in the free trade talks. / Will compromise too many of Canada's assets. Willing to give away too many things to obtain free trade. / I don't think we should give in to the Americans and that's what he seems to be doing. / I think the United States has a monopoly. United States' representatives are better in trade negotiations.

18. Not for Canada/Canadians -- I don't think he represents the majority of the people. / He seems to be more concerned about government rather than average people. / They seem less concerned in convincing the Canadian public that what they are doing is the right thing. They are just doing their own thing. / He was not strong enough for Canada's interests. / He is insensitive to Canadian cultural identity.

19. Shakes/Shingles -- They could have hurt the United States on shakes and shingles. / Because referring back to cedar shakes, there was 37% on it and the Americans didn't have enough shakes to supply their own markets. They have to import from Canada.

20. Doing Nothing -- There seems to be too much wavering at the moment with no real progress being made. / Because they don't get anywhere. They argue and go back and forth.

Question 72 -- Continued

Is it your impression that Mr. Reisman is doing a very good, good, bad, or a very bad job representing Canada's interests?

What is the main reason why you feel that way?

21. Haven't Seen/Heard Anything -- You don't hear too much on television and radio about what is being done on the trade negotiation talks. / Lack of information. Haven't heard too much about him. / I haven't heard enough about what he is doing yet. / Hasn't been much said. Doesn't seem to be strong enough. / He doesn't tell the public how the negotiations are going. / I haven't seen any feedback or progress. / He has no feedback on any issues. / Nothings happened at all so far. I've heard nothing. / He's not putting his ideas across too strongly. We don't get enough feedback on what he's doing. / Don't think he's made it clear on where he stands on free trade.

22. Poor Job -- General -- He doesn't impress me. / He said bad remarks to Peter Murphy and could do a better job. / He's not working hard enough at what he's doing. / Doing his job but not to his fullest potential. / Mr. Reisman should be more definite in his negotiation process.

23. Not in Favour or Free Trade -- I don't think they should be doing the trade talks at all.

24. Poor Negotiator -- He's cocky and blunt. He's not a salesman. / Issue is forced in a manner of controversy not negotiations.

25. Not Representing Special Interests -- Because basically I don't think they are taking the best interest of manufacturers.

26. Government's Position Uncertain -- I maintain that the government is not sure what they're getting involved with.

27. Other -- Poor Job -- If the government got re-elected maybe Mr. Reisman will be better with his views. / I don't like oil and whisky mixed; by buying Hiram Walker he should get his nose out of Gulf. / His previous occupations. Some of his interests -- the water resource company that wanted to sell water. / Things could be no better than they way it is now.

28. Don't Know

29. No Response

D. DERIVATION OF NEW VARIABLES

86. REGION

was derived from questionnaire identification numbers. The resulting categories were labelled as follows:

1.	BRITISH COLUMBIA;	(12%)
2.	ALBERTA;	(9%)
3.	SASKATCHEWAN;	(4%)
4.	MANITOBA;	(4%)
5.	BALANCE OF ONTARIO;	(27%)
6.	METRO;	(9%)
7.	QUEBEC;	(26%)
8.	NEW BRUNSWICK;	(3%)
9.	NOVA SCOTIA;	(4%)
10.	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND; and	(1%)
11.	NEWFOUNDLAND.	(2%)

87. REGION REVISED

was derived from questionnaire identification numbers. The resulting categories were labelled as follows:

1.	BRITISH COLUMBIA;	(12%)
2.	PRAIRIES;	(18%)
3.	ONTARIO;	(36%)
4.	QUEBEC; and	(26%)
5.	ATLANTIC.	(9%)

88. COMMUNITY SIZE

was derived from questionnaire identification numbers. The resulting categories were labelled as follows:

1.	1,000,000 AND OVER;	(29%)
2.	100,000 - 999,999;	(27%)
3.	10,000 - 99,999; and	(10%)
4.	UNDER 10,000/RURAL.	(34%)

89. UNION FAMILY

was derived from
Q.82:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.82	Q.89		
1,2,3	1.	UNION FAMILY; and	(35%)
4	2.	NON-UNION FAMILY.	(65%)

90. Q20C:US DO NO FAVOURS

was derived from
Q.20:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.20	Q.90		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(18%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(7%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(75%)

91. Q21C:FLT EXPORT=INFORM

was derived from
Q.21:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.21	Q.91		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(36%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(10%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(54%)

92. Q22C:CDN COS NOT SURVIVE

was derived from
Q.22:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.22	Q.92		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(43%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(9%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(48%)

93. Q23C:US ADVAN/CDA FRIEND

was derived from
Q.23:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.23	Q.93		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(33%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(7%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(60%)

94. Q24C:FEW CDN WORLD CLASS

was derived from
Q.24:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.24	Q.94		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(44%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(8%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(48%)

95. Q25C:PROB BUT NEED FR TR

was derived from
Q.25:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.25	Q.95		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(28%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(12%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(60%)

96. Q26C:FR TR HELP ONTARIO

was derived from
Q.26:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.26	Q.96		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(35%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(14%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(51%)

97. Q27C:NO DIF AVE CDN WRKR

was derived from
Q.27:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.27	Q.97		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(56%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(8%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(37%)

98. Q28C:CDA WILL LOSE INDEP

was derived from
Q.28:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.28	Q.98		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(46%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(8%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(46%)

99. Q29C:OPPOSE-NO CONF CDA

was derived from
Q.29:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.29	Q.99		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(40%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(10%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(50%)

100. Q30C:CDA MUST STAY INDEP

was derived from
Q.30:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.30	Q.100		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(24%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(9%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(67%)

101. Q31C:FR TR CREATE TENS'N

was derived from
Q.31:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.31	Q.101		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(43%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(11%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(46%)

102. Q32C:PAY REMAIN DIST CDN

was derived from
Q.32:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.32	Q.102		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(32%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(8%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(60%)

103. Q33C:GOVT CLEAR ON GAINS

was derived from
Q.33:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.33	Q.103		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(37%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(12%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(52%)

104. Q34C:NO AGR=INCR TARIFFS

was derived from
Q.34:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.34	Q.104		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(31%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(12%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(57%)

105. Q35C:CHANGE SOCIAL SYSTEM

was derived from
Q.35:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.35	Q.105		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(61%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(8%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(31%)

106. Q36C: GOVERNMENT IGNORE OTH TRD

was derived from
Q.36:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.36	Q.106		
1-5	1.	DISAGREE;	(37%)
6	2.	DEPENDS; and	(9%)
7-11	3.	AGREE.	(53%)

107. Q37C:NO AG=US TRD HARDER

was derived from
Q.37:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.37	Q.107	
1-5	1. DISAGREE;	(34%)
6	2. DEPENDS; and	(9%)
7-11	3. AGREE.	(57%)

108. Q38C:GOV COM/POS BAD DL

was derived from
Q.38:
by collapsing response categories in the following manner:

Q.38	Q.108	
1-5	1. DISAGREE;	(44%)
6	2. DEPENDS; and	(7%)
7-11	3. AGREE.	(49%)

109. EMPLOYMENT BY SEX

was derived from
Q.83:
Q.84:
according to the following reference matrices:

Q.83:CURRENTLY EMPLOYED

	0	1 YES	2 NO
0	0	0	0
1 MALE	0	1	2
2 FEMALE	0	3	4

The resulting categories are labelled as follows:

1. MEN EMPLOYED; (39%)
2. MEN UNEMPLOYED; (11%)
3. WOMEN EMPLOYED; and (27%)
4. WOMEN UNEMPLOYED. (23%)

110. SELF/GOVT AND UNITED STATES

was derived from
Q.4:
Q.5:
according to the following reference matrices:

Q.4:PERSONAL

	0	1 WARM	2 FRIEND	3 BUS	4 COOL	5 NO
0	X	X	X	X	X	X
1 WARM	X	3	2	1	1	0
2 FRIEND	X	4	3	2	1	0
3 BUS	X	5	4	3	2	0
4 COOL	X	5	5	4	3	0
5 NO	0	0	0	0	0	0

The resulting categories are labelled as follows:

1. COLDER THAN GOVERNMENT; (15%)
2. COOLER; (23%)
3. SAME; (39%)
4. CLOSER; and (16%)
5. MUCH CLOSER. (7%)

111. CULTURAL NATIONALIST

was derived from
Q.39:
Q.40:
according to the following reference matrices:

Q.39:

	0	1 sld.incl. culture	2 nt. incl. culture	3 No
0	X	X	X	X
1 FAVOUR	X	3	2	4
2 OPPOSE	X	3	1	4
3 NO	X	3	4	4

The resulting categories are labelled as follows:

1. NATIONALIST; (32%)
2. NO COST NATIONALIST; (17%)
3. NON-NATIONALIST; and (49%)
4. DON'T KNOW/NA (3%)