CMA Waiting Times **Table of Contents**

CMA - WAIT TIMES	1
1. Do you think that wait times for healthcare in Canada are a major problem, somewhat of a problem, not much of a problem or no problem at all?	
2. Why do you think that there is a wait time problem in Canada?	. 2
3. In the past year, do you think that wait lists have gotten longer, shorter or have stayed about the same?	. 4
4. Some people say wait times save Canada money because governments don't have to put as many resources into healthcare. Others say wait times cost Canada money because people who are waiting for treatment are less productive and miss work. Which of the two statements I just read is closest to your view?	
5. Using a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means to No extent at all and 10 means to Great extent, to what extent, if at all, do you think that wait times for healthcare impact on the Canadian economy?	. 6
6. YES SUMMARY TABLE	. 8
6. NO SUMMARY TABLE	. 9
6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 1) A family physician?	10
6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 2) A specialist?	11
6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 3) Advanced diagnostic procedures such as magnetic resonance imaging MRI or a CT Scan?	ng,
6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 4) A surgical procedure or other medical treatment?	13
6. NUMBER OF SERVICES WAITED FOR Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following:	14
7A. What were the consequences of having to wait longer than you thought was reasonable for access to the health care services that you or your family member sought?	15
7B. What else?	17
7A/B. What were the consequences of having to wait longer than you thought was reasonable for access to the health care services that you or your family member sought?	19
8. YES SUMMARY TABLE	21
8. NO SUMMARY TABLE	22
8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 1) Out-of-pocket costs for drugs or treatments that are not covered by health insurance?	
8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 2) Time off work that result in loss of income?	
8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 3) Taking time to assist the person who was waiting for treatment?	
8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 4) Restriction in activities around the household or recreational activities?	26
9. The 2007 federal budget included more than \$600 million to support the provinces in developing at least one patient wait time guarantee in the areas of cancer treatment, heart procedures, diagnostic imaging, joint replaceme and sight restoration. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate the strength of your agreement with the following statements: 1) The Patient Wait Times Guarantee twill significantly contribute to provincial efforts to reduce wait times?	trust 27
9. The 2007 federal budget included more than \$600 million to support the provinces in developing at least one patient wait time guarantee in the areas of cancer treatment, heart procedures, diagnostic imaging, joint replaceme and sight restoration. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate the strength of your agreement with the following statements: 2) The Patient Wait Times Guarantee Trust should be expanded to provide wait time guarantees for the full range of medical procedures and services including diagnosis and treatments?	
10. HIGHLY EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 9,10]	31
10. SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 6,7,8]	32
10. NEITHER SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 5]	. 33
10. NOT VERY EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 2,3,4]	34
10. NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 0,1]	35
10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals?	. 36
10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals a clinics?	
10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 3) More effective management of wait lists?	40 i

11. Thinking about the number of health care professionals in Canada	
(such as doctors and nurses), which statement best describes your view?	42
DEMOGRAPHICS	43
Region:	43
Province:	44
Canadian Markets:	45
Urban / Rural	
Census Metropolitan Area:	48
Census Division	56
Respondent's Sex:	72
Language of Interview:	
What age group do you fall into?	74
What is your current marital status?	75
Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?	76
Do you have any children under the age of 18 currently living in your household?	7
And what are the ages of each of the children under 18 who are currently living in your household?	78
What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?	80
Which one of the following categories best describes your current employment status?	81
And which of the following categories best describes your annual household income?	82

CMA - WAIT TIMES

1. Do you think that wait times for healthcare in Canada are a major problem, somewhat of a problem, not much of a problem or no problem at all?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

											GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
A major problem	554	87	50	32	205	134	47	146	232	176	230	325
	55%	65% BCD	48%	48%	53%	55%	63%	52%	58%	54%	47%	62% J
Somewhat of a problem	340	32	40	26	131	86	24	91	137	112	181	159
	34%	24%	39% A	39%	34%	35% A	32%	32%	34%	34%	37%	31%
Not much of a problem	79	6	11	6	36	19	0	29	24	26	49	31
·	8%	5%	11%	9%	9%	8%	1%	10%	6%	8%	10%	6%
			F	F	F	F					K	
No problem at all	32	8	2	2	10	6	3	13	5	13	27	4
	3%	6%	2%	3%	3%	3%	5%	4% H	1%	4% H	6% K	1%
Don't know/Refused	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	2	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	0	0	0
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY												
A problem (Top2Box)	894	119	90	57	336	221	71	237	369	287	410	484
A Problem (Topzbox)	89%	89%	87%	87%	87%	90%	95%	84%	93% GI	88%	84%	93% J
Not a problem (Low2Box)	111	14	13	8	47	25	4	42	30	38	76	35
	11%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	5%	15% H	7%	12%	16% K	7%

Ipsos-Reid Public Affairs January 8-10, 2008

FINAL DATA





Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES
2. Why do you think that there is a wait time problem in Canada?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
OTAL MENTIONS												
Title de la circa de la litera de la circa												
ase: Think that wait times for healthcare in Ca			101	64	272	244	70	040	440	220	450	F10
Unweighted Base	976	125 125*	101 101*	64 63*	372 373	244 240	70 71*	213	442 393	320 313	458 459	518
Weighted Base	973	125"	101"	63"	3/3	240	71"	267	393	313	459	514
RESOURCES (NET)	620	73	64	34	244	157	47	163	262	194	275	345
	64%	59%	64%	54%	65%	65%	66%	61%	67%	62%	60%	67%
HUMAN RESOURCES (SUBNET)	537	63	52	30	209	143	40	138	229	170	222	J 315
, ,	55%	51%	51%	47%	56%	60%	56%	52%	58%	54%	48%	61%
- Lack of doctors	317	43	24	21	135	64	29	75	133	109	129	J 188
Each of doctors	33%	35%	24%	33%	36%	27%	41%	28%	34%	35%	28%	36%
					BE		BE					J
 Lack of personnel/human resources (unspecified) 	171	14	23	6	47	70	10	53	70	47	70	101
	18%	11%	23% AD	10%	13%	29% ACDF	14%	20%	18%	15%	15%	20%
- Lack of nurses	115	28	12	8	38	23	6	27	40	49	43	73
	12%	22%	12%	13%	10%	10%	9%	10%	10%	16%	9%	14%
- Underpaid medical professionals	34	DEF 5	5	2	16	5	1	6	18	10	9	J 25
leaving the country	3%	4%	5%	4%	4%	2%	1%	2%	5%	3%	2%	5% J
- Medical professionals pressuring the government in order to get pay	12	0	1	0	7	4	0	4	6	1	9	3
increases	1%	-	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	0	2%	1%
Medical professionals trained abroad are not given the opportunity to work in Canada	8	2	0	0	3	3	0	1	7	0	5	3
Gundud	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	0	2%	-	1%	1%
INFRASTRUCTURE (SUBNET)	192	24	23	8	86	33	18	51	84	57	104	88
,	20%	19%	23% E	12%	23% E	14%	25% E	19%	21%	18%	23% K	17%
- Lack of adequate/sufficient funding	117	17	13	4	50	23	10	32	53	32	65	52
	12%	14%	13%	6%	13%	10%	14%	12%	14%	10%	14%	10%
- Shortage of medical facilities	47	5	8	3	24	3	3	12	15	20	25	22
Ĭ	5%	4%	8%	4%	7%	1%	5%	5%	4%	6%	5%	4%
- Other insufficient resources mentions	18	1	E 2	0	<u>Е</u> 8	4	4	6	8	4	12	7
- Other insumicient resources mentions	2%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	6%	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%
- Shortage of (medical) equipment	11	3	0	1	5	2	1	1	8	3	4	7
	1%	3%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	0	2%	1%	1%	1%

Ipsos-Reid Public Affairs January 8-10, 2008

FINAL DATA





Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES

2. Why do you think that there is a wait time problem in Canada?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Inefficient health-care system	133	7	7	9	38	62	11	30	59	44	67	66
	14%	5%	7%	14%	10%	26% ABD	15% A	11%	15%	14%	15%	13%
Too many people requesting medical services	61	2	8	4	29	14	3	19	25	16	34	27
	6%	2%	8%	6%	8% A	6%	5%	7%	6%	5%	7%	5%
Extended waiting periods	56	11	8	2	27	5	3	19	22	15	19	38
	6%	9% E	8% E	3%	7% E	2%	5%	7%	5%	5%	4%	7%
OTHER RESPONSES												
People abusing the system	54	2	3	0	29	18	3	6	31	17	32	22
	6%	2%	3%	-	8% AC	7% AC	4%	2%	8% G	5%	7%	4%
I am aware of it (through the media/personal experience)	47	11	3	6	25	0	3	9	18	20	21	26
	5%	9% E	3% E	10% E	7% E	-	4% E	3%	5%	6%	5%	5%
Poor quality of medical services	30	3	3	3	18	1	3	8	9	13	14	17
	3%	2%	3%	4% E	5% E	1%	4%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%
Healthcare system has to be privatized/people should have to pay for it	24	3	6	0	7	6	1	11	8	5	18	7
F	2%	3%	6% D	-	2%	3%	2%	4%	2%	2%	4% K	1%
There is no wait time problem in Canada	18	2	3	3	9	1	0	7	6	4	10	8
	2%	2%	3%	5% E	2%	0	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Other	50	6	7	6	19	11	2	16	14	20	28	22
	5%	5%	6%	10%	5%	5%	3%	6%	4%	6%	6%	4%
No reason	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
	0	0	-	2% DE	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0
Don't know/Refused	54	13	7	6	14	11	3	22	13	19	24	29
	6%	10% D	7%	9%	4%	5%	5%	8% H	3%	6%	5%	6%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

3. In the past year, do you think that wait lists have gotten longer, shorter or have stayed about the same?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Silidii base				REG	iION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Longer	389 39%	53 39%	43 41%	18 27%	145 38%	101 41%	30 41%	114 41%	163 41%	112 34%	152 31%	237 46%
	30,0	3373	,	2. 70	3375	,0	,0	,5	,0	0.70	0.70	J
Shorter	71	2	3	4	38	20	3	16	29	24	36	35
	7%	2%	3%	7%	10% AB	8% A	4%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%
About the same	502	70	54	40	183	119	35	139	193	170	280	222
, about the barne	50%	53%	53%	62%	48%	48%	47%	49%	48%	52%	57%	43%
											K	
Don't know/Refused	46	8	3	3	19	6	6	12	14	20	19	27
	5%	6%	3%	5%	5%	3%	8% F	4%	3%	6%	4%	5%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

4. Some people say wait times save Canada money because governments don't have to put as many resources into healthcare. Others say wait times cost Canada money because people who are waiting for treatment are less productive and miss work. Which of the two statements I just read is closest to your view?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

		REGION AGE BC ALB SK/MN ONT QUE ATL 18-34 35-54 55+							GEN	NDER		
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents											l	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Wait times save Canada money	188	21	22	16	72	46	11	53	67	68	106	82
	19%	16%	22%	24%	19%	19%	14%	19%	17%	21%	22% K	16%
Wait times cost Canada money	786	105	77	45	304	192	63	223	320	242	367	420
·	78%	79%	75%	68%	79%	78%	85% C	79%	80%	74%	75%	81%
Don't know/Refused	33	7	3	5	10	8	0	5	12	16	15	19
	3%	5%	3%	8%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	5%	3%	4%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

5. Using a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means to No extent at all and 10 means to Great extent, to what extent, if at all, do you think that wait times for healthcare impact on the Canadian economy?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

oman base									AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC		SK/MN	ONT	QUE		18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents											ı	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
[10] Great extent	86	13	7	2	39	18	6	20	35	31	36	50
	9%	10%	7%	4%	10%	7%	8%	7%	9%	9%	7%	10%
[9]	45	4	6	5	18	11	1	8	19	18	9	36
	4%	3%	6%	7%	5%	5%	2%	3%	5%	6%	2%	7% J
[8]	184	29	18	18	63	41	15	51	71	61	71	112
	18%	22%	18%	27%	16%	17%	20%	18%	18%	19%	15%	22% .J
[7]	171	24	7	5	75	46	15	40	93	38	81	91
	17%	18% B	7%	8%	19% BC	19% B	20% B	14%	23% GI	12%	17%	17%
[6]	155	14	10	13	62	47	10	51	59	45	85	69
	15%	10%	10%	19%	16%	19% AB	13%	18%	15%	14%	18%	13%
[5] Neither	176	20	22	12	58	52	12	49	55	72	101	75
	17%	15%	22%	18%	15%	21%	17%	18%	14%	22% H	21% K	14%
[4]	70	11	11	2	23	13	10	32	24	14	37	33
	7%	8%	11%	3%	6%	5%	14% CDE	12% HI	6%	4%	8%	6%
[3]	46	6	6	6	20	5	3	18	13	14	26	20
	5%	4%	5%	10% E	5%	2%	4%	6%	3%	4%	5%	4%
[2]	28	0	7	0	15	3	1	7	12	9	17	10
	3%	0	7% AE	1%	4%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%
[1]	9	1	1	0	5	1	0	2	3	3	7	1
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	0
[0] No extent at all	10	2	1	0	4	2	1	1	7	3	4	6
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0	2%	1%	1%	1%
Don't know/Refused	30	9	5	2	6	7	0	3	7	19	13	16
	3%	7% DF	5% D	3%	1%	3%	-	1%	2%	6% GH	3%	3%
		DΓ	U							υп		
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY												



CMA - WAIT TIMES

5. Using a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means to No extent at all and 10 means to Great extent, to what extent, if at all, do you think that wait times for healthcare impact on the Canadian economy?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

				REG	ION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	ı	J	K
Great extent [Rated 8,9,10]	315	46	32	25	120	70	23	78	126	111	117	198
	31%	35%	31%	38%	31%	28%	31%	28%	32%	34%	24%	38%
Moderate extent [Rated 4,5,6,7]	571	68	51	31	217	157	47	173	230	168	303	268
	57%	51%	49%	48%	56%	64% ABC	63%	61%	58%	52%	62% K	52%
Small extent [Rated 1,2,3]	82	7	14	7	40	10	4	26	29	26	51	32
	8%	5%	14% AE	10%	10% E	4%	5%	9%	7%	8%	10% K	6%
No extent at all [Rated 0]	10	2	1	0	4	2	1	1	7	3	4	6
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0	2%	1%	1%	1%
STATISTICS (10= Great extent 0= No ex	tont at all)											
STATISTICS (TO= Gleat extent 0= NO ex	leni ai aii)	I									1	
Mean	6.36	6.57 B	5.88	6.41	6.36	6.45 B	6.32	6.13	6.48	6.43	6.03	6.67 .J
Standard Deviation	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.1
Standard Error	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Median	5.98	6.35	5.01	5.86	6.05	5.92	6.01	5.60	6.24	5.89	5.53	6.41

CMA - WAIT TIMES 6. YES SUMMARY TABLE

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All Respondents								l			I.	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
1) A family physician	352	30	44	23	127	95	33	105	164	83	161	191
	35%	23%	43% ^	35%	33%	38% A	44% A	37%	41% I	25%	33%	37%
2) A specialist	411	50	43	25	167	94	32	116	195	98	180	230
, .,	41%	37%	41%	38%	43%	38%	43%	41%	49%	30%	37%	44%
Advanced diagnostic procedures such as magnetic resonance imaging, MRI or a CT Scan	279	41	27	20	110	53	28	62	145	72	125	155
	28%	31%	27%	31%	28%	21%	37% E	22%	36% GI	22%	26%	30%
A surgical procedure or other medical treatment	300	34	34	26	113	68	24	90	138	70	135	165
	30%	26%	33%	40%	29%	28%	33%	32% I	35% I	22%	28%	32%



CMA - WAIT TIMES 6. NO SUMMARY TABLE

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

REGION AGE GENDER SK/MN TOTAL ВС ALB ONT QUE ATL 18-34 35-54 55+ Male Female Α В Е G Н Base: All Respondents Unweighted Base 1008 251 224 526 132 103 66 383 73 448 334 482 Weighted Base 281 327 488 1008 133 103* 66* 386 246 75* 399 520 233 326 1) A family physician 652 103 57 41 258 150 42 176 242 326 77% 58% 65% 56% 63% 67% 61% 56% 63% 74% 67% 63% BEF GH 165 59% 2) A specialist 590 83 59 41 215 151 42 203 223 304 287 59% 62% 58% 62% 56% 61% 57% 51% 68% 62% 55% GH Κ 91 75 42 271 251 363 3) Advanced diagnostic procedures such 713 188 46 216 349 245 as magnetic resonance imaging, MRI or a CT Scan 71% 69% 73% 64% 70% 76% 61% 77% 63% 75% 72% 70% F Н Н 272 259 4) A surgical procedure or other medical 702 99 68 38 177 48 191 252 352 350 treatment 70% 74% 66% 58% 71% 72% 64% 68% 65% 77% 72% 67% С С GH



Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES

6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 1) A family physician?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	352	30	44	23	127	95	33	105	164	83	161	191
	35%	23%	43%	35%	33%	38%	44%	37%	41%	25%	33%	37%
			Α			Α	Α	I	l			
No	652	103	57	41	258	150	42	176	233	242	326	326
	65%	77% BEF	56%	63%	67%	61%	56%	63%	58%	74% GH	67%	63%
Don't know/Refused	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	4
	0	-	1%	2%	0	1%	-	-	1%	1%	0	1%

CMA - WAIT TIMES

6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 2) A specialist?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	411	50	43	25	167	94	32	116	195	98	180	230
	41%	37%	41%	38%	43%	38%	43%	41%	49%	30%	37%	44%
NI.	500	00		4.4	0.45	454	40	105	I	000	004	J
No	590	83	59	41	215	151	42	165	203	223	304	287
	59%	62%	58%	62%	56%	61%	57%	59%	51%	68% GH	62% K	55%
Don't know/Refused	7	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	6	4	3
	1%	0	1%	-	1%	1%	-	-	0	2%	1%	1%



Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES

6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 3) Advanced diagnostic procedures such as magnetic resonance imaging, MRI or a CT Scan?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REC	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	279	41	27	20	110	53	28	62	145	72	125	155
	28%	31%	27%	31%	28%	21%	37% E	22%	36% GI	22%	26%	30%
No	713	91	75	42	271	188	46	216	251	245	349	363
	71%	69%	73%	64%	70%	76% F	61%	77% H	63%	75% H	72%	70%
Don't know/Refused	16	0	0	3	5	5	1	3	3	10	14	2
	2%	0	-	5%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	0
				AB						Н	K	



Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES

6. Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following: 4) A surgical procedure or other medical treatment?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

_				REG	ION	•			AGE	•	GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	300	34	34	26	113	68	24	90	138	70	135	165
	30%	26%	33%	40%	29%	28%	33%	32%	35%	22%	28%	32%
No	702	99	68	38	272	177	48	191	259	252	352	350
	70%	74%	66%	58%	71%	72%	64%	68%	65%	77%	72%	67%
Don't know/Refused	7	0	1	1	1	C 1	3	0	2	<u>GH</u> 5	1	6
	1%	-	1%	2%	0	0	4%	-	1%	1%	0	1%
	1						ADE					

CMA - WAIT TIMES

6. NUMBER OF SERVICES WAITED FOR Over the PAST YEAR, have you or a member of your household had to wait for longer than you thought was reasonable to get access to the following:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

		•		REC	SION	•			AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
AT LEAST 1 SERVICE	614	71	64	40	241	145	54	182	276	155	283	331
	61%	53%	62%	62%	62%	59%	72% A	65% I	69% I	47%	58%	64%
1 service	201	21	20	12	87	44	18	71	70	61	100	101
	20%	16%	19%	18%	22%	18%	24%	25% H	17%	19%	21%	19%
2 services	176	19	17	11	64	50	15	51	80	43	78	98
	17%	14%	17%	17%	17%	20%	19%	18%	20% I	13%	16%	19%
3 services	160	25	15	9	58	36	16	40	93	27	77	83
	16%	19%	15%	14%	15%	15%	21%	14%	23% GI	8%	16%	16%
All 4 services	77	5	12	8	32	14	6	21	33	24	29	49
	8%	4%	12% A	12% A	8%	6%	8%	7%	8%	7%	6%	9%
None	394	63	39	25	145	101	21	100	123	172	204	189
	39%	47% F	38%	38%	38%	41%	28%	35%	31%	53% GH	42%	36%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

7A. What were the consequences of having to wait longer than you thought was reasonable for access to the health care services that you or your family member sought?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

				REG	SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
IRST MENTION												
Base: Waited for at least 1 service												
Unweighted Base	618	69	67	40	244	149	49	147	311	158	284	334
Weighted Base	614	71*	64*	40*	241	145	54*	182	276	155	283	331
Condition worsened	73	9	9	2	36	13	4	25	33	14	21	52
	12%	12%	14%	5%	15%	9%	7%	14%	12%	9%	8%	16% J
Unable to work/loss of income	64	3	6	4	18	21	11	25	35	3	31	33
	10%	4%	10%	11%	8%	14%	21%	14%	13%	2%	11%	10%
						AD	AD	I	ı			
Frustration	63	1	6	3	26	15	11	16	32	15	35	28
	10%	2%	9%	8%	11% A	11%	21% A	9%	12%	10%	12%	9%
Nothing, condition not that serious	54	6	4	4	24	9	6	13	20	20	31	23
Trouming, contained for that contact	9%	9%	7%	10%	10%	6%	11%	7%	7%	13%	11%	7%
Stress/anxiety/worry	45	4	4	4	20	12	1	8	23	14	21	25
, ,	7%	5%	7%	10%	8%	8%	3%	4%	8%	9%	7%	7%
Waited in pain	45	7	7	5	14	12	1	11	15	19	19	26
·	7%	9%	11%	12%	6%	8%	3%	6%	5%	12% H	7%	8%
Pain increased	43	13	4	4	12	8	2	11	22	10	20	23
Tall moreasea	7%	19% BDEF	6%	10%	5%	6%	4%	6%	8%	6%	7%	7%
Delayed/delayed health care - had to wait longer	38	2	7	0	12	12	4	18	11	9	15	24
longer	6%	4%	11% C	-	5%	8%	8%	10% H	4%	6%	5%	7%
Anger	19	5	2	0	6	5	1	10	7	3	10	9
	3%	8%	4%	-	3%	3%	1%	5%	2%	2%	4%	3%
Not much/very little	19	2	0	1	11	3	2	4	5	10	9	10
•	3%	3%	-	3%	5%	2%	4%	2%	2%	6% H	3%	3%
Loss of functionality/Unable to function normally	11	3	1	0	2	4	1	3	6	2	6	5
,	2%	4% D	2%	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Had to visit my GP more often	8	3	0	1	3	2	0	2	6	1	4	5
-	1%	4%	-	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%







CMA - WAIT TIMES

7A. What were the consequences of having to wait longer than you thought was reasonable for access to the health care services that you or your family member sought?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Did not have to wait long/ positive mentions	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	4	2
	1%	4% DE	1%	2% D	-	-	3% D	1%	0	1%	1%	1%
Other	90 15%	6 9%	7 10%	6 14%	45 19% F	23 16%	3 5%	28 15%	43 16%	19 12%	41 14%	49 15%
Don't know/Refused	35 6%	3 4%	6 9%	5 12%	11 5%	7 5%	4 7%	4 2%	18 6%	13 8% G	17 6%	18 6%

Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES

7B. What else?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
THER MENTIONS											1	
ase: Excludes respondents who said Don't kr	ow/Pofusod											
Unweighted Base	588	65	62	35	235	144	47	143	296	148	272	316
Weighted Base	582	67*	59*	36**	231	138	51*	178	261	143	270	312
Frustration	44	4	9	3	17	7	4	16	20	7	20	23
	7%	6%	15% E	7%	7%	5%	8%	9%	8%	5%	7%	7%
Unable to work/loss of income	37	3	6	4	15	7	2	14	16	7	14	23
	6%	5%	10%	10%	7%	5%	4%	8%	6%	5%	5%	7%
Condition worsened	31	3	2	2	9	10	5	6	18	6	6	24
	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%	7%	9%	3%	7%	4%	2%	8% J
Waited in pain	23	5	5	1	7	1	2	4	16	3	11	12
	4%	7% E	9% E	4%	3%	1%	5%	2%	6%	2%	4%	4%
Nothing, condition not that serious	20	5	3	4	6	0	2	7	5	8	10	10
-	3%	7% E	5% E	11%	3%	-	4%	4%	2%	6% H	4%	3%
Stress/anxiety/worry	19	1	1	3	9	5	0	5	10	4	4	15
	3%	2%	1%	7%	4%	4%	-	3%	4%	3%	1%	5% J
Pain increased	18	2	4	0	6	6	0	6	8	4	3	16
	3%	2%	7%	=	2%	4%	1%	3%	3%	3%	1%	5% J
Anger	16	3	5	0	5	3	0	7	6	3	5	11
•	3%	4%	8% D	1%	2%	2%	-	4%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Delayed/delayed health care - had to wait longer	14	2	0	1	8	3	0	4	7	4	6	8
	2%	2%	-	3%	4%	2%	-	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Not much/very little	10	0	2	1	4	3	1	3	5	1	5	5
•	2%	-	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Loss of functionality/Unable to function normally	9	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3	2	4	5
•	2%	6% DE	-	4%	0	-	6% DE	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Had to visit my GP more often	4	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3
	1%	2%	-	-	1%	-	-	0	1%	1%	1%	1%
Did not have to wait long/ positive mentions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
mentions	0	_	-	4%	-	_	-	_	0	-	_	0



Detailed Tables CMA Waiting Times

CMA - WAIT TIMES

7B. What else?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Other	64	9	2	3	33	10	7	19	31	13	35	29
	11%	13%	4%	7%	14%	7%	14%	11%	12%	9%	13%	9%
					В							
No others	274	28	24	13	106	80	23	84	115	74	132	142
	47%	41%	40%	36%	46%	58%	46%	47%	44%	52%	49%	45%
						ABD						
Don't know/Refused	29	2	6	1	15	4	1	7	15	7	17	12
	5%	4%	10%	3%	6%	3%	3%	4%	6%	5%	6%	4%
			E									

CMA - WAIT TIMES

7A/B. What were the consequences of having to wait longer than you thought was reasonable for access to the health care services that you or your family member sought?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

					GION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
OTAL MENTIONS												
ase: Waited for at least 1 service												
Unweighted Base	618	69	67	40	244	149	49	147	311	158	284	334
Weighted Base	614	71*	64*	40*	241	145	54*	182	276	155	283	331
Frustration	107	5	14	6	43	22	15	32	52	22	55	52
	17%	8%	23% A	15%	18%	15%	29% A	18%	19%	14%	19%	16%
Condition worsened	99	12	11	4	43	21	9	30	50	19	28	72
	16%	16%	16%	9%	18%	15%	16%	16%	18%	12%	10%	22% J
Unable to work/loss of income	99	6	11	8	32	28	13	39	49	11	44	55
	16%	8%	18%	20%	13%	20%	25% A	21% I	18% I	7%	15%	17%
Nothing, condition not that serious	69	10	6	8	30	9	6	21	21	27	39	30
	11%	14%	10%	19% E	12%	6%	11%	11%	8%	17% H	14%	9%
Waited in pain	66	11	11	6	21	13	4	15	31	20	28	38
	11%	16%	17%	15%	9%	9%	7%	8%	11%	13%	10%	12%
Pain increased	61	15	8	4	17	14	2	17	30	14	23	39
	10%	21% DEF	12%	10%	7%	10%	4%	9%	11%	9%	8%	12%
Stress/anxiety/worry	58	4	5	5	27	16	1	11	30	17	24	35
	9%	5%	8%	12%	11%	11%	3%	6%	11%	11%	8%	10%
Delayed/delayed health care - had to wait longer	47	4	7	1	18	12	4	19	15	13	19	28
3	8%	6%	11%	2%	8%	8%	8%	10%	6%	8%	7%	8%
Anger	35	8	7	0	11	8	1	17	13	6	16	20
	6%	11%	11%	1%	5%	6%	1%	9%	5%	4%	6%	6%
Not much/very little	29	2	2	2	15	5	3	8	11	11	14	15
	5%	3%	3%	5%	6%	4%	5%	4%	4%	7%	5%	5%
Loss of functionality/Unable to function normally	20	7	1	1	2	4	4	7	8	4	10	9
•	3%	10% DE	2%	3%	1%	2%	8% D	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%
Had to visit my GP more often	13	4	0	1	6	2	0	2	7	3	6	7
•	2%	6%	-	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

7A/B. What were the consequences of having to wait longer than you thought was reasonable for access to the health care services that you or your family member sought?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Did not have to wait long/ positive mentions	7	3	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	2	4	3
	1%	4% DE	1%	5% DE	-	-	3% D	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Other	145	15	8	8	72	33	8	44	70	31	71	74
	24%	22%	13%	20%	30% B	23%	16%	24%	25%	20%	25%	22%
Don't know/Refused	35 6%	3 4%	6 9%	5 12%	11 5%	7 5%	4 7%	4 2%	18 6%	12 8% G	17 6%	18 6%

CMA - WAIT TIMES 8. YES SUMMARY TABLE

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REC	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents											1	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Out-of-pocket costs for drugs or treatments that are not covered by health insurance	349	40	30	25	158	70	26	108	133	108	162	187
	35%	30%	29%	38%	41% BE	29%	35%	38%	33%	33%	33%	36%
Time off work that resulted in loss of income	288	22	27	20	123	71	25	107	139	41	133	155
	29%	16%	26%	30% A	32% A	29% A	33% A	38% I	35% I	13%	27%	30%
Taking time to assist the person who was waiting for treatment	295	33	28	22	127	65	20	94	138	62	137	158
	29%	25%	27%	34%	33%	26%	27%	33% I	35% I	19%	28%	30%
Restriction in activities around the household or recreational activities	338	46	33	23	134	77	26	99	155	83	150	188
	34%	35%	32%	35%	35%	31%	35%	35% I	39% I	25%	31%	36%



CMA - WAIT TIMES 8. NO SUMMARY TABLE

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents	ı	I						I				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Out-of-pocket costs for drugs or treatments that are not covered by health insurance	650	93	72	40	222	175	49	171	264	213	323	327
	64%	70% D	70% D	60%	58%	71% D	65%	61%	66%	65%	66%	63%
2) Time off work that resulted in loss of income	713	110	76	44	262	173	49	173	259	280	352	361
	71%	83% CDEF	74%	67%	68%	70%	66%	61%	65%	86% GH	72%	69%
Taking time to assist the person who was waiting for treatment	705	100	75	42	256	179	53	186	259	260	346	359
v	70%	75%	73%	64%	66%	73%	71%	66%	65%	80% GH	71%	69%
4) Restriction in activities around the household or recreational activities	664	85	69	41	252	168	49	181	243	241	335	330
	66%	64%	67%	63%	65%	68%	65%	64%	61%	74% GH	69%	63%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 1) Out-of-pocket costs for drugs or treatments that are not covered by health insurance?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	ı	J	K
Base: All respondents											l.	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	349	40	30	25	158	70	26	108	133	108	162	187
	35%	30%	29%	38%	41% BE	29%	35%	38%	33%	33%	33%	36%
No	650	93	72	40	222	175	49	171	264	213	323	327
	64%	70% D	70% D	60%	58%	71% D	65%	61%	66%	65%	66%	63%
Don't know/Refused	9	0	1	1	6	1	0	3	1	5	3	6
	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	0	-	1%	0	2%	1%	1%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 2) Time off work that resulted in loss of income?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION			AGE		GENDER		
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	288	22	27	20	123	71	25	107	139	41	133	155
	29%	16%	26%	30% ^	32% _A	29% A	33% ^	38%	35%	13%	27%	30%
No	713	110	76	44	262	173	49	173	259	280	352	361
	71%	83% CDEF	74%	67%	68%	70%	66%	61%	65%	86% GH	72%	69%
Don't know/Refused	7	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	0	6	4	4
	1%	1%	-	3%	0	1%	1%	1%	-	2% H	1%	1%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 3) Taking time to assist the person who was waiting for treatment?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION			AGE		GENDER		
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	295	33	28	22	127	65	20	94	138	62	137	158
	29%	25%	27%	34%	33%	26%	27%	33% I	35% I	19%	28%	30%
No	705	100	75	42	256	179	53	186	259	260	346	359
	70%	75%	73%	64%	66%	73%	71%	66%	65%	80% GH	71%	69%
Don't know/Refused	8	0	0	2	3	2	1	2	2	5	4	4
	1%	-	-	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	1%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

8. In the last year, have you or has a member of your household experienced any of the following as a result of having to wait for health care to be provided by the healthcare system in your province: 4) Restriction in activities around the household or recreational activities?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION			AGE		GEN	IDER	
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Yes	338	46	33	23	134	77	26	99	155	83	150	188
	34%	35%	32%	35%	35%	31%	35%	35% I	39% I	25%	31%	36%
No	664	85	69	41	252	168	49	181	243	241	335	330
	66%	64%	67%	63%	65%	68%	65%	64%	61%	74% GH	69%	63%
Don't know/Refused	6	2	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	3	3	2
	1%	1% D	1%	3% D	-	0	-	1%	0	1%	1%	0



CMA - WAIT TIMES

9. The 2007 federal budget included more than \$600 million to support the provinces in developing at least one patient wait time guarantee in the areas of cancer treatment, heart procedures, diagnostic imaging, joint replacement and sight restoration. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate the strength of your agreement with the following statements: 1) The Patient Wait Times Guarantee trust will significantly contribute to provincial efforts to reduce wait times?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

					SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
[10] Strongly agree	109	11	10	7	38	38	5	23	47	39	51	59
	11%	9%	9%	10%	10%	15%	7%	8%	12%	12%	10%	11%
[9]	34	5	4	2	16	6	0	8	17	9	7	27
	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	3%	-	3%	4%	3%	1%	5%
[8]	126	16	9	12	40	33	15	28	49	48	56	70
[0]	12%	12%	9%	19%	10%	13%	20% D	10%	12%	15%	11%	13%
[7]	125	21	9	7	50	29	9	42	49	33	62	63
•	12%	15%	9%	11%	13%	12%	12%	15%	12%	10%	13%	12%
[6]	137	22	14	6	44	35	16	46	50	41	59	78
	14%	16%	14%	9%	11%	14%	22% D	16%	13%	13%	12%	15%
[5] Neither	241	35	26	22	98	50	11	76	91	72	137	104
	24%	26%	25%	33% EF	25%	20%	15%	27%	23%	22%	28% K	20%
[4]	63	3	10	3	28	16	4	18	26	19	37	26
	6%	2%	9% A	5%	7%	6%	5%	6%	7%	6%	7%	5%
[3]	44	3	7	2	13	15	4	11	23	11	24	21
	4%	2%	7%	3%	3%	6%	6%	4%	6%	3%	5%	4%
[2]	27	4	1	1	11	6	4	4	12	11	19	8
	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	2%	5%	1%	3%	3%	4% K	1%
[1]	9	0	2	0	6	0	0	3	5	1	3	6
	1%	0	2%	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	1%	0	1%	1%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

9. The 2007 federal budget included more than \$600 million to support the provinces in developing at least one patient wait time guarantee in the areas of cancer treatment, heart procedures, diagnostic imaging, joint replacement and sight restoration. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate the strength of your agreement with the following statements: 1) The Patient Wait Times Guarantee trust will significantly contribute to provincial efforts to reduce wait times?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Small base					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
[0] Strongly disagree	38	1	3	0	21	9	4	11	15	12	19	19
	4%	1%	3%	1%	5% A	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Don't know/Refused	55	11	8	3	21	9	3	11	14	30	15	40
	6%	8%	8%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	3%	9% GH	3%	8% J
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY												
Strongly agree [Rated 9,10]	143	17	14	9	54	44	5	31	64	48	57	86
Chongly agree [rated 6,16]	14%	13%	13%	14%	14%	18% F	7%	11%	16%	15%	12%	16%
Somewhat agree [Rated 6,7,8]	388	59	33	25	135	97	40	117	148	122	177	211
	38%	44%	32%	38%	35%	39%	54% BD	41%	37%	37%	36%	41%
Neither [Rated 5]	241	35	26	22	98	50	11	76	91	72	137	104
	24%	26%	25%	33% EF	25%	20%	15%	27%	23%	22%	28% K	20%
Somewhat disagree [Rated 2,3,4]	134	10	18	6	52	36	12	32	61	41	79	55
	13%	8%	17% A	9%	13%	15%	16%	11%	15%	12%	16% K	11%
Strongly disagree [Rated 0,1]	47	1	5	1	27	9	4	14	20	12	22	25
	5%	1%	4%	1%	7% A	4%	5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%
STATISTICS (10= Strongly agree 0= Stro	ngly disagree)											
		0.04	5.04	0.00	5.04	2.25	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.40	5.04	
Mean	6.04	6.34	5.81	6.38	5.84	6.25	5.83	5.90	6.03	6.18	5.81	6.26 J
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4
Standard Error	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Median	5.40	5.66	4.97	5.47	5.15	5.65	5.55	5.27	5.40	5.55	4.98	5.72



CMA - WAIT TIMES

9. The 2007 federal budget included more than \$600 million to support the provinces in developing at least one patient wait time guarantee in the areas of cancer treatment, heart procedures, diagnostic imaging, joint replacement and sight restoration. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate the strength of your agreement with the following statements: 2) The Patient Wait Times Guarantee Trust should be expanded to provide wait time guarantees for the full range of medical procedures and services including diagnosis and treatments?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

SITIAII DASE				REC	SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
[10] Strongly agree	205	22	19	8	85	56	14	53	88	63	82	123
	20%	17%	19%	12%	22%	23%	19%	19%	22%	19%	17%	24%
[9]	55	6	5	3	24	12	5	17	25	14	21	34
	5%	4%	5%	4%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	4%	4%	7%
[8]	175	28	17	7	59	48	17	50	67	59	72	103
	17%	21%	16%	10%	15%	19%	23%	18%	17%	18%	15%	20%
[7]	153	30	14	12	59	30	8	55	58	38	89	63
	15%	23% E	13%	18%	15%	12%	11%	20%	15%	12%	18% K	12%
[6]	108	14	7	6	48	28	5	40	37	30	66	42
1-1	11%	11%	7%	9%	12%	11%	7%	14%	9%	9%	14% K	8%
[5] Neither	164	20	20	18	51	39	16	40	58	67	90	75
	16%	15%	20%	28% ADE	13%	16%	21%	14%	14%	20% H	18%	14%
[4]	35	2	4	6	11	9	1	10	19	6	16	18
	3%	1%	4%	10% AD	3%	4%	2%	4%	5% I	2%	3%	3%
[3]	29	2	7	2	9	6	3	6	15	8	11	18
•	3%	1%	7% AD	3%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	3%	2%	3%
[2]	22	3	3	1	9	5	0	3	11	9	13	9
	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%
[1]	7	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	6	1	5	2
	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	0	1%	0



CMA - WAIT TIMES

9. The 2007 federal budget included more than \$600 million to support the provinces in developing at least one patient wait time guarantee in the areas of cancer treatment, heart procedures, diagnostic imaging, joint replacement and sight restoration. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate the strength of your agreement with the following statements: 2) The Patient Wait Times Guarantee Trust should be expanded to provide wait time guarantees for the full range of medical procedures and services including diagnosis and treatments?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Small base					SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
[0] Strongly disagree	17	2	3	0	8	2	2	1	6	11	12	5
	2%	1%	3%	-	2%	1%	3%	0	2%	3% G	2%	1%
Don't know/Refused	39	4 3%	3 3%	2 4%	18 5%	8 3%	2 3%	7 3%	10 2%	22	11 2%	27
	4%	3%	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%	3%	2%	7% GH	2%	5% J
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY												
Strongly agree [Rated 9,10]	260	28	24	11	109	69	19	69	113	77	102	157
55g., ag. 55 [a.53 5, 15]	26%	21%	24%	16%	28%	28%	25%	25%	28%	24%	21%	30% J
Somewhat agree [Rated 6,7,8]	435	73	37	24	165	105	31	146	162	127	227	208
	43%	55% BCDE	36%	37%	43%	43%	41%	52% HI	41%	39%	47%	40%
Neither [Rated 5]	164	20	20	18	51	39	16	40	58	67	90	75
	16%	15%	20%	28% ADE	13%	16%	21%	14%	14%	20% H	18%	14%
Somewhat disagree [Rated 2,3,4]	86	7	15	9	29	21	5	18	45	23	41	45
	8%	5%	14% AD	14% A	7%	8%	7%	6%	11%	7%	8%	9%
Strongly disagree [Rated 0,1]	24	2	3	0	13	4	2	1	12	12	17	7
	2%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%	0	3% G	4% G	3%	1%
STATISTICS (10= Strongly agree 0= Stro	ngly disagree)											
Mean	6.97	7.10 C	6.60	6.35	7.04	7.13 C	6.94	7.19	6.95	6.80	6.67	7.26
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.1	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.3
Standard Error	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Median	6.68	6.73	6.37	5.60	6.74	6.91	6.95	6.68	6.75	6.55	6.28	7.14



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. HIGHLY EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 9,10]

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents		l .						l .				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	633	82	59	32	258	150	52	185	258	189	263	369
·	63%	62%	57%	50%	67% C	61%	69% C	66%	65%	58%	54%	71% J
Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	328	58	34	19	142	55	21	92	134	102	135	193
·	33%	43% E	34% E	29%	37% E	22%	28%	33%	34%	31%	28%	37% J
3) More effective management of wait lists	366 36%	45 34%	35 34%	22 34%	144 37%	98 40%	23 31%	103 37%	153 38%	110 34%	143 29%	224 43%



CMA - WAIT TIMES 10. SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 6,7,8]

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	H	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents											1	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	264	38	30	20	94	69	13	70	98	96	157	106
·	26%	29%	29%	30%	24%	28%	17%	25%	25%	29%	32% K	20%
Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	422	50	40	26	147	124	34	114	182	125	216	205
	42%	38%	39%	40%	38%	51% AD	46%	41%	46%	38%	44%	39%
More effective management of wait lists	406	56	48	26	146	94	36	122	163	120	208	198
	40%	42%	46%	39%	38%	38%	49%	43%	41%	37%	43%	38%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. NEITHER SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 5]

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Siliali base				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	l	J	K
Base: All Respondents		Į.						I.			I	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	57	7	8	11	13	13	5	16	23	18	34	23
·	6%	6%	7%	17% ADE	3%	5%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	4%
Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	130	14	17	13	50	27	9	36	41	52	68	61
	13%	10%	17%	20%	13%	11%	12%	13%	10%	16% H	14%	12%
3) More effective management of wait lists	124	13	7	14	53	31	6	38	44	43	63	61
,	12%	10%	7%	22% ABF	14%	13%	8%	13%	11%	13%	13%	12%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. NOT VERY EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 2,3,4]

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

REGION GENDER AGE SK/MN TOTAL ВС ALB ONT QUE ATL 18-34 35-54 55+ Male Female Α В С Ε G Н Base: All Respondents Unweighted Base 1008 132 383 251 224 334 482 526 103 66 73 448 Weighted Base 75* 281 327 488 1008 133 103* 66* 386 246 399 520 2 1) More doctors, nurses and other health 34 6 2 11 9 5 8 14 11 23 11 care professionals 3% 1% 6% 3% 3% 4% 6% 3% 3% 3% 5% 2% K 2) Improvements to infrastructures such as 84 5 6 7 27 28 10 31 32 20 47 36 hospitals and clinics 8% 4% 5% 11% 13% 10% 11% 7% 11% 8% 6% 7% Α Α 30 74 11 33 14 30 50 24 3) More effective management of wait lists 9 1 14 5 7% 9% 9% 2% 9% 5% 10% 6% 7% 8% 9% 5% Κ



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 0,1]

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION		•		AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	11	1	1	0	6	3	0	3	3	6	8	4
	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	32	2	4	0	14	10	1	8	9	16	19	13
noophale and omnee	3%	1%	4%	-	4%	4%	2%	3%	2%	5%	4%	3%
3) More effective management of wait lists	20	1	2	1	9	3	3	3	6	11	14	5
	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	1%	4%	3% K	1%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	SION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
[10] Highly effective	516	58	45	26	217	125	46	149	202	165	207	309
	51%	44%	44%	39%	56% ABC	51%	61% ABC	53%	51%	51%	42%	59% J
[9]	116	24	14	7	41	25	6	36	56	24	56	60
[0]	12%	18% DE	13%	11%	10%	10%	8%	13%	14% I	7%	12%	12%
[8]	166	22	18	11	63	45	7	44	66	56	95	70
1-7	16%	16%	18%	17%	16%	18%	9%	16%	17%	17%	20% K	14%
[7]	61	11	5	4	19	17	5	17	19	26	42	20
	6%	8%	5%	7%	5%	7%	7%	6%	5%	8%	9% K	4%
[6]	37	6	6	5	12	7	1	9	14	15	20	16
	4%	4%	6%	7%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%
[5] Neither	57	7	8	11	13	13	5	16	23	18	34	23
	6%	6%	7%	17% ADE	3%	5%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	4%
[4]	17	1	2	0	3	6	5	5	8	4	14	3
	2%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	6% AD	2%	2%	1%	3% K	0
[3]	13	0	2	1	7	2	0	3	5	4	6	7
	1%	-	2%	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
[2]	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	2	2
	0	0	1%	1%	0	0	-	0	0	1%	0	0
[1]	5	0	0	0	4	2	0	1	2	2	4	1
	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	0	0	1%	1%	0
[0] Not at all effective	6	1	1	0	3	1	0	1	1	4	4	2
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	0	0	1%	1%	0
Don't know/Refused	9	2	0	0	4	3	0	1	2	7	3	6
	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	0	0	2% H	1%	1%



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı	J	K
OPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY												
Highly effective [Rated 9,10]	633 63%	82 62%	59 57%	32 50%	258 67%	150 61%	52 69%	185 66%	258 65%	189 58%	263 54%	369 71%
	63%	02%	51%	50%	67% C	01%	69% C	00%	00%	36%	54%	71% J
Somewhat effective [Rated 6,7,8]	264 26%	38 29%	30 29%	20 30%	94 24%	69 28%	13 17%	70 25%	98 25%	96 29%	157 32% K	106 20%
Neither [Rated 5]	57 6%	7 6%	8 7%	11 17% ADE	13 3%	13 5%	5 7%	16 6%	23 6%	18 5%	34 7%	23 4%
Not very effective [Rated 2,3,4]	34 3%	2 1%	6 6%	2 3%	11 3%	9 4%	5 6%	8 3%	14 3%	11 3%	23 5% K	11 2%
Not at all effective [Rated 0,1]	11 1%	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	6 2%	3 1%	0 -	3 1%	3 1%	6 2%	8 2%	4 1%
STATISTICS (10= Highly effective 0= Not a	t all effective)	l I										
Mean	8.60	8.61	8.25	8.04	8.77 BC	8.58	8.74	8.70	8.66	8.46	8.26	8.92 J
Standard Deviation	2.0	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.1	1.8
Standard Error	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Median	9.03	8.70	8.52	7.99	9.12	9.02	9.19	9.06	9.02	9.03	8.37	9.17



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Small base					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
[10] Highly effective	241	39	27	15	100	41	19	62	105	74	99	142
	24%	29% E	26%	23%	26% E	17%	25%	22%	26%	23%	20%	27% J
[9]	87	19	7	4	43	13	2	30	29	28	36	51
1-1	9%	14% EF	7%	6%	11% EF	5%	2%	11%	7%	9%	7%	10%
[8]	207	25	15	9	81	60	18	62	89	56	90	117
	21%	18%	14%	14%	21%	24%	24%	22%	22%	17%	18%	22%
[7]	136	20	15	12	41	36	12	29	61	45	82	53
	13%	15%	15%	18%	11%	15%	16%	10%	15%	14%	17% K	10%
[6]	79	6	10	5	26	28	4	24	32	24	44	35
	8%	4%	10%	7%	7%	12% A	6%	8%	8%	7%	9%	7%
[5] Neither	130	14	17	13	50	27	9	36	41	52	68	61
	13%	10%	17%	20%	13%	11%	12%	13%	10%	16% H	14%	12%
[4]	35	3	1	3	8	15	5	17	11	7	14	21
	3%	2%	1%	4%	2%	6% D	7%	6% I	3%	2%	3%	4%
[3]	26	1	3	3	10	6	2	10	10	5	21	6
	3%	1%	3%	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	4% K	1%
[2]	22 2%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	9 2%	7 3%	3 4%	4 1%	11 3%	7 2%	12 3%	10 2%
			1 /0	2 /0			470	1 76	370			2 /0
[1]	11	0	1	0	6	4	0	0	4	7	6	4
	1%	0	1%	-	2%	1%	-	-	1%	2% G	1%	1%
[0] Not at all effective	21	2	3	0	8	7	1	8	5	9	13	9
	2%	1%	3%	-	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	2%
Don't know/Refused	13	4	1	0	6	1	0	0	2	11	2	11
	1%	3%	1%	-	2%	1%	-	-	0	3%	0	2%
										GH		J



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

				REG	SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
OPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY		1										
Highly effective [Rated 9,10]	328	58	34	19	142	55	21	92	134	102	135	193
	33%	43% E	34% E	29%	37% E	22%	28%	33%	34%	31%	28%	37% J
Somewhat effective [Rated 6,7,8]	422 42%	50 38%	40 39%	26 40%	147 38%	124 51%	34 46%	114 41%	182 46%	125 38%	216 44%	205 39%
	42%	30%	39%	40%	30%	AD	40%		40%	30 70	44 70	39%
Neither [Rated 5]	130 13%	14 10%	17 17%	13 20%	50 13%	27 11%	9 12%	36 13%	41 10%	52 16%	68 14%	61 12%
		1070	17 70							Н		
Not very effective [Rated 2,3,4]	84 8%	5 4%	6 5%	7 11%	27 7%	28 11%	10 13%	31 11%	32 8%	20 6%	47 10%	36 7%
			3 70			Α	Α					
Not at all effective [Rated 0,1]	32 3%	2 1%	4 4%	0 -	14 4%	10 4%	1 2%	8 3%	9 2%	16 5%	19 4%	13 3%
STATISTICS (10= Highly effective 0= Not a	t all effective)											
Mean	7.23	7.87	7.14	7.03	7.36	6.82	7.12	7.17	7.42	7.07	6.93	7.52
		BCEF			E							J
Standard Deviation	2.5	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.4
Standard Error	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Median	7.18	7.72	6.88	6.62	7.41	6.79	7.06	7.21	7.28	7.01	6.78	7.47

Ipsos-Reid Public Affairs January 8-10, 2008







CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 3) More effective management of wait lists?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

Siliali base				REC	GION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents								l				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
[10] Highly effective	271	27	23	16	119	69	18	71	116	84	109	162
	27%	20%	22%	24%	31%	28%	24%	25%	29%	26%	22%	31% J
[9]	96	18	12	6	A 25	29	5	32	37	26	34	62
[a]	9%	14%	11%	10%	23 7%	12%	7%	12%	9%	26 8%	7%	12%
		D				D						J
[8]	231	33	26	10	87	57	18	59	92	78	108	124
	23%	25%	25%	16%	23%	23%	24%	21%	23%	24%	22%	24%
[7]	116	18	13	8	40	23	14	40	48	29	75	42
	12%	14%	13%	12%	10%	9%	19% E	14%	12%	9%	15% K	8%
[6]	59	5	9	7	19	15	4	23	23	13	26	33
1-3	6%	4%	9%	11%	5%	6%	6%	8%	6%	4%	5%	6%
[5] Neither	124	13	7	14	53	31	6	38	44	43	63	61
	12%	10%	7%	22% ABF	14%	13%	8%	13%	11%	13%	13%	12%
[4]	29	4	4	1	14	4	1	3	14	12	18	10
	3%	3%	4%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%	4%	4%	2%
[3]	17	1	3	0	7	3	2	6	7	5	12	5
	2%	1%	3%	-	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%
[2]	28	6	2	0	12	6	1	6	10	13	20	9
	3%	5%	2%	-	3%	3%	1%	2%	2%	4%	4% K	2%
[1]	5	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	3	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	0	2%	0	0	1%	1%	0
[0] Not at all effective	15	1	2	1	6	3	2	2	4	9	11	4
	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%
Don't know/Refused	17	5	3	1	1	6	1	2	2	13	9	8
	2%	4%	3%	2%	0	2%	1%	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%
		D	D			D				GH		



CMA - WAIT TIMES

10. Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means Not at all effective and 10 means Highly effective, how effective would say each of the following would be on reducing wait times: 3) More effective management of wait lists?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

Small base				REG	ION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
OPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY		I										
Highly effective [Rated 9,10]	366	45	35	22	144	98	23	103	153	110	143	224
	36%	34%	34%	34%	37%	40%	31%	37%	38%	34%	29%	43% J
Somewhat effective [Rated 6,7,8]	406	56	48	26	146	94	36	122	163	120	208	198
•	40%	42%	46%	39%	38%	38%	49%	43%	41%	37%	43%	38%
Neither [Rated 5]	124	13	7	14	53	31	6	38	44	43	63	61
	12%	10%	7%	22% ABF	14%	13%	8%	13%	11%	13%	13%	12%
Not very effective [Rated 2,3,4]	74	11	9	1	33	14	5	14	30	30	50	24
	7%	9%	9%	2%	9%	6%	7%	5%	8%	9%	10% K	5%
Not at all effective [Rated 0,1]	20	1	2	1	9	3	3	3	6	11	14	5
	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	1%	4%	3% K	1%
STATISTICS (10= Highly effective 0= Not a	t all effective)	l										
Mean	7.50	7.49	7.46	7.35	7.46	7.69	7.33	7.58	7.63	7.27	7.10	7.88 J
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.1
Standard Error	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Median	7.44	7.43	7.40	7.03	7.45	7.60	7.23	7.38	7.52	7.40	7.10	7.74



CMA - WAIT TIMES

11. Thinking about the number of health care professionals in Canada (such as doctors and nurses), which statement best describes your view?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All Respondents	1							l				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
There are enough health care professionals in Canada	36	5	7	2	14	6	3	13	12	10	25	11
	4%	4%	7%	3%	3%	2%	4%	5%	3%	3%	5% K	2%
There is a slight shortage of health care professionals in Canada	252	36	25	16	86	68	20	85	91	75	151	100
	25%	27%	25%	25%	22%	28%	27%	30%	23%	23%	31% K	19%
There is a significant shortage of health care professionals in Canada	710	91	69	46	284	169	51	179	295	234	307	403
·	70%	68%	67%	71%	74%	69%	69%	64%	74% G	72%	63%	77% J
Don't know/Refused	10	2	2	1	3	3	0	3	0	7	4	6
	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	0	2% H	1%	1%



DEMOGRAPHICS Region:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

_				REC	SION	•			AGE	•	GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents											<u> </u>	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
British Columbia	133	133	0	0	0	0	0	32	47	54	65	68
	13%	100% BCDEF	-	-	-	-	-	11%	12%	16%	13%	13%
Alberta	103	0	103	0	0	0	0	38	35	30	45	58
	10%	-	100% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	13%	9%	9%	9%	11%
Sask/Man	66	0	0	66	0	0	0	22	17	25	34	32
	6%	-	-	100% ABDEF	-	-	-	8%	4%	8%	7%	6%
Ontario	386	0	0	0	386	0	0	87	169	129	192	194
	38%	-	-	-	100% ABCEF	-	-	31%	42% G	40%	39%	37%
Quebec	246	0	0	0	0	246	0	70	103	72	115	131
	24%	-	-	-	-	100% ABCDF	-	25%	26%	22%	24%	25%
Atlantic	75	0	0	0	0	0	75	32	27	16	38	37
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	100% ABCDE	11% I	7%	5%	8%	7%



DEMOGRAPHICS

Province:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REC	SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı	J	K
Base: All respondents											L	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
British Columbia	133	133	0	0	0	0	0	32	47	54	65	68
	13%	100% BCDEF	-	-	-	-	-	11%	12%	16%	13%	13%
Alberta	103	0	103	0	0	0	0	38	35	30	45	58
	10%	-	100% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	13%	9%	9%	9%	11%
Saskatchewan	32	0	0	32	0	0	0	12	8	12	18	14
	3%	-	-	49% ABDEF	-	-	-	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%
Manitoba	33	0	0	33	0	0	0	11	10	13	15	18
	3%	-	-	51% ABDEF	-	-	-	4%	2%	4%	3%	3%
Ontario	386	0	0	0	386	0	0	87	169	129	192	194
	38%	-	-	-	100% ABCEF	-	-	31%	42% G	40%	39%	37%
Quebec	246	0	0	0	0	246	0	70	103	72	115	131
	24%	-	-	-	-	100% ABCDF	-	25%	26%	22%	24%	25%
New Brunswick	24	0	0	0	0	0	24	11	8	5	12	12
	2%	-	-	-	-	-	33% ABCDE	4%	2%	1%	3%	2%
Nova Scotia	34	0	0	0	0	0	34	12	15	6	17	17
	3%	-	-	-	-	-	45% ABCDE	4%	4%	2%	3%	3%
Prince Edward Island	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	2	1	3
	0	-	-	-	-	-	6% ABDE	1%	-	1%	0	1%
Newfoundland	12	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	3	4	7	5
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	16% ABCDE	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%



DEMOGRAPHICS

Canadian Markets:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents								1				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
WEST (NET)	301	133	103	66	0	0	0	92	99	109	144	158
	30%	100% DEF	100% DEF	100% DEF	-	-	-	33%	25%	33% H	29%	30%
- British Columbia	133	133	0	0	0	0	0	32	47	54	65	68
British Columbia	13%	100% BCDEF	-	-	-	-	-	11%	12%	16%	13%	13%
- Alberta	103	0	103	0	0	0	0	38	35	30	45	58
	10%	-	100% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	13%	9%	9%	9%	11%
- Saskatchewan/Manitoba	66	0	0	66	0	0	0	22	17	25	34	32
	6%	-	-	100% ABDEF	-	-	-	8%	4%	8%	7%	6%
ONTARIO (NET)	386	0	0	0	386	0	0	87	169	129	192	194
o, (<u>.</u>)	38%	-	-	-	100% ABCEF	-	-	31%	42% G	40%	39%	37%
GTA (SUBNET)	166	0	0	0	166	0	0	30	85	51	75	91
OTA (OOBNET)	16%	-	-	-	43% ABCEF	-	-	11%	21% G	15%	15%	17%
- 416	61	0	0	0	61	0	0	14	27	20	34	28
410	6%	-	-	-	16% ABCEF	-	-	5%	7%	6%	7%	5%
- 905	105	0	0	0	105	0	0	17	58	30	42	63
	10%	-	-	-	27% ABCEF	-	-	6%	15% GI	9%	9%	12%
- Central Ontario	70	0	0	0	70	0	0	20	31	19	40	31
Contral Charle	7%	-	-	-	18% ABCEF	-	-	7%	8%	6%	8%	6%
- Eastern Ontario	53	0	0	0	53	0	0	15	16	23	28	26
24550.11 0.1141.15	5%	-	-	-	14% ABCEF	-	-	5%	4%	7%	6%	5%
- SouthWest Ontario	64	0	0	0	64	0	0	15	22	26	32	32
SSSVOOL STRAINS	6%	-	-	-	17% ABCEF	-	-	5%	6%	8%	7%	6%
- Northern Ontario	32	0	0	0	32	0	0	7	15	10	17	16
	3%	-	-	-	8% ABCEF	-	-	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%
QUEBEC (NET)	246	0	0	0	0	246	0	70	103	72	115	131
	24%	-	-	-	-	100% ABCDF	-	25%	26%	22%	24%	25%



DEMOGRAPHICS

Canadian Markets:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н		J	K
- Montreal CMA - Quebec	128	0	0	0	0	128	0	39	52	37	58	70
	13%	-	-	-	-	52%	-	14%	13%	11%	12%	13%
						ABCDF						
- Other - Quebec	118	0	0	0	0	118	0	31	51	36	57	61
	12%	-	-	-	-	48%	-	11%	13%	11%	12%	12%
						ABCDF						
Atlantic	75	0	0	0	0	0	75	32	27	16	38	37
	7%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	11%	7%	5%	8%	7%
							ABCDE	1				



DEMOGRAPHICS

Urban / Rural

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Urban	809	113	85	40	321	204	45	231	324	253	379	429
	80%	85% CF	83% CF	61%	83% CF	83% CF	61%	82%	81%	77%	78%	83%
Rural	199	20	17	26	65	42	29	50	75	74	108	91
	20%	15%	17%	39% ABDE	17%	17%	39% ABDE	18%	19%	23%	22%	17%



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
St. John's	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	1	5	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	6% ABDE	1%	0	0	1% K	-
Grand Falls-Windsor	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	Ö	-	-	-	-	-	1% D	0	0	-	-	0
Charlottetown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ö	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	Ö	-	Ö
Halifax	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	5	4	7	8
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	19% ABCDE	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Kentville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	-	0
Truro	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	1	2
	0	-	-	-	-	-	5% ADE	1%	0	0	0	0
New Glasgow	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% DE	1%	-	-	-	0
Cape Breton	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	0	5	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	6% ABDE	1%	1%	-	1% K	-
Moncton	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	1	4	5
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	12% ABCDE	3% HI	-	0	1%	1%
Saint John	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% DE	-	0	-	-	0
Fredericton	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	3% DE	1%	0	Ö	0	-
Bathurst	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Ö	-	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	Ö	-	Ö	-
Edmundston	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	2	2	2
	0	-	-	-	-	-	6% ABDE	1%	Ö	1%	1%	0



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

ornan base				REC	GION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н		J	K
Rimouski	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	0	-	0
Riviere-du-Loup	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Kiviere-du-Loup	Ö	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	-
Baie-Comeau	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
24.5 00644	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	-	Ö
Chicoutimi - Jonquiere	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	3	2	3	4
	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	0	1%	1%	1%	1%
Alma	3	0	0	0	0	D 3	0	2	2	0	3	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	0	-	1%	0
Dolbeau	3	0	0	0	0	D 3	0	0	3	0	3	0
	0	-	-	=	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-
Sept-Iles	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
·	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	0
Quebec	25	0	0	0	0	25	0	10	6	9	14	12
	3%	-	-	-	-	10% ABCDF	=	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%
Saint-Georges	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-
Thetford Mines	2 0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0	-	0	0
Sherbrooke	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	1	2	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	0	0	0	0	0
Magog	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	-	0	-
Victoriaville	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	-	0
Trois-Rivieres	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	1	1	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	-	1%	0	0	0
Shawinigan	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	2	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	1%	0	0



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Sitiali base				REG	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Drummondville	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	-
Granby	1 0	0	0	0	0	1 1%	0	0	1 0	0	0	1 0
Saint-Hyacinthe	1 0	0	0	0	0	1 0	0	1 0	0	0	0	1 0
Joliette	4 0	0	0	0	0	4 1%	0	4 1%	0	0	3 1%	1 0
	U	-	-	-	-	D	-	H	-	-	1 70	U
Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	=	-	-	1%	=	-	0	-	=	0
Montreal	116	0	0	0	0	116	0	34	50	33	53	64
	12%	-	-	-	-	47% ABCDF	-	12%	13%	10%	11%	12%
Salaberry-de-Valleyfield	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	-	0
Rouyn-Noranda	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	-	0
Cornwall	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	1
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	0	0
Hawkesbury	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	0
Ottawa - Hull	34	0	0	0	25	9	0	10	13	11	11	23
	3%	-	-	-	7% ABF	4% A	-	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%
Brockville	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-
Pembroke	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	0
	0	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0
Kingston	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	4	1	1	5	2
	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	0	0	1%	0



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Siliali Dase				REC	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Belleville	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	0
Cobourg	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peterborough	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	3	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	1%	0
Lindsay	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2 1%	0	1	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	=	1%	0	0	0
Oshawa	17 2%	0	0	0	17 4%	0	0	4 1%	9 2%	4 1%	13 3%	4 1%
		-	-	-	AE	-	-	1%			K	
Toronto	149 15%	0	0	0	149	0	0	27	77	46 14%	63 13%	86
	15%	-	-	-	39% ABCEF	-	-	9%	19% G	14%	13%	17%
Hamilton	11	0	0	0	11	0	0	2 1%	6 1%	3 1%	2	8 2%
	1%	-	-	-	3% E	-	-	1%	170	170	0	2%
St. Catharines - Niagara	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	4	2	3	5	3
	1%	-	-	-	2% E	-	-	1%	0	1%	1%	1%
Kitchener	19	0	0	0	19	0	0	4	10	6	12	7
	2%	-	-	-	5% ABE	-	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%
Brantford	4 0	0	0	0	4 1%	0	0	1 0	1 0	1 0	2 0	1 0
	U	-	-	-		-	-	U	U			0
Woodstock	3 0	0	0	0	3 1%	0	0	0	1 0	2 1%	2 0	1 0
	U				170					1 70	U	0
Tillsonburg	1 0	0	0	0	1 0	0	0	0	0	1 0	0	1 0
Simcoe	1 0	0	0	0	1 0	0	0	0	1 0	0	1 0	0
Guelph	3	0	0	0	3 1%	0	0	1 0	2 0	0	3 1%	0
	U	-		-	I 70	-	-	U	U		1 70	



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Silidii Dase				REG	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Stratford	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-
London	13	0	0	0	13	0	0	4	4	5	5	8
	1%	-	-	-	3% E	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Chatham	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0
Windsor	9 1%	0	0	0	9 2%	0	0	6 2%	2 1%	1 0	5 1%	4 1%
		_			Е							
Sarnia	9 1%	0 -	0	0 -	9 2%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	4 1%	3 1%	4 1%	4 1%
0 0 1			•		2% E							
Owen Sound	2 0	0 -	0	0 -	2 1%	0	0 -	2 1%	0	0 0	2 0	0 0
Barrie	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	3	3	2
Dame	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	0	1%	1%	0
Orillia	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	2	0	2	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	0	0	0	0
Midland	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
	0	-	-	-	1%	=	-	1%	-	-	0	-
Sudbury	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	4	0	5
	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	0	1%
Haileybury	3 0	0	0	0	3 1%	0	0	0	1 0	1	3 1%	0
							<u>-</u>			0		
Timmins	2 0	0	0	0	2 0	0	0	0	2 0	0	0	2 0
Sault Ste. Marie	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0	0	2 0	0 -
Thursday Day			0						4			
Thunder Bay	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

				REG	SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Kenora	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	1%	=	-	0	-
Winnipeg	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	8	5	8	9	12
	2%	-	-	32% ABDEF	-	=	-	3%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Brandon	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
	0	-	-	3% DE	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Thompson	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	=	2% DE	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-
Regina	6 1%	0	0	6 9%	0	0	0	2 1%	0	4 1%	3 1%	3 1%
				ABDEF						Н		
Moose Jaw	2 0	0	0	2 3%	0	0	0	2 1%	0	0	0	2
				DE								
Saskatoon	8 1%	0	0	8 12%	0	0	0	3 1%	3 1%	2 1%	6 1%	2 0
				ABDEF								
Medicine Hat	6 1%	0	6 6%	0	0	0	0	5 2%	0	2 1%	2 0	5 1%
			ADE		-			Н	=	176	U	
Lethbridge	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
	0	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0
Calgary	35	0	35	0	0	0	0	11	13	11	15	20
	3%	-	34% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%
Red Deer	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	0	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0
Edmonton	28	0	28	0	0	0	0	10	9	9	13	14
	3%	-	27% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%
Lloydminster	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	1% D	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
Grand Centre	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1
	0	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Siliali base				REC	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н		J	K
Grande Prairie	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	-	1%	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	0
Wood Buffalo	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
	0	-	1% D	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	0
Wetaskiwin	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0
Kelowna	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2
	0	3% DE	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	0	1%	0
Vernon	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2
	0	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Kamloops	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
	0	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	0
Chilliwack	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	1
	0	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
Abbotsford	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3	3
	1%	5% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	0	0	1%	1%
Vancouver	69	69	0	0	0	0	0	17	24	29	32	37
	7%	52% BCDEF	-	-	-	-	-	6%	6%	9%	7%	7%
Victoria	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	4
	1%	5% BDE	-	-	-	-	-	0	1%	1%	0	1%
Duncan	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2 0
	0	2% D	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0	
Nanaimo	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
	0	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	1%
Courtenay	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
	0	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	0	-	-	1%
Campbell River	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2
	0	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
		DE										



DEMOGRAPHICS
Census Metropolitan Area:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Quesnel	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	0	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	0
		D										
Terrace	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
	0	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-
Not in a CMA/Unknown	206	26	22	26	61	45	26	52	79	73	108	98
	20%	19%	21%	39%	16%	18%	35%	19%	20%	22%	22%	19%
				ABDE			ADE					



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

smail base				REG	GION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All respondents	l							I			I	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
BRITISH COLUMBIA												
Control Kastanay Basianal Bistrict	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Central Kootenay Regional District	0	1%	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
Kootenay Boundary Regional District	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0
,,	0	3% DE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	0
Okanagan-Similkameen Regional District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0
Fraser Valley Regional District	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	5	4
	1%	7% BDEF	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Greater Vancouver Regional District	69	69	0	0	0	0	0	17	24	29	32	37
	7%	52% BCDEF	-	-	-	-	-	6%	6%	9%	7%	7%
Capital Regional District	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	4
	1%	5% BDE	-	-	-	-	-	0	1%	1%	0	1%
Cowichan Valley Regional District	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
	0	2% D	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0	0
Nanaimo Regional District	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
	0	3% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	1%
Comox-Strathcona Regional District	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	4
	1%	5% BDE	-	-	-	=	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Sunshine Coast Regional District	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	0	1%	-	-	<u>-</u>	=	=	-	0	=	=	0
Sqamish-Lillooet Regional District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Thompson-Nicola Regional District	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	2
	0	3% DE	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0
Central Okanagan Regional District	4 0	4 3% DE	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	2 0	3 1%	2 0
North Okanagan Regional District	3 0	3 2% DE	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 0	1 0	2 0
Columbia-Shuswap Regional District	3 0	3 2% DE	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	3 1%	0 -
Cariboo Regional District	2 0	2 1% D	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	2 0	0 -	2 0
Mount Waddington Regional District	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0
Kitimat-Stikine Regional District	2 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -
Bilkley-Nechako Regional District	3 0	3 2% DE	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	3 1%	0 -
Fraser-Fort George Regional District	5 0	5 4% DE	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	2 1%	4 1%	1 0
Peace River Regional District	2 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	2 0	0 -



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

					GION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Division No. 1	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	2	5
	1%	-	6% ADE	-	-	-	-	2% H	-	1%	0	1%
Division No. 2	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
	0	-	4% ADE	-	-	-	-	1%	0	-	-	1%
Division No. 5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	1% D	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0
Division No. 6	36	0	36	0	0	0	0	11	13	12	15	21
	4%	-	35% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%
Division No. 7	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	2% D	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Division No. 8	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	6
	1%	-	8% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	0	1%
Division No. 10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	1% D	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
Division No. 11	29	0	29	0	0	0	0	10	10	9	13	15
	3%	-	28% ACDEF	-	-	-	-	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%
Division No. 12	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	1
	0	-	3% DE	-	-	-	-	-	1%	0	1%	0
Division No. 13	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	4	1
	1%	-	5% ADE	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	0	1%	0
Division No. 15	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
	0	-	2% D	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-
Division No. 16	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
	0	-	1% D	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	0
Division No. 19	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	4	0
	0	-	4% ADE	-	-	-	-	1%	0	0	1%	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Division No. 3	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
	0	-	-	4% ADE	-	-	-	-	0	0	1%	-
Division No. 5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	2% D	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-
Division No. 6	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	4	4	5
	1%	-	-	12% ABDEF	-	-	-	1%	0	1%	1%	1%
Division No. 7	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
	0	-	-	5% ABDE	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%
Division No. 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
Division No. 10	2 0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
	0	-	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0
Division No. 11	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	6	2
	1%	-	-	12% ABDEF	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	0
Division No. 13	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	•	-	1% D	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0
Division No. 14	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	0	-	-	4% ADE	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	0
Division No. 15	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	2% DE	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0
Division No. 17	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	-
Division No. 18	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Sitiali base				REG					AGE			IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Division No. 1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
	0	-	-	3% DE	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0
Division No. 2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1
	0	-	-	4% ADE	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0
Division No. 3	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	1
	0	-	-	6% ABDEF	-	-	-	1%	0	0	1%	0
Division No. 7	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
	0	-	-	3% DE	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Division No. 11	19	0	0	19	0	0	0	8	3	7	6	12
	2%	-	-	28% ABDEF	-	-	-	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%
Division No. 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0
Division No. 13	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	2% DE	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	-
Division No. 19	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	2% D	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-
Division No. 22	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	2% DE	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-
ONTARIO												
Stormont Dundas and Glengarry	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	1
Clomon Bundas and Clongary	ő	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	0	0
Prescott and Russell	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	3
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	0	0
Ottawa	22	0	0	0	22	0	0	7	8	7	8	15
	2%	-	-	-	6% ABE	-	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Leeds and Grenville	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	0	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Siliali base				RE(GION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Frontenac County	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	4	1	1	5	2
	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	0	0	1%	0
Lennox and Addington	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-
Hastings County	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	2
	0	-	-	=	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	1%	0
Prince Edward Division	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	0	0
Northumberland County	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peterborough County	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	3	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	1%	0
Kawartha Lakes Division	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2 1%	0	1	2 0
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	0	U
Durham Regional Municipality	22	0	0	0	22	0	0	4	11	8	13	10
	2%	-	-	=	6% ABE	-	-	1%	3%	2%	3%	2%
York Regional Municipality	31	0	0	0	31	0	0	5	19	6	10	21
	3%	-	-	=	8% ABCEF	-	-	2%	5% I	2%	2%	4%
Toronto	65	0	0	0	65	0	0	16	29	20	35	30
	6%	-	-	-	17% ABCEF	-	-	6%	7%	6%	7%	6%
Peel Regional Municipality	27	0	0	0	27	0	0	3	16	8	12	15
	3%	-	-	=	7% ABCEF	-	-	1%	4% G	2%	2%	3%
Dufferin County	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	2	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	0	0
Wellington County	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	3	1	4	1
	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	1%	0	1%	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

small bas

Siliali base				REG	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Halton Regional Municipality	19	0	0	0	19	0	0	3	9	7	4	15
	2%	-	-	-	5% ABE	-	-	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Hamilton	7	0	0	0	7	0	0	2	3	3	2	6
	1%	-	-	-	2% E	-	-	1%	1%	1%	0	1%
Niagara Regional Municipality	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	4	2	3	5	3
	1%	-	-	-	2% E	-	-	1%	0	1%	1%	1%
Haldimand-Norfolk Regional Municipality	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	2
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0
Brant County	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	1
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
Waterloo Regional Municipality	24	0	0	0	24	0	0	6	11	7	15	9
	2%	-	-	-	6% ABE	-	-	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%
Perth County	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	=	-	0	0	-
Oxford County	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	5	3	3
	1%	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	0	2%	1%	1%
Elgin County	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	4
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	-	1%
Chatham-Kent Division	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	-
Essex County	11	0	0	0	11	0	0	7	2	1	7	4
	1%	-	-	-	3% E	-	-	3% 	1%	0	1%	1%
Lambton County	11	0	0	0	11	0	0	2	5	5	7	5
	1%	-	-	-	3% E	-	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Middlesex County	12	0	0	0	12	0	0	4	4	3	5	6
	1%	-	-	-	3% E	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Huron County	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	3
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	1%	0	1%



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

small bas

					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Bruce County	4 0	0 -	0	0	4 1%	0	0	0 -	0	4 1%	3 1%	1 0
Grey County	4 0	0 -	0	0	4 1%	0	0	2 1%	2 0	0	2 0	2 0
Simcoe County	16 2%	0 -	0	0	16 4%	0	0	8 3%	3 1%	5 2%	9 2%	7
Muskoka District Municipality	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	AE 1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0	0	0 0	0
Haliburton County	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0
Renfrew County	5 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	5 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	2 0	1 0	5 1%	0
Parry Sound District	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0	0 -	2 0	0
Sudbury District	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0	0 -	0 -	2 0
Greater Sudbury Division	5 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	5 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	4 1%	0 0	5 1%
Timiskaming District	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	3 1%	0
Cochrane District	7 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	7 2%	0 -	0 -	0 -	5 1%	3 1%	2 0	5 1%
Algoma District	4 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	3 1%	0 -	2 0	2 0
Thunder Bay District	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Rainy River District	1 0	0	0	0	1 0	0	0	0	0	1 0	1 0	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

smaii base					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Kenora District	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	3	0
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	0	-	1%	-
QUEBEC												
La Côte-de-Gaspé	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
La cole de Caspe	Ö	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	Ö	Ö	-
La Haute-Gaspésie	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
·	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	-	0	-
Rimouski-Neigette	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	1	2	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	1%	-	0	0	0
Rivière-du-Loup	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	-
Témiscouata	1 0	0	0	0	0	1 1%	0	0	1 0	0	1 0	0
Kamouraska	4 0	0	0	0	0	4 2%	0	0	4 1%	0	3 1%	1 0
						D						
L'Islet	1 0	0 -	0	0	0	1 0	0	0 -	1 0	0	0 -	1 0
Bellechasse	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Deliechasse	Ö	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	-	0
Comm. Urbaine de Québec	16	0	0	0	0	16	0	5	4	7	7	8
	2%	-	-	-	-	6% ABDF	-	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Desjardins	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0
Les Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	5	1	2	6	2
	1%	-	=	=	-	3% D	-	2%	0	1%	1%	0
Robert-Cliche	1 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 0	0	1	0
	U	-	-	-	-	0	-		U	-	0	-



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Siliali base				REG	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Beauce-Sartigan	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	3	4	0
	0	-	-	-	-	2% D	-	-	0	1%	1%	-
Le Granit	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	0	-
L'Amiante	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	1	0	1	3
	0	-	-	-	-	2% D	-	1%	0	-	0	1%
L'Érable	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	-	0
Lotbinière	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	0	0
Portneuf	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	-	0
Mékinac	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	0	-
Le Cente-de-la-Mauricie	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	2	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	1%	0	0
Francheville	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	1	1	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	-	1%	0	0	0
Arthabaska	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	1	0	4
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	-	1%	0	-	1%
Le Haut-Saint-François	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	0
Le Val-Saint-François	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	0	0
La Région-Sherbrookoise	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0	0	0	0
Coatiook	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Memphrémagog	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	-	0	-
La Haute-Yamaska	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	=	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	-	0
Drummond	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	-	0	1%	1%	-
Les Maskoutains	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	0
Rouville	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	1	1	3
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	0	0	0	0	1%
Le Haut-Richelieu	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	3
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	1%	0	-	-	1%
La Vallée-du-Richelieu	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	2	1	2	2
	0	-	=	-	-	2% D	-	0	0	0	0	0
Champlain	18	0	0	0	0	18	0	5	7	6	5	13
	2%	-	-	-	-	7% ABCDF	-	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%
L'Assomption	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	0	0
Joliette	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	3	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	1% H	-	-	1%	0
Matawanie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	-



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

small bas

Gridii bado					SION				AGE			NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Les Mouulins	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	5	1	3	5
	1%	-	-	-	-	3% D	-	0	1%	0	1%	1%
Laval	10	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2	3	5	5
	1%	-	-	-	-	4% AD	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Comm. Urbaine-de-Montréal	62	0	0	0	0	62	0	21	22	19	32 7%	30
	6%	-	=	-	-	25% ABCDF	=	8%	6%	6%	7%	6%
Roussillon	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	4	0	2	3
	0	-	-	-	-	2% D	-	0	1%	-	0	0
Le Haut-Saint-Laurent	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	-	0
Beauharnois-Salaberry	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	-	0
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0	-	-	0
Deux-Montagnes	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	0	0
Thérèse-De-Blainville	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	0	-	0	0
Mirabel	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0
La Rivière-du-Nord	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	2	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	-	0	0	0	0
Argenteuil	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	-	0
Antoine-Labelle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	-
Papineau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Comm. Urbaine-de-l'Outaouais	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	0.15	A T.	40.04	~= - .			
Comm Urbaine-de-l'Outaquais		•		SIVIVIIA	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
Comm. Urbaine-de-l'Outaouais		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
John Cibanio de l'Odiacado	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	3	2	1	2	4
	1%	-	-	-	-	3% D	-	1%	1%	0	0	1%
Les Collines-de-l'Outaouais	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	0	-	0
Pontiac	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	0
Rouyn-Noranda	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	-	0
Abitibi-Ouest	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0
Abitibi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	-
Le Domainde-du-Roy	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0
Maria-Chapdelaine	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-
Lac-Saint-Jean-Est	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	3	0
	0	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	1%	0	-	1%	0
Le Fjord-du-Saguenay	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	4	2	4	4
	1%	-	-	-	-	3% D	-	0	1%	1%	1%	1%
Manicouagan	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0	-	0
Sept-Rivières - Caniapiscau	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
	0	-	-	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	0
EW BRUNSWICK												



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Sitiali base				REG	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Saint John County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% DE	-	0	-	-	0
Charlotte County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	1%	0	-	-	-	0
Sunbury County	1 0	0	0	0	0	0	1 1%	0	0	1 0	0	1 0
							D					
Kings County	1 0	0	0	0	0	0	1 2%	0	1 0	0	1 0	0
							D					
Albert County	1 0	0	0	0	0	0	1 1%	0	0	1 0	0	1 0
							D					
Westmorland County	8 1%	0 -	0	0 -	0 -	0	8 10%	8 3%	0 -	0	4 1%	4 1%
No de la la colonia			•				ABCDE	HI	-			
Northumberland County	2 0	0 -	0	0 -	0 -	0	2 3%	0	2 1%	0	1 0	1 0
York County	2	0	0	0	0	0	DE 2	1	0	0	2	0
Fork County	0	-	-	-	-	-	3%	1%	0	0	0	-
Victoria County	1	0	0	0	0	0	DE 1	0	1	0	0	1
violona county	0	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	0	-	-	0
Madawaska County	4	0	0	0	0	0	D 4	1	0	2	2	2
•	0	-	-	-	-	-	6% ABDE	1%	0	1%	1%	0
Gloucester County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	1% D	-	0	-	0	-
NOVA SCOTIA												
Digby County	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2
J.,,	0	-	-	-	-	-	3% DE	-	Ô	0	-	0
Queens County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	0



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

* small base				REG					AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Lunenburg County	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	4% ADE	-	1%	-	0	0
Kings County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% D	-	0	-	0	0
Hants County	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	3% DE	1%	-	-	0	-
Halifax County	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	5	4	7	8
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	19% ABCDE	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Colchester County	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	1	2
	0	-	-	-	-	-	5% ADE	1%	0	0	0	0
Cumberland County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	0	-	0
Pictou County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% DE	1%	-	-	-	0
Cape Breton County	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	0	5	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	6% ABDE	1%	1%	-	1% K	-
P.E.I.												
Kings County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% D	-	-	0	0	-
Queens County	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2
•	0	-	-	-	-	-	3% DE	1%	-	0	-	0
Prince County	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% DE	1%	-	-	-	0
NEWFOUNDLAND												



DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Division

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	IDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Division No. 1	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	1	2	6	1
	1%	-	-	-	-	-	9% ABCDE	1%	0	1%	1%	0
Division No. 3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	2% D	-	0	-	-	0
Division No. 6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	1% D	0	0	-	-	0
Division No. 9	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1
	0	-	-	-	-	-	3% DE	0	-	0	0	0

DEMOGRAPHICS Respondent's Sex:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents								l			<u> </u>	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Male	488	65	45	34	192	115	38	142	197	148	488	0
	48%	49%	43%	51%	50%	47%	51%	50%	49%	45%	100%	-
											K	
Female	520	68	58	32	194	131	37	140	202	178	0	520
	52%	51%	57%	49%	50%	53%	49%	50%	51%	55%	-	100%
												J



DEMOGRAPHICS Language of Interview:

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	SION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	К
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
English	784	133	103	66	386	22	75	216	304	262	382	402
	78%	100% E	100% E	100% E	100% E	9%	100% E	77%	76%	80%	78%	77%
French	224	0	0	0	0	224	0	65	95	64	106	118
	22%	-	-	-	-	91%	-	23%	24%	20%	22%	23%
						ABCDF						



DEMOGRAPHICS

What age group do you fall into?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

small base				REG	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents											l.	
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
18 to 24	96	15	14	3	34	18	12	96	0	0	48	48
	9%	11%	14%	5%	9%	7%	16% E	34% HI	-	-	10%	9%
25 to 34	186	17	24	19	53	52	20	186	0	0	94	91
	18%	13%	23% D	29% AD	14%	21% D	27% AD	66% HI	-	-	19%	18%
35 to 44	185	22	15	6	73	56	13	0	185	0	92	94
	18%	17%	15%	9%	19%	23% C	17%	-	47% GI	-	19%	18%
45 to 54	213	25	19	11	96	48	14	0	213	0	105	108
	21%	19%	19%	17%	25%	19%	18%	-	53% GI	-	22%	21%
55 to 64	171	22	18	11	68	43	9	0	0	171	71	100
	17%	16%	17%	17%	18%	17%	13%	-	-	52% GH	15%	19%
65+	155	32	13	13	61	30	7	0	0	155	77	78
	15%	24% BEF	12%	20%	16%	12%	9%	-	-	48% GH	16%	15%
Refused	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	0	-	-	2% DE	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
STATISTICS												
Average age	46	49 BEF	44	48 F	48 EF	45	41	27	45 G	66 GH	46	47
Standard Deviation	16.5	17.9	17.6	18.1	16.1	15.2	16.0	4.9	5.7	8.3	16.5	16.6
Standard Error	0.5	1.6	1.7	2.3	0.8	1.0	1.9	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.7



DEMOGRAPHICS
What is your current marital status?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Sitiali base				REC	SION				AGE		GE	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All respondents								l				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Single or never married	233	28	24	12	76	74	19	136	64	33	126	107
	23%	21%	24%	19%	20%	30% D	25%	48% HI	16% I	10%	26%	21%
Married	472	71	52	34	207	68	39	86	216	169	244	228
	47%	53%	51%	52%	54%	28%	52%	31%	54%	52%	50%	44%
		E	E	E	E		E		G	G		
Common-law or living with a partner	112	8	11	2	29	54	7	46	47	18	48	65
	11%	6%	11%	3%	8%	22% ABCDF	9%	16% I	12% I	6%	10%	12%
Divorced or separated	117	19	8	8	41	31	9	11	57	49	45	72
·	12%	14%	8%	12%	11%	13%	12%	4%	14% G	15% G	9%	14% J
Widowed	67	6	6	8	28	18	2	2	8	57	21	46
	7%	4%	6%	12%	7%	7%	2%	1%	2%	18% GH	4%	9% J
Refused	7	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	5	0	5	2
	1%	0	-	2% E	1%	-	-	0	1%	-	1%	0



DEMOGRAPHICS Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?

S/H/I - J/K

Proportions/Means: Columns	Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/ł
* emall haca	

small base		REGION							AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All Respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
1 person	195	29	14	10	73	56	12	37	52	107	96	99
	19%	22%	14%	15%	19%	23%	17%	13%	13%	33% GH	20%	19%
2 persons	324	47	33	24	118	80	23	63	101	161	156	169
	32%	35%	32%	36%	31%	33%	30%	23%	25%	49% GH	32%	32%
3 persons	214	22	21	16	87	50	17	87	90	38	110	104
	21%	17%	20%	24%	23%	20%	23%	31% HI	22% I	12%	23%	20%
4 persons	175	17	19	13	65	43	19	63	100	12	78	97
	17%	12%	18%	19%	17%	18%	26% A	22% I	25% I	4%	16%	19%
5 persons	60	13	10	0	25	9	1	24	32	4	20	40
	6%	10% CE	10% CE	1%	6%	4%	2%	9% I	8% I	1%	4%	8% J
6 persons	23	2	5	0	9	5	1	5	16	2	14	8
	2%	1%	5%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	4% I	1%	3%	2%
7 persons	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	3	1
	0	1%	-	1%	0	-	-	0	1%	-	1%	0
8 persons	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	3	0
	0	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	0	1%	-
9 persons	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
	0	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-
10+ persons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	-
Refused	8	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	4	2	5	3
	1%	0	-	4% DE	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	0
STATISTICS												
Mean	2.69	2.68	2.94	2.57	2.74	2.54	2.72	3.00	3.08	1.95	2.69	2.69
	2.00	2.00	E	2.01	2.7 1	2.0 1		1	1	1.00	2.00	2.00



DEMOGRAPHICS

Do you have any children under the age of 18 currently living in your household?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REG	ION				AGE		GEN	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: Excludes respondents living alone	9											
Unweighted Base	812	106	88	52	312	194	60	196	385	230	387	425
Weighted Base	805	103*	88*	53*	309	188	62*	244	342	218	386	418
Yes	362	30	39	23	140	93	36	141	208	13	159	203
	45%	29%	45%	44%	45%	50%	58%	58%	61%	6%	41%	49%
			Α		Α	Α	Α	1	1			
No	443	74	49	30	169	95	26	104	135	204	227	215
	55%	71%	55%	56%	55%	50%	42%	42%	39%	94%	59%	51%
		BDEF								GH		

DEMOGRAPHICS

And what are the ages of each of the children under 18 who are currently living in your household?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

* small base; ** very small base (I	, ,	REGION AGE										NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
ALL AGES												
Base: Children under the age of 18												
Unweighted Base	367	33	41	20	151	93	29	106	245	15	166	201
Weighted Base	362	30**	39*	23**	140	93*	36**	141*	208	13**	159	203
Under 1 year old	24	3	3	0	12	3	4	15	9	0	11	13
·	7%	9%	9%	-	8%	3%	11%	11%	4%	-	7%	6%
One year old	43	8	1	3	14	14	3	28	13	3	16	27
•	12%	26%	4%	13%	10%	15%	8%	20% H	6%	19%	10%	13%
Two years old	34	1	5	4	10	8	5	26	7	0	15	19
	9%	4%	14%	17%	7%	9%	13%	19% H	4%	-	9%	9%
Three years old	29	0	6	3	11	4	5	21	9	0	12	18
	8%	2%	15%	13%	8%	5%	14%	15% H	4%	-	7%	9%
Four years old	35	9	0	2	12	11	1	19	16	0	15	20
	10%	30%	-	7%	9%	12% B	4%	13%	8%	-	9%	10%
Five years old	34	2	5	2	13	8	3	10	23	1	19	15
	9%	7%	13%	9%	10%	9%	9%	7%	11%	7%	12%	8%
Six years old	31	5	3	4	12	5	1	21	10	0	12	19
•	9%	16%	8%	17%	9%	6%	4%	15% H	5%	-	7%	9%
Seven years old	34	1	3	6	12	5	7	16	16	1	13	21
	9%	3%	7%	24%	9%	6%	18%	12%	8%	11%	8%	10%
Eight years old	41	5	1	4	16	14	3	15	25	1	25	17
	11%	16%	3%	15%	11%	15%	8%	11%	12%	11%	16%	8%
Nine years old	23	0	2	1	11	7	1	3	18	1	17	5
	6%	2%	5%	5%	8%	7%	4%	2%	9% G	11%	11% K	3%
Ten years old	32	3	3	0	12	11	4	9	22	1	17	15
	9%	11%	7%	-	9%	11%	10%	6%	11%	11%	11%	7%



DEMOGRAPHICS

And what are the ages of each of the children under 18 who are currently living in your household?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Small base, very small base (under 60)		-		REC	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Eleven years old	22	2	2	5	6	6	2	3	17	2	11	11
	6%	5%	4%	20%	4%	7%	6%	2%	8% G	14%	7%	5%
Twelve years old	34	1	5	3	18	7	0	7	27	0	22	13
	9%	3%	13%	15%	13%	7%	1%	5%	13% G	-	14% K	6%
Thirteen years old	29	2	4	3	10	8	2	5	24	0	12	16
	8%	6%	9%	13%	7%	9%	7%	4%	11% G	-	8%	8%
Fourteen years old	29	1	7	0	11	7	3	5	23	0	7	22
	8%	4%	18%	2%	8%	7%	7%	4%	11% G	3%	4%	11% J
Fifteen years old	34	3	2	2	14	9	5	7	25	2	15	20
·	10%	11%	4%	7%	10%	10%	13%	5%	12%	14%	9%	10%
Sixteen years old	28	1	4	0	12	8	3	3	21	4	11	17
•	8%	3%	11%	-	8%	8%	8%	2%	10% G	30%	7%	8%
Seventeen years old	48	6	4	1	27	9	2	3	41	4	16	32
•	13%	19%	10%	4%	19%	10%	5%	2%	20% G	29%	10%	16%
Refused	8	0	3	0	5	0	0	2	6	0	4	4
	2%	-	7% E	2%	3%	-	-	1%	3%	-	2%	2%



DEMOGRAPHICS

What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

				REG	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	K
Base: All respondents								ı				
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Grade school or some high school	134	10	6	16	52	42	8	39	37	58	79	55
-	13%	7%	6%	25% ABD	13% B	17% AB	11%	14%	9%	18% H	16% K	11%
Complete high school	311	33	41	22	118	75	22	78	114	119	148	163
	31%	25%	39% A	34%	31%	31%	30%	28%	29%	36% H	30%	31%
Some community college or university, but did not finish	161	31	18	8	69	24	12	49	69	44	67	95
	16%	23% E	17%	12%	18% E	10%	16%	17%	17%	13%	14%	18%
Complete technical or trade school/Community college	234	29	25	10	79	70	20	69	105	60	115	119
, ,	23%	22%	25%	15%	20%	28% CD	27%	25%	26% I	18%	24%	23%
Complete university degree, such as a Bachelor's	104	18	10	5	43	24	6	31	49	24	44	61
	10%	13%	10%	7%	11%	10%	7%	11%	12% I	7%	9%	12%
Post-graduate degree, such as a Master's or Ph.D.	51	8	4	3	23	8	6	13	23	15	27	24
	5%	6%	4%	4%	6%	3%	8%	5%	6%	4%	5%	5%
Refused	13	4	0	2	3	4	0	2	1	8	9	4
	1%	3%	-	4%	1%	2%	-	1%	0	2% H	2%	1%



DEMOGRAPHICS

Which one of the following categories best describes your current employment status?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K * small base

				REC	SION				AGE		GEI	NDER
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Working full-time	447	44	45	22	179	116	40	128	253	66	233	214
	44%	33%	44%	34%	46%	47%	53%	45%	64%	20%	48%	41%
					Α	Α	AC	I	GI			
Working part-time	97	17	16	5	36	17	6	39	37	21	31	66
	10%	12%	16% E	8%	9%	7%	8%	14% I	9%	6%	6%	13% J
Self-employed	96	6	17	11	34	25	4	30	46	20	67	29
	10%	4%	16% AF	17% AF	9%	10%	5%	11%	12% I	6%	14% K	5%
Unemployed, but looking for work	42	6	2	1	12	13	8	16	21	6	24	18
	4%	5%	2%	2%	3%	5%	11% BD	6% I	5% I	2%	5%	4%
Attending school full-time/A student	42	7	5	3	13	10	4	37	5	0	17	25
	4%	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%	6%	13% HI	1% I	-	3%	5%
Retired	195	37	11	13	79	45	9	2	5	189	94	102
	19%	28% BEF	11%	21%	21% B	18%	12%	1%	1%	58% GH	19%	20%
Not in the workforce/A full-time homemaker	57	14	4	7	21	10	2	18	18	20	13	44
	6%	10% E	4%	10%	5%	4%	2%	7%	5%	6%	3%	8% J
Other/Social assistance/Disability	27	2	3	1	9	11	1	12	10	5	5	22
•	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	4% J
Refused	5	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	0
	0	0	-	2% E	1%	-	-	-	1%	0	1% K	-



DEMOGRAPHICS

And which of the following categories best describes your annual household income?

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C/D/E/F - G/H/I - J/K

* small base

Small base		REGION						AGE			GENDER	
	TOTAL	BC	ALB	SK/MN	ONT	QUE	ATL	18-34	35-54	55+	Male	Female
		Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K
Base: All respondents												
Unweighted Base	1008	132	103	66	383	251	73	224	448	334	482	526
Weighted Base	1008	133	103*	66*	386	246	75*	281	399	327	488	520
Under \$10,000	37	2	5	4	11	11	4	18	7	12	14	23
	4%	1%	5%	7% A	3%	5%	5%	7% H	2%	4%	3%	4%
\$10,000 to just under \$20,000	102	15	10	6	27	29	15	36	19	48	32	71
	10%	12%	9%	9%	7%	12%	20% D	13% H	5%	15% H	6%	14% J
\$20,000 to just under \$30,000	87	11	6	3	35	29	2	24	35	28	42	45
	9%	9%	6%	5%	9%	12%	3%	8%	9%	9%	9%	9%
\$30,000 to just under \$40,000	91	9	8	9	34	27	5	26	25	40	47	44
	9%	7%	7%	14%	9%	11%	6%	9%	6%	12% H	10%	8%
\$40,000 to just under \$50,000	107	13	9	6	31	36	12	27	46	35	55	53
	11%	10%	9%	10%	8%	15% D	17% D	10%	11%	11%	11%	10%
\$50,000 to just under \$60,000	105	10	16	9	36	27	6	29	45	31	53	52
	10%	8%	16%	14%	9%	11%	8%	10%	11%	9%	11%	10%
\$60,000 to just under \$70,000	58	9	4	4	20	11	9	17	27	14	38	20
	6%	7%	4%	6%	5%	5%	12% E	6%	7%	4%	8% K	4%
\$70,000 to just under \$80,000	53	10	9	1	21	10	2	12	30	11	28	26
	5%	7%	9%	2%	5%	4%	3%	4%	8% I	3%	6%	5%
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	84	12	5	3	40	22	3	28	43	13	48	36
	8%	9%	4%	5%	10%	9%	4%	10%	11% I	4%	10%	7%
\$100,000 and over	155	19	25	8	79	15	10	36	83	35	84	71
	15%	14% E	24% E	12%	21% E	6%	13%	13%	21% GI	11%	17%	14%
Refused	128	24	6	11	52	28	7	28	38	60	48	80
	13%	18%	6%	17%	13%	11%	9%	10%	10%	18%	10%	15%
		В		В						GH		J





