

# CMA Waiting Times

## Table of Contents

<b>CMA - WAIT TIMES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
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? .....	1
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? .....	5
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? .....	6
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? .....	7
6. YES SUMMARY TABLE .....	9
6. NO SUMMARY TABLE .....	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: 1) A family physician? .....	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: 2) A specialist? .....	12
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? .....	13
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? .....	14
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: .....	15
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? .....	16
7B. What else? .....	18
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? .....	20
8. YES SUMMARY TABLE .....	22
8. NO SUMMARY TABLE .....	23
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? .....	24
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? .....	25
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? .....	26
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? .....	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 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? .....	28
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? .....	30
10. HIGHLY EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 9,10] .....	32
10. SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 6,7,8] .....	33
10. NEITHER SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 5] .....	34
10. NOT VERY EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 2,3,4] .....	35
10. NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 0,1] .....	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: 1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals? .....	37
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? .....	39
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? .....	41

11. Thinking about the number of health care professionals in Canada (such as doctors and nurses), which statement best describes your view? .....	43
---	----

DEMOGRAPHICS..... 44

Region: .....	44
Province: .....	45
Canadian Markets: .....	46
Urban / Rural .....	48
Census Metropolitan Area: .....	49
Census Division .....	57
Respondent's Sex: .....	72
Language of Interview: .....	73
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? .....	77
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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
A major problem	554 55%	445 55%	109 55%	71 53%	176 56%	223 56%	78 50%	130 57%	165 55%	183 52%
Somewhat of a problem	340 34%	271 34%	69 34%	41 31%	98 32%	138 35%	60 39%	65 29%	104 34%	134 38% G
Not much of a problem	79 8%	65 8%	14 7%	12 9%	32 10%	24 6%	12 7%	22 10%	23 7%	24 7%
No problem at all	32 3%	25 3%	7 3%	9 7% DE	5 2%	8 2%	4 3%	8 3%	11 4%	8 2%
Don't know/Refused	3 0	3 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%	1 0	3 1%	1 0	0 -
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
A problem (Top2Box)	894 89%	716 89%	178 89%	112 84%	274 88%	361 91% C	139 89%	195 86%	269 89%	317 91%
Not a problem (Low2Box)	111 11%	90 11%	21 11%	21 16% E	37 12%	31 8%	16 10%	29 13%	34 11%	32 9%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

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

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
TOTAL MENTIONS										
Base: Think that wait times for healthcare in Canada are a problem										
Unweighted Base	976	803	173	84	205	335	346	173	277	411
Weighted Base	973	781	192	124*	306	385	150	217	292	341
RESOURCES (NET)	620	494	125	73	177	261	104	115	194	232
	64%	63%	65%	58%	58%	68%	70%	53%	66%	68%
						D	D		G	G
HUMAN RESOURCES (SUBNET)	537	428	109	68	154	227	83	97	175	190
	55%	55%	57%	55%	50%	59%	56%	45%	60%	56%
									G	G
- Lack of doctors	317	245	72	42	101	123	48	56	100	111
	33%	31%	37%	34%	33%	32%	32%	26%	34%	33%
- Lack of personnel/human resources (unspecified)	171	142	29	17	41	85	27	33	57	62
	18%	18%	15%	13%	13%	22%	18%	15%	19%	18%
						D				
- Lack of nurses	115	96	20	17	39	43	15	30	35	28
	12%	12%	10%	14%	13%	11%	10%	14%	12%	8%
- Underpaid medical professionals leaving the country	34	29	5	4	14	13	4	6	11	12
	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%	4%
- Medical professionals pressuring the government in order to get pay increases	12	8	4	4	3	4	1	1	2	8
	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
- Medical professionals trained abroad are not given the opportunity to work in Canada	8	6	2	0	3	2	3	0	3	2
	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	0	1%	1%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

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

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
INFRASTRUCTURE (SUBNET)	192 20%	157 20%	35 18%	12 10%	50 16%	83 22%	46 31%	35 16%	50 17%	90 26%
- Lack of adequate/sufficient funding	117 12%	96 12%	21 11%	6 5%	30 10%	57 15%	24 16%	19 9%	35 12%	53 16%
- Shortage of medical facilities	47 5%	38 5%	9 4%	3 2%	14 5%	18 5%	12 8%	8 4%	10 3%	25 7%
- Other insufficient resources mentions	18 2%	14 2%	4 2%	2 2%	5 2%	6 1%	6 4%	4 2%	4 1%	9 3%
- Shortage of (medical) equipment	11 1%	10 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 0	4 1%	4 3%	4 2%	3 1%	5 1%
Inefficient health-care system	133 14%	107 14%	27 14%	13 11%	39 13%	53 14%	25 17%	27 12%	46 16%	49 14%
Too many people requesting medical services	61 6%	46 6%	15 8%	11 8%	18 6%	18 5%	11 7%	16 7%	19 6%	20 6%
Extended waiting periods	56 6%	47 6%	9 5%	10 8%	17 5%	19 5%	10 7%	13 6%	24 8%	16 5%
OTHER RESPONSES										
People abusing the system	54 6%	46 6%	8 4%	6 5%	21 7%	23 6%	5 3%	7 3%	19 7%	20 6%
I am aware of it (through the media/personal experience)	47 5%	41 5%	6 3%	4 3%	15 5%	21 5%	7 4%	9 4%	18 6%	14 4%
Poor quality of medical services	30 3%	21 3%	9 5%	6 5%	14 5%	11 3%	0 -	12 5%	7 2%	7 2%
Healthcare system has to be privatized/people should have to pay for it	24 2%	23 3%	1 0	0 -	5 2%	13 3%	7 4%	5 2%	3 1%	14 4%
There is no wait time problem in Canada	18 2%	18 2%	0 -	2 1%	6 2%	6 1%	4 3%	4 2%	5 2%	7 2%
Other	50 5%	37 5%	13 7%	8 6%	15 5%	23 6%	5 3%	14 6%	13 4%	17 5%

## 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
No reason	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Don't know/Refused	54 6%	39 5%	15 8%	13 11% EF	29 10% EF	7 2%	4 3%	27 12% HI	6 2%	13 4%

## 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Longer	389 39%	317 39%	72 36%	59 44% F	128 41% F	150 38%	48 31%	97 43%	106 35%	131 37%
Shorter	71 7%	59 7%	12 6%	8 6%	19 6%	27 7%	16 10%	13 6%	21 7%	22 6%
About the same	502 50%	401 50%	101 51%	66 50%	149 48%	198 50%	82 53%	106 47%	165 54%	180 51%
Don't know/Refused	46 5%	32 4%	14 7%	0 -	15 5% C	21 5% C	9 6% C	11 5%	12 4%	17 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Wait times save Canada money	188 19%	154 19%	34 17%	32 24% F	58 19%	72 18%	22 14%	33 14%	64 21%	70 20%
Wait times cost Canada money	786 78%	626 77%	160 80%	96 72%	246 79%	311 79%	128 82% C	186 82%	232 76%	270 77%
Don't know/Refused	33 3%	29 4%	5 2%	6 4%	8 3%	13 3%	6 4%	9 4%	8 3%	10 3%



## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
[10] Great extent	86 9%	75 9%	11 6%	14 11%	26 8%	35 9%	9 6%	20 9%	28 9%	25 7%
[9]	45 4%	37 5%	7 4%	11 8%	12 4%	16 4%	6 4%	12 5%	10 3%	17 5%
[8]	184 18%	142 18%	42 21%	36 27% EF	53 17%	68 17%	26 16%	43 19%	50 17%	55 16%
[7]	171 17%	136 17%	35 18%	19 14%	49 16%	69 17%	35 22% D	46 20%	45 15%	65 18%
[6]	155 15%	131 16%	24 12%	13 10%	57 18%	58 15%	26 17%	29 13%	49 16%	65 19%
[5] Neither	176 17%	139 17%	37 18%	17 13%	61 20%	72 18%	21 13%	38 17%	65 21%	54 16%
[4]	70 7%	50 6%	20 10%	9 7%	29 9%	21 5%	10 6%	18 8%	21 7%	26 7%
[3]	46 5%	37 5%	9 4%	4 3%	6 2%	24 6% D	11 7% D	2 1%	12 4% G	25 7% G
[2]	28 3%	24 3%	4 2%	1 1%	6 2%	15 4%	4 3%	4 2%	11 4%	8 2%
[1]	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	1 1%	1 0	3 1%	2 1%	1 1%	0 0	3 1%
[0] No extent at all	10 1%	7 1%	3 1%	2 1%	0 -	5 1%	3 2% D	1 0	3 1%	4 1%
Don't know/Refused	30 3%	22 3%	8 4%	5 4%	12 4%	9 2%	2 2%	14 6% I	9 3% I	2 0
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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
Great extent [Rated 8,9,10]	315 31%	254 31%	61 30%	61 45% DEF	91 29%	118 30%	41 26%	75 33%	88 29%	97 28%
Moderate extent [Rated 4,5,6,7]	571 57%	456 56%	115 58%	59 44%	195 63% C	220 56%	92 59% C	131 57%	180 59%	210 60%
Small extent [Rated 1,2,3]	82 8%	69 9%	13 6%	7 5%	14 4%	42 11% D	17 11% D	7 3%	23 8% G	37 10% G
No extent at all [Rated 0]	10 1%	7 1%	3 1%	2 1%	0 -	5 1%	3 2% D	1 0	3 1%	4 1%
STATISTICS (10= Great extent 0= No extent at all)										
Mean	6.36	6.38	6.26	6.85 EF	6.42	6.25	6.15	6.67 I	6.27	6.20
Standard Deviation	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.1	2.1
Standard Error	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Median	5.98	5.98	5.99	6.82	5.81	5.90	5.97	6.31	5.71	5.81

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 6. YES SUMMARY TABLE

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) A family physician	352 35%	274 34%	78 39%	37 27%	107 34%	149 38%	54 35%	71 31%	116 38%	127 36%
2) A specialist	411 41%	337 42%	74 37%	41 31%	118 38%	184 47%	60 39%	87 38%	117 39%	159 46%
3) Advanced diagnostic procedures such as magnetic resonance imaging, MRI or a CT Scan	279	226	53	34	90	121	30	69	73	96
	28%	28%	26%	26%	29% F	31% F	19%	30%	24%	28%
4) A surgical procedure or other medical treatment	300	237	62	37	99	113	43	73	83	111
	30%	29%	31%	28%	32%	29%	28%	32%	27%	32%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 6. NO SUMMARY TABLE

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) A family physician	652 65%	531 66%	121 61%	97 73%	201 65%	245 62%	100 65%	156 69%	187 62%	220 63%
2) A specialist	590 59%	466 58%	124 62%	91 68% E	192 62% E	208 53%	94 60% E	138 61%	184 61%	189 54%
3) Advanced diagnostic procedures such as magnetic resonance imaging, MRI or a CT Scan	713  71%	570  71%	142  71%	94  70%	216  69%	270  68%	124  80% DE	152  67%	228  75%	250  72%
4) A surgical procedure or other medical treatment	702  70%	566  70%	136  68%	94  70%	212  68%	279  71%	111  71%	153  67%	218  72%	237  68%

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	352 35%	274 34%	78 39%	37 27%	107 34%	149 38%	54 35%	71 31%	116 38%	127 36%
No	652 65%	531 66%	121 61%	97 73%	201 65%	245 62%	100 65%	156 69%	187 62%	220 63%
Don't know/Refused	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 0	2 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	411 41%	337 42%	74 37%	41 31%	118 38%	184 47%	60 39%	87 38%	117 39%	159 46%
No	590 59%	466 58%	124 62%	91 68%	192 62%	208 53%	94 60%	138 61%	184 61%	189 54%
Don't know/Refused	7 1%	6 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 0	3 1%	1 1%	3 1%	2 1%	1 0

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	279 28%	226 28%	53 26%	34 26%	90 29% F	121 31% F	30 19%	69 30%	73 24%	96 28%
No	713 71%	570 71%	142 71%	94 70%	216 69%	270 68%	124 80% DE	152 67%	228 75%	250 72%
Don't know/Refused	16 2%	12 1%	4 2%	5 4%	5 2%	4 1%	2 1%	6 3%	3 1%	3 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: 4) A surgical procedure or other medical treatment?

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	300 30%	237 29%	62 31%	37 28%	99 32%	113 29%	43 28%	73 32%	83 27%	111 32%
No	702 70%	566 70%	136 68%	94 70%	212 68%	279 71%	111 71%	153 67%	218 72%	237 68%
Don't know/Refused	7 1%	6 1%	1 1%	3 2% D	0 -	3 1%	1 1%	1 0	2 1%	2 1%



## 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
AT LEAST 1 SERVICE	614 61%	487 60%	127 64%	66 50%	189 61%	251 63% C	98 63% C	130 57%	178 59%	227 65%
1 service	201 20%	159 20%	43 21%	22 16%	58 18%	79 20%	42 27% CDE	33 15%	62 21%	71 20%
2 services	176 17%	136 17%	40 20%	17 13%	57 18%	67 17%	31 20%	42 18%	47 16%	72 21%
3 services	160 16%	127 16%	32 16%	17 13%	53 17%	65 16%	20 13%	37 16%	42 14%	58 16%
All 4 services	77 8%	65 8%	12 6%	11 8%	21 7%	40 10% F	6 4%	18 8%	26 9%	26 8%
None	394 39%	321 40%	73 36%	67 50% EF	123 39%	145 37%	57 37%	97 43%	125 41%	122 35%

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
FIRST MENTION										
Base: Waited for at least 1 service										
Unweighted Base	618	506	112	44	125	218	224	103	167	275
Weighted Base	614	487	127*	66*	189	251	98	130*	178	227
Condition worsened	73 12%	54 11%	19 15%	4 7%	19 10%	39 15%	11 11%	20 16%	18 10%	30 13%
Unable to work/loss of income	64 10%	55 11%	9 7%	10 14%	13 7%	28 11%	14 14% D	12 9%	27 15%	21 9%
Frustration	63 10%	41 8%	22 18% A	6 9%	16 9%	27 11%	12 12%	8 6%	19 10%	26 11%
Nothing, condition not that serious	54 9%	44 9%	10 8%	6 8%	19 10%	22 9%	8 8%	10 8%	14 8%	26 11%
Stress/anxiety/worry	45 7%	37 8%	9 7%	4 7%	19 10%	14 5%	8 8%	10 8%	5 3%	24 10% H
Waited in pain	45 7%	36 7%	9 7%	10 15% E	15 8%	14 5%	6 6%	13 10%	15 9%	10 4%
Pain increased	43 7%	36 7%	7 5%	2 2%	15 8%	18 7%	7 7%	7 6%	10 6%	20 9%
Delayed/delayed health care - had to wait longer	38 6%	32 7%	6 5%	3 5%	9 5%	20 8%	7 7%	8 6%	14 8%	10 4%
Anger	19 3%	15 3%	4 3%	4 6%	6 3%	7 3%	2 2%	2 1%	5 3%	4 2%
Not much/very little	19 3%	13 3%	6 5%	0 -	8 4%	7 3%	4 4%	5 4%	6 3%	5 2%
Loss of functionality/Unable to function normally	11 2%	11 2%	0 -	0 -	3 2%	6 2%	2 2%	1 1%	1 1%	7 3%
Had to visit my GP more often	8 1%	7 1%	2 1%	2 2%	5 3%	2 1%	0 -	3 3% I	4 2% I	0 -
Did not have to wait long/ positive mentions	5 1%	4 1%	1 1%	1 2%	0 -	1 0	1 1%	2 2%	3 2%	0 0

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Other	90 15%	76 16%	14 11%	10 15%	28 15%	35 14%	14 14%	21 16%	27 15%	32 14%
Don't know/Refused	35 6%	25 5%	11 8%	5 8%	14 7%	11 4%	4 4%	7 5%	11 6%	12 5%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 7B. What else?

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
OTHER MENTIONS										
Base: Excludes respondents who said Don't know/Refused										
Unweighted Base	588	485	103	40	117	208	217	99	158	263
Weighted Base	582	466	116*	61*	177	240	95	125*	168	217
Frustration	44 7%	35 8%	9 7%	5 8%	8 4%	22 9%	9 10%	5 4%	13 7%	20 9%
Unable to work/loss of income	37 6%	34 7%	4 3%	3 5%	17 10%	12 5%	6 6%	9 7%	7 4%	13 6%
Condition worsened	31 5%	24 5%	7 6%	1 2%	12 7%	12 5%	5 6%	8 6%	10 6%	8 4%
Waited in pain	23 4%	18 4%	4 4%	1 2%	5 3%	11 5%	6 6%	3 2%	5 3%	13 6%
Nothing, condition not that serious	20 3%	10 2%	10 8% A	4 6%	9 5%	6 2%	1 1%	3 2%	11 7% I	0 0
Stress/anxiety/worry	19 3%	18 4%	1 1%	2 3%	6 3%	9 4%	2 2%	5 4%	7 4%	6 3%
Pain increased	18 3%	14 3%	4 4%	0 -	5 3%	7 3%	5 5%	5 4%	5 3%	7 3%
Anger	16 3%	12 3%	4 4%	1 2%	5 3%	7 3%	3 3%	2 2%	1 1%	11 5% H
Delayed/delayed health care - had to wait longer	14 2%	10 2%	4 4%	3 5% D	0 -	10 4% DF	1 1%	1 1%	4 2%	5 2%
Not much/very little	10 2%	9 2%	1 1%	0 -	5 3%	3 1%	2 3%	2 1%	4 2%	4 2%
Loss of functionality/Unable to function normally	9 2%	8 2%	1 1%	1 2%	3 2%	3 1%	1 2%	2 2%	1 1%	5 2%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 7B. What else?

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
Had to visit my GP more often	4 1%	3 1%	1 1%	0 -	3 2%	0 -	1 1% E	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Did not have to wait long/ positive mentions	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%
Other	64 11%	53 11%	11 9%	5 8%	13 7%	34 14%	12 13%	12 9%	18 11%	25 11%
No others	274 47%	223 48%	50 43%	32 52%	89 50%	103 43%	42 45%	72 57% I	75 45%	96 44%
Don't know/Refused	29 5%	21 5%	8 7%	3 5%	12 7%	9 4%	5 5%	2 2%	10 6%	11 5%

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
TOTAL MENTIONS										
Base: Waited for at least 1 service										
Unweighted Base	618	506	112	44	125	218	224	103	167	275
Weighted Base	614	487	127*	66*	189	251	98	130*	178	227
Frustration	107 17%	76 16%	31 24% A	11 16%	24 13%	49 20%	21 21% D	14 11%	31 17%	46 20% G
Condition worsened	99 16%	76 16%	23 19%	6 9%	30 16%	49 19%	16 16%	27 21%	26 15%	37 16%
Unable to work/loss of income	99 16%	86 18%	12 10%	11 17%	30 16%	39 16%	19 19%	19 15%	33 19%	33 15%
Nothing, condition not that serious	69 11%	52 11%	17 13%	9 14%	25 13%	26 10%	8 8%	11 9%	23 13%	26 11%
Waited in pain	66 11%	53 11%	13 10%	11 17%	18 10%	25 10%	11 11%	16 12%	20 11%	22 10%
Pain increased	61 10%	50 10%	11 9%	2 2%	20 10%	25 10%	12 12% C	12 9%	15 9%	26 12%
Stress/anxiety/worry	58 9%	50 10%	9 7%	4 7%	22 12%	22 9%	10 10%	13 10%	11 6%	28 12% H
Delayed/delayed health care - had to wait longer	47 8%	37 8%	9 7%	5 7%	9 5%	27 11%	7 7%	9 7%	16 9%	13 6%
Anger	35 6%	27 6%	8 6%	6 9%	11 6%	15 6%	4 4%	4 3%	6 3%	16 7%
Not much/very little	29 5%	22 5%	7 5%	0 -	13 7%	10 4%	6 6%	7 5%	10 5%	9 4%
Loss of functionality/Unable to function normally	20 3%	18 4%	1 1%	1 2%	6 3%	8 3%	4 4%	3 2%	3 1%	12 5%
Had to visit my GP more often	13 2%	10 2%	3 2%	2 2%	8 4% E	2 1%	1 1%	3 3%	4 2%	2 1%
Did not have to wait long/ positive mentions	7 1%	4 1%	3 2%	1 2%	1 1%	1 0	1 1%	2 2%	3 2%	2 1%

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Other	145 24%	120 25%	25 19%	14 22%	41 22%	63 25%	24 24%	32 25%	44 25%	52 23%
Don't know/Refused	35 6%	24 5%	11 8%	5 8%	14 7%	11 4%	4 4%	7 5%	10 6%	12 5%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 8. YES SUMMARY TABLE

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) Out-of-pocket costs for drugs or treatments that are not covered by health insurance	349	271	78	50	98	142	54	82	114	101
	35%	33%	39%	37%	31%	36%	35%	36%	37% I	29%
2) Time off work that resulted in loss of income	288	227	61	33	80	134	39	65	99	88
	29%	28%	30%	25%	26%	34% DF	25%	29%	33% I	25%
3) Taking time to assist the person who was waiting for treatment	295	228	67	39	77	127	49	69	83	106
	29%	28%	33%	29%	25%	32%	32%	30%	28%	30%
4) Restriction in activities around the household or recreational activities	338	262	76	40	90	149	51	71	99	125
	34%	32%	38%	30%	29%	38% D	33%	31%	33%	36%



## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 8. NO SUMMARY TABLE

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) Out-of-pocket costs for drugs or treatments that are not covered by health insurance	650	529	121	82	210	249	100	142	189	248
	64%	65%	61%	62%	67%	63%	65%	63%	62%	71% H
2) Time off work that resulted in loss of income	713	577	136	99	226	260	116	160	202	261
	71%	71%	68%	74%	73%	66%	74% E	70%	67%	75% H
3) Taking time to assist the person who was waiting for treatment	705	575	130	93	232	265	106	157	216	242
	70%	71%	65%	70%	74%	67%	68%	69%	71%	69%
4) Restriction in activities around the household or recreational activities	664	544	120	94	218	244	104	156	202	224
	66%	67%	60%	70%	70%	62%	67%	69%	67%	64%

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	349 35%	271 33%	78 39%	50 37%	98 31%	142 36%	54 35%	82 36%	114 37% I	101 29%
No	650 64%	529 65%	121 61%	82 62%	210 67%	249 63%	100 65%	142 63%	189 62%	248 71% H
Don't know/Refused	9 1%	9 1%	1 0	1 1%	3 1%	4 1%	1 0	4 2% I	1 0	0 -

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	288 29%	227 28%	61 30%	33 25%	80 26%	134 34% DF	39 25%	65 29%	99 33% I	88 25%
No	713 71%	577 71%	136 68%	99 74%	226 73%	260 66%	116 74% E	160 70%	202 67%	261 75% H
Don't know/Refused	7 1%	4 1%	3 2%	1 1%	5 1%	1 0	0 0	3 1%	2 1%	0 0

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	295 29%	228 28%	67 33%	39 29%	77 25%	127 32%	49 32%	69 30%	83 28%	106 30%
No	705 70%	575 71%	130 65%	93 70%	232 74%	265 67%	106 68%	157 69%	216 71%	242 69%
Don't know/Refused	8 1%	5 1%	3 1%	1 1%	3 1%	3 1%	0 0	1 1%	4 1%	2 0

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Yes	338 34%	262 32%	76 38%	40 30%	90 29%	149 38% D	51 33%	71 31%	99 33%	125 36%
No	664 66%	544 67%	120 60%	94 70%	218 70%	244 62%	104 67%	156 69%	202 67%	224 64%
Don't know/Refused	6 1%	2 0	3 2% A	0 -	3 1%	2 0	0 0	0 -	3 1%	0 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
	Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303
[10] Strongly agree	109 11%	87 11%	23 11%	23 17% F	32 10%	41 10%	12 7%	36 16% I	31 10%	24 7%
[9]	34 3%	28 3%	6 3%	2 2%	11 4%	16 4%	4 3%	6 3%	16 5%	8 2%
[8]	126 12%	105 13%	21 10%	24 18%	36 12%	41 10%	23 15%	26 11%	39 13%	51 15%
[7]	125 12%	100 12%	24 12%	16 12%	35 11%	51 13%	21 14%	20 9%	39 13%	47 14%
[6]	137 14%	102 13%	35 18%	5 4%	52 17% C	59 15% C	18 11% C	38 17%	38 13%	49 14%
[5] Neither	241 24%	196 24%	45 23%	39 29%	76 25%	90 23%	33 22%	52 23%	73 24%	92 26%
[4]	63 6%	51 6%	12 6%	7 5%	18 6%	27 7%	9 6%	15 6%	15 5%	25 7%
[3]	44 4%	39 5%	6 3%	1 1%	16 5%	16 4%	11 7% C	7 3%	14 5%	14 4%
[2]	27 3%	20 2%	7 3%	1 1%	9 3%	12 3%	5 3%	6 3%	6 2%	9 3%
[1]	9 1%	8 1%	1 0	0 -	3 1%	4 1%	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	7 2%
[0] Strongly disagree	38 4%	28 4%	9 5%	10 7%	10 3%	11 3%	8 5%	9 4%	13 4%	13 4%
Don't know/Refused	55 6%	46 6%	10 5%	5 4%	12 4%	27 7%	10 6%	13 6%	17 6%	9 3%

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Strongly agree [Rated 9,10]	143 14%	114 14%	29 14%	25 19% F	43 14%	57 15%	16 10%	42 18% I	46 15% I	33 9%
Somewhat agree [Rated 6,7,8]	388 38%	307 38%	81 41%	46 34%	124 40%	151 38%	61 40%	84 37%	117 39%	147 42%
Neither [Rated 5]	241 24%	196 24%	45 23%	39 29%	76 25%	90 23%	33 22%	52 23%	73 24%	92 26%
Somewhat disagree [Rated 2,3,4]	134 13%	110 14%	25 12%	9 7%	43 14%	55 14%	25 16% C	27 12%	36 12%	48 14%
Strongly disagree [Rated 0,1]	47 5%	37 5%	10 5%	10 7%	13 4%	15 4%	10 6%	9 4%	15 5%	20 6%
STATISTICS (10= Strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree)										
Mean	6.04	6.04	6.01	6.36	5.99	6.06	5.75	6.25	6.11	5.82
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.3
Standard Error	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Median	5.40	5.39	5.42	6.10	5.33	5.41	5.25	5.49	5.52	5.20

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
[10] Strongly agree	205 20%	162 20%	42 21%	31 23%	61 20%	81 21%	30 19%	43 19%	54 18%	69 20%
[9]	55 5%	41 5%	14 7%	3 2%	8 3%	29 7% D	13 8% CD	13 6%	12 4%	25 7%
[8]	175 17%	137 17%	39 19%	29 22%	58 19%	58 15%	30 19%	36 16%	61 20%	61 17%
[7]	153 15%	116 14%	37 18%	24 18%	44 14%	55 14%	27 18%	29 13%	51 17%	52 15%
[6]	108 11%	93 11%	15 7%	17 13%	33 11%	43 11%	12 7%	30 13%	26 9%	48 14%
[5] Neither	164 16%	132 16%	32 16%	20 15%	52 17%	70 18%	20 13%	50 22% I	58 19% I	43 12%
[4]	35 3%	27 3%	7 4%	3 2%	16 5%	13 3%	3 2%	7 3%	5 2%	18 5% H
[3]	29 3%	26 3%	3 1%	1 1%	12 4%	12 3%	4 2%	3 1%	11 4%	12 3%
[2]	22 2%	21 3%	2 1%	1 1%	7 2%	9 2%	5 3%	3 1%	8 2%	6 2%
[1]	7 1%	5 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	3 1%	1 0	0 -	3 1%	3 1%
[0] Strongly disagree	17 2%	13 2%	4 2%	3 2%	6 2%	6 2%	3 2%	3 1%	4 1%	7 2%
Don't know/Refused	39 4%	35 4%	4 2%	1 1%	13 4%	16 4%	7 5%	11 5%	11 4%	7 2%



## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Strongly agree [Rated 9,10]	260 26%	203 25%	56 28%	34 26%	69 22%	110 28%	43 28%	56 25%	65 22%	94 27%
Somewhat agree [Rated 6,7,8]	435 43%	345 43%	91 45%	70 52% E	135 43%	156 40%	69 44%	94 41%	138 45%	160 46%
Neither [Rated 5]	164 16%	132 16%	32 16%	20 15%	52 17%	70 18%	20 13%	50 22% I	58 19% I	43 12%
Somewhat disagree [Rated 2,3,4]	86 8%	74 9%	11 6%	5 4%	35 11%	33 8%	12 8%	13 6%	24 8%	36 10%
Strongly disagree [Rated 0,1]	24 2%	19 2%	5 3%	3 2%	7 2%	10 2%	3 2%	3 1%	6 2%	9 3%
STATISTICS (10= Strongly agree 0= Strongly disagree)										
Mean	6.97	6.91	7.20	7.24	6.80	6.96	7.15	6.97	6.87	6.97
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.4
Standard Error	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Median	6.68	6.60	6.93	6.87	6.50	6.62	6.98	6.44	6.61	6.68

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

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

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	633	515	117	85	187	251	102	138	184	218
	63%	64%	59%	64%	60%	64%	66%	61%	61%	62%
2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	328	257	71	62	88	125	47	79	88	103
	33%	32%	36%	47% DEF	28%	32%	30%	35%	29%	30%
3) More effective management of wait lists	366	299	68	59	104	146	53	84	125	110
	36%	37%	34%	44%	33%	37%	34%	37%	41% I	32%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

## 10. SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE SUMMARY TABLE [Rated 6,7,8]

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	264	211	53	35	90	93	42	58	87	98
	26%	26%	27%	26%	29%	24%	27%	26%	29%	28%
2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	422	344	78	44	130	173	71	87	141	151
	42%	43%	39%	33%	42%	44%	46% C	38%	46%	43%
3) More effective management of wait lists	406	326	81	51	116	164	69	84	112	170
	40%	40%	40%	38%	37%	42%	45%	37%	37%	49% GH

## 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	57	41	16	4	23	25	5	16	19	17
	6%	5%	8%	3%	7% F	6%	3%	7%	6%	5%
2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	130	108	22	9	54	46	19	39	32	45
	13%	13%	11%	7%	17% C	12%	13%	17%	11%	13%
3) More effective management of wait lists	124	106	19	16	51	42	15	39	31	33
	12%	13%	9%	12%	16% F	11%	10%	17% HI	10%	10%

## 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	34	26	8	8	7	14	4	10	11	11
	3%	3%	4%	6%	2%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%
2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	84	64	20	14	28	27	13	11	28	38
	8%	8%	10%	10%	9%	7%	9%	5%	9%	11% G
3) More effective management of wait lists	74	55	19	4	26	32	12	9	30	28
	7%	7%	10%	3%	8%	8%	8%	4%	10% G	8%

## CMA - WAIT TIMES

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

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1) More doctors, nurses and other health care professionals	11	6	5	1	1	8	0	3	2	3
	1%	1%	2%	1%	0	2%	0	1%	1%	1%
2) Improvements to infrastructures such as hospitals and clinics	32	25	8	1	8	20	3	7	11	11
	3%	3%	4%	1%	3%	5% F	2%	3%	4%	3%
3) More effective management of wait lists	20	13	7	4	4	8	4	4	4	5
	2%	2%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
[10] Highly effective	516 51%	414 51%	102 51%	78 58%	154 49%	197 50%	81 52%	113 50%	156 51%	167 48%
[9]	116 12%	101 12%	15 8%	8 6%	33 11%	55 14% C	21 14% C	25 11%	28 9%	51 15%
[8]	166 16%	134 17%	32 16%	18 13%	56 18%	62 16%	29 19%	32 14%	57 19%	63 18%
[7]	61 6%	49 6%	12 6%	12 9%	19 6%	20 5%	8 5%	17 7%	20 6%	21 6%
[6]	37 4%	28 3%	9 5%	6 4%	15 5%	11 3%	5 3%	10 4%	10 3%	14 4%
[5] Neither	57 6%	41 5%	16 8%	4 3%	23 7% F	25 6%	5 3%	16 7%	19 6%	17 5%
[4]	17 2%	13 2%	4 2%	3 2%	6 2%	7 2%	1 1%	4 2%	8 3%	5 1%
[3]	13 1%	9 1%	3 2%	3 2%	1 0	5 1%	1 1%	4 2%	1 0	6 2%
[2]	5 0	4 1%	0 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	0 0
[1]	5 1%	3 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0	4 1%	0 0	1 1%	0 0	1 0
[0] Not at all effective	6 1%	3 0	3 1%	1 1%	0 -	5 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	2 1%
Don't know/Refused	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	3 1%	2 1%	3 1%	1 0	2 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Highly effective [Rated 9,10]	633 63%	515 64%	117 59%	85 64%	187 60%	251 64%	102 66%	138 61%	184 61%	218 62%
Somewhat effective [Rated 6,7,8]	264 26%	211 26%	53 27%	35 26%	90 29%	93 24%	42 27%	58 26%	87 29%	98 28%
Neither [Rated 5]	57 6%	41 5%	16 8%	4 3%	23 7% F	25 6%	5 3%	16 7%	19 6%	17 5%
Not very effective [Rated 2,3,4]	34 3%	26 3%	8 4%	8 6%	7 2%	14 4%	4 2%	10 4%	11 4%	11 3%
Not at all effective [Rated 0,1]	11 1%	6 1%	5 2%	1 1%	1 0	8 2%	0 0	3 1%	2 1%	3 1%
STATISTICS (10= Highly effective 0= Not at all effective)										
Mean	8.60	8.67	8.33	8.60	8.59	8.52	8.83 E	8.46	8.59	8.60
Standard Deviation	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.1	1.7	2.1	1.9	1.9
Standard Error	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Median	9.03	9.04	9.02	9.14	8.99	9.01	9.05	9.01	9.03	8.87



## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
[10] Highly effective	241 24%	190 23%	51 26%	48 36% DEF	70 22%	82 21%	35 23%	63 28%	60 20%	73 21%
[9]	87 9%	68 8%	20 10%	14 10%	18 6%	43 11% D	12 8%	17 7%	28 9%	30 9%
[8]	207 21%	171 21%	36 18%	29 22%	56 18%	82 21%	39 25% D	46 20%	68 22%	74 21%
[7]	136 13%	106 13%	30 15%	13 10%	42 13%	59 15%	21 13%	25 11%	49 16%	50 14%
[6]	79 8%	67 8%	12 6%	3 2%	32 10% C	33 8% C	11 7% C	16 7%	24 8%	27 8%
[5] Neither	130 13%	108 13%	22 11%	9 7%	54 17% C	46 12%	19 13%	39 17%	32 11%	45 13%
[4]	35 3%	25 3%	10 5%	7 5%	10 3%	12 3%	6 4%	4 2%	10 3%	20 6% G
[3]	26 3%	20 2%	6 3%	3 2%	9 3%	8 2%	4 3%	1 1%	10 3%	11 3%
[2]	22 2%	19 2%	3 2%	4 3%	9 3%	6 2%	3 2%	6 2%	8 3%	7 2%
[1]	11 1%	10 1%	1 1%	0 -	4 1%	6 2%	0 0	2 1%	5 2%	3 1%
[0] Not at all effective	21 2%	15 2%	7 3%	1 1%	4 1%	13 3%	3 2%	5 2%	6 2%	8 2%
Don't know/Refused	13 1%	11 1%	2 1%	3 2%	3 1%	4 1%	1 1%	4 2%	3 1%	1 0

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Highly effective [Rated 9,10]	328 33%	257 32%	71 36%	62 47% DEF	88 28%	125 32%	47 30%	79 35%	88 29%	103 30%
Somewhat effective [Rated 6,7,8]	422 42%	344 43%	78 39%	44 33%	130 42%	173 44%	71 46% C	87 38%	141 46%	151 43%
Neither [Rated 5]	130 13%	108 13%	22 11%	9 7%	54 17% C	46 12%	19 13%	39 17%	32 11%	45 13%
Not very effective [Rated 2,3,4]	84 8%	64 8%	20 10%	14 10%	28 9%	27 7%	13 9%	11 5%	28 9%	38 11% G
Not at all effective [Rated 0,1]	32 3%	25 3%	8 4%	1 1%	8 3%	20 5% F	3 2%	7 3%	11 4%	11 3%
STATISTICS (10= Highly effective 0= Not at all effective)										
Mean	7.23	7.23	7.24	7.92 DEF	6.99	7.14	7.31	7.37	7.11	7.06
Standard Deviation	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.5
Standard Error	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Median	7.18	7.17	7.22	7.90	6.75	7.13	7.24	7.30	7.09	7.04

## 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
[10] Highly effective	271 27%	219 27%	52 26%	49 37% F	82 26%	103 26%	33 21%	65 29%	91 30% I	78 22%
[9]	96 9%	80 10%	16 8%	10 8%	22 7%	43 11%	20 13% D	19 8%	34 11%	32 9%
[8]	231 23%	184 23%	47 24%	28 21%	65 21%	94 24%	38 24%	46 20%	65 21%	92 26%
[7]	116 12%	91 11%	26 13%	18 14%	32 10%	46 12%	20 13%	21 9%	34 11%	56 16% G
[6]	59 6%	51 6%	8 4%	4 3%	19 6%	24 6%	12 8%	16 7%	13 4%	23 6%
[5] Neither	124 12%	106 13%	19 9%	16 12%	51 16% F	42 11%	15 10%	39 17% HI	31 10%	33 10%
[4]	29 3%	22 3%	7 3%	1 1%	10 3%	14 3%	4 3%	2 1%	13 4% G	10 3%
[3]	17 2%	13 2%	4 2%	1 1%	7 2%	6 1%	4 2%	0 -	8 3% G	9 2% G
[2]	28 3%	20 2%	9 4%	1 1%	9 3%	13 3%	5 3%	8 3%	10 3%	9 2%
[1]	5 0	4 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	0 0	1 0
[0] Not at all effective	15 1%	9 1%	5 3%	4 3%	3 1%	6 1%	3 2%	3 1%	4 1%	4 1%
Don't know/Refused	17 2%	11 1%	7 3%	0 -	11 4% E	3 1%	2 1%	7 3% H	1 0	3 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: 3) *More effective management of wait lists?*

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
TOPBOX & LOWBOX SUMMARY										
Highly effective [Rated 9,10]	366 36%	299 37%	68 34%	59 44%	104 33%	146 37%	53 34%	84 37%	125 41% I	110 32%
Somewhat effective [Rated 6,7,8]	406 40%	326 40%	81 40%	51 38%	116 37%	164 42%	69 45%	84 37%	112 37%	170 49% GH
Neither [Rated 5]	124 12%	106 13%	19 9%	16 12%	51 16% F	42 11%	15 10%	39 17% HI	31 10%	33 10%
Not very effective [Rated 2,3,4]	74 7%	55 7%	19 10%	4 3%	26 8%	32 8%	12 8%	9 4%	30 10% G	28 8%
Not at all effective [Rated 0,1]	20 2%	13 2%	7 3%	4 3%	4 1%	8 2%	4 3%	4 2%	4 1%	5 2%
STATISTICS (10= Highly effective 0= Not at all effective)										
Mean	7.50	7.54	7.34	7.86	7.35	7.52	7.38	7.51	7.61	7.45
Standard Deviation	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2
Standard Error	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Median	7.44	7.46	7.39	7.73	7.29	7.47	7.38	7.43	7.60	7.31

## 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/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B - C/D/E/F - G/H/I

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
There are enough health care professionals in Canada	36	25	11	12	8	12	4	15	6	12
	4%	3%	5%	9% DEF	2%	3%	2%	6% H	2%	3%
There is a slight shortage of health care professionals in Canada	252	191	61	41	75	100	34	58	75	91
	25%	24%	30%	31%	24%	25%	22%	26%	25%	26%
There is a significant shortage of health care professionals in Canada	710	585	125	79	226	279	117	150	221	244
	70%	72% B	63%	59%	73% C	71% C	75% C	66%	73%	70%
Don't know/Refused	10	7	3	2	2	4	1	4	2	2
	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

**Region:**

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
British Columbia	133 13%	113 14%	20 10%	10 7%	33 11%	60 15%	26 17% C	28 12%	32 11%	49 14%
Alberta	103 10%	85 11%	17 9%	6 4%	41 13% C	43 11%	14 9%	21 9%	33 11%	43 12%
Sask/Man	66 6%	40 5%	26 13% A	16 12% EF	22 7%	18 4%	7 5%	14 6%	24 8%	16 5%
Ontario	386 38%	321 40%	65 33%	52 39%	118 38%	148 37%	66 42%	73 32%	101 33%	160 46% GH
Quebec	246 24%	204 25%	42 21%	42 31% F	75 24%	94 24%	31 20%	70 31% I	90 30% I	58 17%
Atlantic	75 7%	45 6%	29 15% A	8 6%	22 7%	33 8%	12 7%	21 9%	23 8%	23 7%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Province:*

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
British Columbia	133 13%	113 14%	20 10%	10 7%	33 11%	60 15%	26 17% C	28 12%	32 11%	49 14%
Alberta	103 10%	85 11%	17 9%	6 4%	41 13% C	43 11%	14 9%	21 9%	33 11%	43 12%
Saskatchewan	32 3%	15 2%	17 9% A	12 9% DEF	8 3%	7 2%	3 2%	7 3%	12 4%	9 3%
Manitoba	33 3%	25 3%	8 4%	4 3%	14 4%	10 3%	4 3%	7 3%	12 4%	7 2%
Ontario	386 38%	321 40%	65 33%	52 39%	118 38%	148 37%	66 42%	73 32%	101 33%	160 46% GH
Quebec	246 24%	204 25%	42 21%	42 31% F	75 24%	94 24%	31 20%	70 31% I	90 30% I	58 17%
New Brunswick	24 2%	24 3% B	0 -	2 1%	10 3%	10 3%	2 1%	8 4%	10 3%	6 2%
Nova Scotia	34 3%	16 2%	18 9% A	3 2%	10 3%	15 4%	5 3%	8 3%	9 3%	11 3%
Prince Edward Island	5 0	0 -	5 2% A	0 -	0 -	4 1%	1 0	1 0	1 0	2 1%
Newfoundland	12 1%	6 1%	6 3% A	3 2%	2 1%	4 1%	4 2%	4 2%	3 1%	4 1%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Canadian Markets:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
WEST (NET)	301 30%	238 29%	63 32%	32 24%	96 31%	121 31%	46 30%	63 28%	89 29%	108 31%
- British Columbia	133 13%	113 14%	20 10%	10 7%	33 11%	60 15%	26 17% C	28 12%	32 11%	49 14%
- Alberta	103 10%	85 11%	17 9%	6 4%	41 13% C	43 11%	14 9%	21 9%	33 11%	43 12%
- Saskatchewan/Manitoba	66 6%	40 5%	26 13% A	16 12% EF	22 7%	18 4%	7 5%	14 6%	24 8%	16 5%
ONTARIO (NET)	386 38%	321 40%	65 33%	52 39%	118 38%	148 37%	66 42%	73 32%	101 33%	160 46% GH
GTA (SUBNET)	166 16%	162 20% B	4 2%	18 13%	45 15%	65 17%	35 22% D	20 9%	34 11%	86 25% GH
- 416	61 6%	61 8% B	0 -	6 5%	12 4%	24 6%	18 12% CDE	3 1%	18 6% G	29 8% G
- 905	105 10%	101 13% B	4 2%	11 9%	33 11%	41 10%	16 10%	17 7%	16 5%	57 16% GH
- Central Ontario	70 7%	61 8%	9 5%	12 9%	19 6%	27 7%	13 8%	14 6%	20 6%	26 7%
- Eastern Ontario	53 5%	37 5%	16 8%	5 4%	19 6%	20 5%	9 6%	16 7%	15 5%	19 5%
- SouthWest Ontario	64 6%	45 6%	19 10%	11 8%	24 8%	22 6%	7 4%	18 8%	22 7%	15 4%



## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Canadian Markets:*

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
- Northern Ontario	32 3%	15 2%	17 8% A	6 5%	10 3%	13 3%	2 1%	4 2%	10 3%	14 4%
QUEBEC (NET)	246 24%	204 25%	42 21%	42 31% F	75 24%	94 24%	31 20%	70 31% I	90 30% I	58 17%
- Montreal CMA - Quebec	128 13%	123 15% B	5 2%	19 14%	33 11%	53 13%	21 13%	28 12%	44 14%	35 10%
- Other - Quebec	118 12%	81 10%	37 18% A	23 17% F	42 14% F	41 10%	11 7%	42 18% I	46 15% I	23 7%
Atlantic	75 7%	45 6%	29 15% A	8 6%	22 7%	33 8%	12 7%	21 9%	23 8%	23 7%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Urban / Rural*

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Urban	809 80%	809 100% B	0 -	101 75%	237 76%	322 82%	138 89% CDE	185 81%	237 78%	278 80%
Rural	199 20%	0 -	199 100% A	33 25% F	74 24% F	73 18% F	17 11%	42 19%	66 22%	71 20%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Census Metropolitan Area:*

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
St. John's	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0	3 1%
Grand Falls-Windsor	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0
Charlottetown	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Halifax	14 1%	9 1%	5 3%	1 1%	3 1%	8 2%	3 2%	1 1%	4 1%	6 2%
Kentville	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Truro	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 0	2 1%	1 0	0 -
New Glasgow	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Cape Breton	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	1 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%
Moncton	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	2 1%	6 2%	1 0	0 -	6 3% I	2 1%	0 -
Saint John	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Fredericton	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Bathurst	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Edmundston	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1%	0 0	1 1%	2 1%	0 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Rimouski	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -
Riviere-du-Loup	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Baie-Comeau	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Chicoutimi - Jonquiere	7 1%	7 1%	0 -	3 2%	1 0	2 1%	0 0	5 2% H	0 -	2 0
Alma	3 0	3 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 0	2 1%	2 1%	0 -
Dolbeau	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Sept-Iles	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Quebec	25 3%	25 3% B	0 -	3 2%	7 2%	11 3%	3 2%	8 4%	8 2%	7 2%
Saint-Georges	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -
Thetford Mines	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -
Sherbrooke	4 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0	2 1% D	0 -	1 0	2 1%
Magog	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Victoriaville	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Trois-Rivieres	4 0	4 0	0 -	3 2% D	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	1 0
Shawinigan	3 0	1 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Drummondville	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0
Granby	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Saint-Hyacinthe	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -
Joliette	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Montreal	116 12%	115 14% B	1 0	16 12%	28 9%	49 13%	20 13%	28 12%	41 14%	30 9%
Salaberry-de-Valleyfield	2 0	2 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Rouyn-Noranda	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Cornwall	3 0	3 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 0	3 1%
Hawkesbury	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Ottawa - Hull	34 3%	31 4%	4 2%	2 2%	13 4%	11 3%	8 5%	12 5%	6 2%	13 4%
Brockville	1 0	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 0	0 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Pembroke	2 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 0	0 -	2 1%	0 0
Kingston	6 1%	4 0	3 1%	0 -	3 1%	3 1%	0 -	4 2%	1 0	1 0
Belleville	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 1%	1 0	0 -	2 1%
Cobourg	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Peterborough	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0
Lindsay	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 0	1 0	1 0	0 0
Oshawa	17 2%	17 2%	0 -	1 1%	8 3%	5 1%	1 1%	3 1%	2 1%	8 2%
Toronto	149 15%	145 18% B	4 2%	16 12%	37 12%	61 15%	33 22% CDE	18 8%	33 11%	78 22% GH
Hamilton	11 1%	11 1%	0 -	1 1%	3 1%	5 1%	1 1%	5 2%	1 0	4 1%
St. Catharines - Niagara	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	2 2%	4 1%	2 0	0 0	3 2%	2 1%	2 0
Kitchener	19 2%	19 2%	0 -	4 3%	3 1%	8 2%	5 3%	1 1%	5 2%	9 3%
Brantford	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Woodstock	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	2 0
Tillsonburg	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
Simcoe	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Guelph	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%
Stratford	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
London	13 1%	11 1%	2 1%	5 4%	4 1%	3 1%	1 1%	5 2%	4 1%	3 1%
Chatham	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Windsor	9 1%	8 1%	1 1%	1 1%	4 1%	3 1%	1 1%	6 2%	2 1%	1 0
Sarnia	9 1%	7 1%	1 1%	0 -	6 2%	3 1%	0 -	4 2%	5 1%	0 -
Owen Sound	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 0	0 -	2 1%	0 0
Barrie	5 1%	4 0	1 1%	1 1%	3 1%	0 -	0 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%
Orillia	4 0	4 0	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	0 -	0 0	0 -	2 1%	0 0
Midland	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 2% E	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Sudbury	5 1%	4 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	0 0	3 1%	0 -	2 0
Haileybury	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Timmins	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	2 0	0 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Sault Ste. Marie	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Thunder Bay	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Kenora	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Winnipeg	21 2%	19 2%	3 1%	1 1%	7 2%	9 2%	3 2%	5 2%	7 2%	5 1%
Brandon	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Thompson	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Regina	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	4 3% E	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 0	4 1% I	0 -
Moose Jaw	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Saskatoon	8 1%	6 1%	1 1%	3 2% D	0 -	4 1%	1 0	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%
Medicine Hat	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	3 1%	0 0	3 1%	0 0	3 1%
Lethbridge	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Calgary	35 3%	34 4% B	1 1%	0 -	14 5% C	16 4% C	5 3% C	4 2%	16 5%	12 3%
Red Deer	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -
Edmonton	28 3%	24 3%	3 2%	1 1%	9 3%	11 3%	7 4%	5 2%	7 2%	14 4%



## DEMOGRAPHICS

Census Metropolitan Area:

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Lloydminster	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Grand Centre	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -
Grande Prairie	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 0	0 -	1 0
Wood Buffalo	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0
Wetaskiwin	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Kelowna	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 1%	1 1%	0 -	4 1%	0 0
Vernon	3 0	3 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Kamloops	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	1 0	0 0
Chilliwack	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1% D	0 -	0 0	3 1%
Abbotsford	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	6 1%	0 0	3 1%	2 1%	2 0
Vancouver	69 7%	69 9% B	0 -	7 5%	17 6%	34 9%	11 7%	13 6%	11 4%	31 9% H
Victoria	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	4 3% DE	0 -	2 1%	5 1%
Duncan	2 0	2 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Nanaimo	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Census Metropolitan Area:*

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Courtenay	3 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Campbell River	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Quesnel	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 0	2 1%	0 -	0 0
Terrace	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
Not in a CMA/Unknown	206 20%	56 7%	150 75% A	31 23% F	80 26% EF	69 17%	21 14%	41 18%	83 27% GI	60 17%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
BRITISH COLUMBIA										
Central Kootenay Regional District	1 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1% E	0 0	1 0	0 0
Kootenay Boundary Regional District	3 0	0 0	3 2% A	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 -
Okanagan-Similkameen Regional District	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -
Fraser Valley Regional District	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	7 2% D	2 2% D	3 1%	2 1%	4 1%
Greater Vancouver Regional District	69 7%	69 9% B	0 -	7 5%	17 6%	34 9%	11 7%	13 6%	11 4%	31 9% H
Capital Regional District	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	4 3% DE	0 -	2 1%	5 1%
Cowichan Valley Regional District	2 0	2 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Nanaimo Regional District	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	0 0
Comox-Strathcona Regional District	7 1%	4 0	3 2%	0 -	2 0	5 1%	0 0	2 1%	4 1%	0 0
Sunshine Coast Regional District	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	1 0	0 0
Squamish-Lillooet Regional District	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -
Thompson-Nicola Regional District	4 0	4 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0	1 1%	2 1%	1 0	1 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Central Okanagan Regional District	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 1%	1 1%	0 -	4 1%	0 0
North Okanagan Regional District	3 0	3 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Columbia-Shuswap Regional District	3 0	0 -	3 2% A	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -
Cariboo Regional District	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 0	2 1%	0 -	0 0
Mount Waddington Regional District	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Kitimat-Stikine Regional District	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
Bilkley-Nechako Regional District	3 0	0 -	3 2% A	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Fraser-Fort George Regional District	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	1 1% E	0 -	3 1%	2 0
Peace River Regional District	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
ALBERTA										
Division No. 1	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	3 1%	0 0	3 1%	0 0	3 1%
Division No. 2	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	4 1%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Division No. 5	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Division No. 6	36 4%	35 4% B	1 1%	0 -	14 5% C	17 4% C	5 3% C	4 2%	17 6% G	12 3%
Division No. 7	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 0	1 1%	0 -	0 0
Division No. 8	8 1%	6 1%	1 1%	0 -	6 2%	2 0	0 -	1 1%	3 1%	3 1%
Division No. 10	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Division No. 11	29 3%	25 3%	3 2%	1 1%	9 3%	12 3%	7 4%	5 2%	8 3%	14 4%
Division No. 12	4 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	1 0
Division No. 13	5 1%	1 0	4 2% A	0 -	3 1%	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	2 1%
Division No. 15	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -
Division No. 16	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 0
Division No. 19	4 0	1 0	3 2% A	3 2% DE	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 0	2 1%	2 1%
SASKATCHEWAN										
Division No. 3	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	2 2% E	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0
Division No. 5	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Division No. 6	8 1%	6 1%	2 1%	4 3% E	3 1%	0 -	1 1% E	2 1%	4 1%	0 0
Division No. 7	3 0	2 0	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	2 1%	0 -
Division No. 8	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Division No. 10	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 0	1 0
Division No. 11	8 1%	6 1%	1 1%	3 2% D	0 -	4 1%	1 0	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%
Division No. 13	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Division No. 14	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 15	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Division No. 17	1 0	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	1 0	0 0
Division No. 18	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
MANITOBA										
Division No. 1	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -
Division No. 2	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	3 2% E	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Division No. 3	4 0	3 0	2 1%	0 -	3 1%	1 0	0 0	1 0	2 1%	0 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Division No. 7	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Division No. 11	19 2%	19 2%	0 -	0 -	7 2%	8 2%	3 2%	5 2%	7 2%	2 1%
Division No. 12	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Division No. 13	1 0	0 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 19	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 22	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
ONTARIO										
Stormont Dundas and Glengarry	3 0	3 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 0	3 1%
Prescott and Russell	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	3 1%
Ottawa	22 2%	21 3%	1 1%	2 2%	6 2%	9 2%	6 4%	10 5% H	3 1%	7 2%
Leeds and Grenville	3 0	0 0	3 2% A	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%
Frontenac County	6 1%	4 0	3 1%	0 -	3 1%	3 1%	0 -	4 2%	1 0	1 0
Lennox and Addington	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Hastings County	5 0	3 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 1%	1 0	0 -	3 1%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Prince Edward Division	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -
Northumberland County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Peterborough County	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0
Kawartha Lakes Division	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 0	1 0	1 0	0 0
Durham Regional Municipality	22 2%	22 3% B	0 -	4 3%	9 3%	6 1%	1 1%	3 1%	5 1%	9 3%
York Regional Municipality	31 3%	28 4%	2 1%	6 4%	7 2%	12 3%	5 3%	7 3%	4 1%	17 5% H
Toronto	65 6%	65 8% B	0 -	6 5%	14 4%	26 6%	19 12% CDE	6 3%	18 6%	30 9% G
Peel Regional Municipality	27 3%	27 3% B	0 -	0 -	6 2%	16 4%	5 3% C	0 -	6 2%	16 5% G
Dufferin County	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	4 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Wellington County	5 1%	4 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	2 1% D	0 -	1 0	4 1%
Halton Regional Municipality	19 2%	19 2%	0 -	0 -	9 3%	4 1%	5 3% E	4 2%	0 0	13 4% H
Hamilton	7 1%	7 1%	0 -	1 1%	3 1%	3 1%	0 0	5 2%	1 0	1 0
Niagara Regional Municipality	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	2 2%	4 1%	2 0	0 0	3 2%	2 1%	2 0



## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Haldimand-Norfolk Regional Municipality	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	2 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Brant County	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Waterloo Regional Municipality	24 2%	22 3%	1 1%	4 3%	4 1%	11 3%	5 3%	1 1%	8 3%	10 3%
Perth County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Oxford County	6 1%	4 1%	2 1%	3 2%	1 0	1 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	3 1%
Elgin County	4 0	3 0	1 1%	3 2% D	0 -	1 0	0 0	1 1%	1 0	0 0
Chatham-Kent Division	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Essex County	11 1%	10 1%	1 1%	1 1%	4 1%	4 1%	1 1%	6 2% I	4 1%	1 0
Lambton County	11 1%	7 1%	4 2%	0 -	7 2%	4 1%	0 0	5 2% I	6 2% I	0 -
Middlesex County	12 1%	10 1%	2 1%	3 3%	4 1%	3 1%	1 1%	4 2%	4 1%	3 1%
Huron County	4 0	0 -	4 2% A	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 0	0 -	1 0	2 1%
Bruce County	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	0 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Grey County	4 0	3 0	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	2 1%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Simcoe County	16 2%	11 1%	5 3%	6 5% E	6 2%	3 1%	2 1%	3 2%	5 2%	5 1%
Muskoka District Municipality	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 0
Haliburton County	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Renfrew County	5 0	2 0	3 2% A	1 1%	2 1%	1 0	0 0	0 -	5 2%	0 0
Parry Sound District	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	2 2% E	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Sudbury District	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0
Greater Sudbury Division	5 1%	4 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	0 0	3 1%	0 -	2 0
Timiskaming District	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Cochrane District	7 1%	3 0	4 2% A	0 -	4 1%	2 1%	0 0	0 -	4 1%	3 1%
Algoma District	4 0	2 0	2 1%	0 -	0 -	4 1%	0 0	0 -	2 1%	3 1%
Thunder Bay District	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Rainy River District	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Kenora District	3 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
QUEBEC										

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
La Côte-de-Gaspé	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
La Haute-Gaspésie	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Rimouski-Neigette	3 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	2 1%
Rivière-du-Loup	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Témiscouata	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Kamouraska	4 0	0 -	4 2% A	0 -	4 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	3 1%	0 -
L'Islet	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0
Bellechasse	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Comm. Urbaine de Québec	16 2%	16 2%	0 -	3 2%	6 2%	3 1%	3 2%	7 3%	3 1%	3 1%
Desjardins	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Les Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	9 1%	9 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	7 2% F	0 -	1 0	4 1%	4 1%
Robert-Cliche	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Beauce-Sartigan	4 0	3 0	1 1%	1 1%	3 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	3 1%	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Le Granit	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
L'Amiante	4 0	2 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	4 1%	0 -	3 1%	1 0	0 -
L'Érable	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Lotbinière	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -
Portneuf	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Mékinac	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Le Cente-de-la-Mauricie	3 0	1 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Francheville	4 0	4 0	0 -	3 2% D	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	1 0
Arthabaska	4 0	2 0	1 1%	1 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Le Haut-Saint-François	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Le Val-Saint-François	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0
La Région-Sherbrookoise	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0
Coaticook	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Memphrémagog	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
La Haute-Yamaska	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Drummond	3 0	2 0	1 0	0 -	1 0	2 0	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 0
Les Maskoutains	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -
Rouville	4 0	1 0	3 1% A	1 1%	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	4 1%	0 -
Le Haut-Richelieu	3 0	1 0	2 1%	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	0 -
La Vallée-du-Richelieu	4 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 1%	1 0	1 1%	1 0	2 0
Champlain	18 2%	18 2%	0 -	3 2%	4 1%	8 2%	2 1%	2 1%	8 3%	5 1%
L'Assomption	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0
Joliette	4 0	4 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Matawanie	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Les Mouulins	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	1 1%	4 1%	2 1%	0 -	1 1%	2 1%	3 1%
Laval	10 1%	10 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	7 2%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%
Comm. Urbaine-de-Montréal	62 6%	62 8% B	0 -	12 9%	16 5%	22 5%	11 7%	19 8% I	23 8% I	12 3%
Roussillon	4 0	3 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	3 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 0	2 1%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Le Haut-Saint-Laurent	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Beauharnois-Salaberry	2 0	2 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	2 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0	2 0
Deux-Montagnes	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 0	0 -	0 0	2 1%
Thérèse-De-Blainville	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0
Mirabel	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 0	0 0
La Rivière-du-Nord	3 0	3 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	3 1%	0 0	0 -	1 0	1 0
Argenteuil	1 0	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
Antoine-Labelle	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
Comm. Urbaine-de-l'Outaouais	6 1%	6 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%	3 1%	2 1%	1 0	3 1%	2 0
Les Collines-de-l'Outaouais	3 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	1 0
Pontiac	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	2 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Rouyn-Noranda	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
Abitibi-Ouest	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Abitibi	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
Le Domaine-du-Roy	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Maria-Chapdelaine	3 0	3 0	0 -	1 1%	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
Lac-Saint-Jean-Est	3 0	3 0	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 -	0 0	2 1%	2 1%	0 -
Le Fjord-du-Saguenay	8 1%	7 1%	1 1%	3 2%	3 1%	2 1%	0 0	6 3% HI	0 -	2 0
Manicouagan	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Sept-Rivières - Caniapiscau	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
NEW BRUNSWICK										
Saint John County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Charlotte County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -
Sunbury County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -
Kings County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Albert County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Westmorland County	8 1%	8 1%	0 -	2 1% E	6 2% E	0 -	0 -	6 3% I	2 1%	0 -
Northumberland County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 0
York County	2 0	2 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Victoria County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Madawaska County	4 0	4 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	2 1%	0 0	1 1%	2 1%	0 0
Gloucester County	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
NOVA SCOTIA										
Digby County	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
Queens County	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -
Lunenburg County	3 0	0 -	3 1% A	0 -	1 0	1 0	0 0	1 0	0 -	2 1%
Kings County	1 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	1 0
Hants County	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	2 1% E	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	0 -
Halifax County	14 1%	9 1%	5 3%	1 1%	3 1%	8 2%	3 2%	1 1%	4 1%	6 2%



## DEMOGRAPHICS

## Census Division

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Colchester County	3 0	1 0	2 1% A	0 -	2 1%	1 0	0 0	2 1%	1 0	0 -
Cumberland County	0 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
Pictou County	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Cape Breton County	5 0	5 1%	0 -	0 -	3 1%	1 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	2 1%
P.E.I.										
Kings County	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	1 0	0 -	0 0
Queens County	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	2 1%
Prince County	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 -	1 0	0 -
NEWFOUNDLAND										
Division No. 1	7 1%	5 1%	2 1%	0 -	2 1%	4 1%	2 1%	1 1%	2 1%	3 1%
Division No. 3	1 0	0 -	1 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Division No. 6	1 0	1 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 0
Division No. 9	2 0	0 -	2 1% A	1 1%	0 -	0 -	1 1% E	1 1%	1 0	1 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Respondent's Sex:*

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Male	488 48%	379 47%	108 54%	79 59% EF	148 48%	181 46%	70 45%	88 39%	155 51% G	197 56% G
Female	520 52%	429 53%	91 46%	55 41%	163 52%	214 54% C	85 55% C	140 61% HI	148 49%	152 44%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*Language of Interview:*

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
English	784 78%	624 77%	160 80%	96 72%	247 79%	304 77%	128 82% C	168 74%	219 72%	292 83% GH
French	224 22%	185 23%	39 20%	38 28% F	64 21%	91 23%	28 18%	59 26% I	84 28% I	58 17%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

*What age group do you fall into?*

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
18 to 24	96 9%	76 9%	20 10%	20 15% F	33 10% F	37 9% F	4 2%	31 14% I	26 9%	25 7%
25 to 34	186 18%	156 19%	30 15%	19 14%	46 15%	81 20%	41 26% CD	47 21%	56 19%	67 19%
35 to 44	185 18%	152 19%	33 17%	11 8%	47 15%	87 22% C	39 25% CD	27 12%	52 17%	88 25% GH
45 to 54	213 21%	172 21%	42 21%	26 20%	67 22%	87 22%	33 21%	35 15%	64 21%	95 27% G
55 to 64	171 17%	127 16%	44 22%	20 15%	65 21%	63 16%	22 14%	36 16%	55 18%	56 16%
65+	155 15%	126 16%	29 15%	38 28% DEF	54 17% EF	40 10%	16 10%	51 23% I	51 17% I	18 5%
Refused	2 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -
STATISTICS										
Average age	46	46	48	49 EF	48 EF	44	45	47 I	47 I	44
Standard Deviation	16.5	16.7	16.0	19.2	17.6	15.0	14.3	19.6	16.5	13.2
Standard Error	0.5	0.6	1.2	2.1	1.2	0.8	0.8	1.5	1.0	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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Single or never married	233 23%	196 24%	37 18%	43 32% EF	72 23%	86 22%	31 20%	88 39% HI	64 21%	54 15%
Married	472 47%	356 44%	116 58% A	49 37%	134 43%	195 49% C	92 59% CDE	36 16%	139 46% G	234 67% GH
Common-law or living with a partner	112 11%	94 12%	18 9%	14 10%	35 11%	49 12%	15 10%	16 7%	52 17% GI	34 10%
Divorced or separated	117 12%	97 12%	20 10%	15 11%	37 12%	49 12%	13 8%	64 28% HI	29 10% I	17 5%
Widowed	67 7%	61 8%	7 3%	13 9% EF	32 10% EF	15 4%	4 2%	23 10% I	20 6% I	9 2%
Refused	7 1%	4 1%	3 1%	0 -	1 0	1 0	1 1%	0 -	0 -	2 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

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

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All Respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
1 person	195 19%	167 21%	29 14%	29 22%	63 20%	77 19%	22 14%	98 43% HI	57 19% I	22 6%
2 persons	324 32%	255 32%	69 35%	39 29%	113 36%	115 29%	56 36%	73 32%	109 36%	102 29%
3 persons	214 21%	169 21%	45 23%	32 24%	66 21%	86 22%	28 18%	31 14%	69 23% G	90 26% G
4 persons	175 17%	132 16%	43 22%	19 15%	40 13%	84 21% D	32 20% D	15 7%	55 18% G	89 25% GH
5 persons	60 6%	53 7%	7 3%	7 5%	21 7%	20 5%	11 7%	5 2%	8 3%	29 8% GH
6 persons	23 2%	19 2%	3 2%	3 2%	6 2%	9 2%	4 3%	1 1%	6 2%	13 4% G
7 persons	4 0	3 0	0 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	1 1%	2 1%	0 -	2 0
8 persons	3 0	2 0	1 1%	1 1%	0 -	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	1 0
9 persons	2 0	2 0	0 -	2 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -
10+ persons	0 0	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 0
Refused	8 1%	7 1%	1 1%	0 -	3 1%	0 -	1 1% E	0 -	0 -	0 -
STATISTICS										
Mean	2.69	2.67	2.74	2.76	2.55	2.74	2.83 D	2.02	2.56 G	3.16 GH

## 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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: Excludes respondents living alone										
Unweighted Base	812	663	149	70	163	275	302	98	228	391
Weighted Base	805	635	169	105*	246	318	132	130*	246	327
Yes	362 45%	286 45%	76 45%	41 39%	96 39%	162 51% D	63 48%	55 43%	106 43%	164 50%
No	443 55%	349 55%	94 55%	64 61%	149 61% E	157 49%	69 52%	74 57%	140 57%	163 50%

## DEMOGRAPHICS

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

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

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

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
ALL AGES										
Base: Children under the age of 18 currently living in household										
Unweighted Base	367	305	62	25	62	136	144	40	95	197
Weighted Base	362	286	76*	41**	96*	162	63	55*	106*	164
Under 1 year old	24 7%	20 7%	5 6%	2 5%	1 2%	10 6%	11 17% DE	0 -	6 6%	17 10% G
One year old	43 12%	28 10%	15 20% A	3 8%	12 12%	22 14%	5 9%	5 10%	18 17%	16 10%
Two years old	34 9%	28 10%	5 7%	4 9%	11 11%	13 8%	6 10%	7 12%	8 8%	16 10%
Three years old	29 8%	26 9%	4 5%	4 9%	7 7%	12 7%	7 11%	8 14%	6 6%	14 9%
Four years old	35 10%	27 9%	8 10%	4 9%	10 11%	15 9%	6 9%	6 11%	15 14% I	10 6%
Five years old	34 9%	27 10%	7 9%	6 14%	8 8%	13 8%	8 12%	7 13%	12 11%	13 8%
Six years old	31 9%	26 9%	5 7%	4 9%	9 10%	12 7%	6 9%	4 7%	11 10%	12 7%
Seven years old	34 9%	17 6%	17 22% A	1 4%	5 5%	24 15% F	4 6%	7 13%	14 13%	11 7%
Eight years old	41 11%	32 11%	10 13%	7 16%	13 14%	12 8%	9 14%	7 12%	13 13%	15 9%
Nine years old	23 6%	17 6%	6 7%	5 13%	3 3%	9 6%	5 8%	3 5%	6 5%	14 9%
Ten years old	32 9%	25 9%	7 10%	4 10%	9 9%	13 8%	6 9%	4 8%	6 6%	14 9%
Eleven years old	22 6%	19 7%	3 4%	6 14%	1 1%	10 6%	6 9% D	3 6%	3 3%	15 9%
Twelve years old	34 9%	24 8%	10 14%	7 16%	8 9%	11 7%	8 13%	4 7%	14 13%	16 9%



## DEMOGRAPHICS

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

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

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

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban A	Rural B	<HS C	HS D	Post sec E	University F	<\$30K G	\$30K-<\$60K H	\$60K + I
Thirteen years old	29 8%	19 7%	10 13%	6 15%	10 10%	8 5%	5 8%	6 11%	5 5%	17 10%
Fourteen years old	29 8%	24 8%	5 7%	0 -	9 10%	17 10%	3 5%	5 8%	7 7%	14 9%
Fifteen years old	34 10%	29 10%	6 8%	7 17%	10 10%	12 8%	5 8%	3 5%	7 7%	18 11%
Sixteen years old	28 8%	21 7%	7 9%	3 6%	7 7%	14 8%	4 7%	5 10%	6 6%	13 8%
Seventeen years old	48 13%	42 15%	6 8%	5 12%	16 16%	22 14%	6 9%	12 22%	10 10%	24 15%
Refused	8 2%	7 2%	1 1%	0 -	2 2%	5 3%	2 3%	0 -	0 -	3 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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Grade school or some high school	134 13%	101 12%	33 16%	134 100% DEF	0 -	0 -	0 -	45 20% HI	37 12%	30 9%
Complete high school	311 31%	237 29%	74 37%	0 -	311 100% CEF	0 -	0 -	93 41% I	99 32% I	77 22%
Some community college or university, but did not finish	161 16%	128 16%	34 17%	0 -	0 -	161 41% CDF	0 -	35 15%	47 15%	58 17%
Complete technical or trade school/Community college	234 23%	194 24%	39 20%	0 -	0 -	234 59% CDF	0 -	43 19%	83 27%	85 24%
Complete university degree, such as a Bachelor's	104 10%	92 11% B	12 6%	0 -	0 -	0 -	104 67% CDE	6 3%	26 9% G	63 18% GH
Post-graduate degree, such as a Master's or Ph.D.	51 5%	46 6%	5 3%	0 -	0 -	0 -	51 33% CDE	3 1%	8 3%	35 10% GH
Refused	13 1%	10 1%	3 1%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	2 1%	3 1%	1 0

## DEMOGRAPHICS

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

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

\* small base

		REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
	TOTAL	Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Working full-time	447 44%	376 47% B	70 35%	35 26%	123 40% C	200 51% CD	88 57% CD	59 26%	140 46% G	212 61% GH
Working part-time	97 10%	80 10%	17 9%	12 9%	31 10%	39 10%	12 8%	25 11%	27 9%	25 7%
Self-employed	96 10%	64 8%	32 16% A	20 15%	25 8%	32 8%	19 12%	13 6%	25 8%	51 14% GH
Unemployed, but looking for work	42 4%	24 3%	18 9% A	5 4%	20 6% F	15 4% F	2 1%	24 11% HI	11 4%	5 1%
Attending school full-time/A student	42 4%	37 5%	5 3%	3 2%	17 5%	19 5%	4 2%	20 9% HI	10 3%	9 3%
Retired	195 19%	157 19%	38 19%	39 29% EF	68 22% EF	58 15%	22 14%	59 26% I	70 23% I	24 7%
Not in the workforce/A full-time homemaker	57 6%	45 6%	12 6%	18 13% DEF	16 5%	18 5%	5 3%	18 8%	11 4%	17 5%
Other/Social assistance/Disability	27 3%	22 3%	5 3%	1 1%	9 3%	13 3%	3 2%	9 4%	7 2%	6 2%
Refused	5 0	3 0	1 1%	0 -	1 0	0 -	0 0	0 -	0 -	0 -

## DEMOGRAPHICS

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

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

\* small base

	TOTAL	REGION TYPE		EDUCATION				INCOME		
		Urban	Rural	<HS	HS	Post sec	University	<\$30K	\$30K-<\$60K	\$60K +
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Base: All respondents										
Unweighted Base	1008	829	179	90	209	343	357	180	289	419
Weighted Base	1008	809	199	134*	311	395	155	227	303	349
Under \$10,000	37 4%	30 4%	7 4%	9 6% EF	21 7% EF	5 1%	1 1%	37 16% HI	0 -	0 -
\$10,000 to just under \$20,000	102 10%	81 10%	22 11%	19 14% F	42 13% F	37 9% F	4 2%	102 45% HI	0 -	0 -
\$20,000 to just under \$30,000	87 9%	74 9%	13 7%	18 13% F	30 10% F	35 9% F	4 3%	87 38% HI	0 -	0 -
\$30,000 to just under \$40,000	91 9%	67 8%	24 12%	20 15% EF	33 11% F	30 7%	9 5%	0 -	91 30% GI	0 -
\$40,000 to just under \$50,000	107 11%	86 11%	21 11%	11 8%	32 10%	51 13% F	10 7%	0 -	107 35% GI	0 -
\$50,000 to just under \$60,000	105 10%	84 10%	21 11%	6 5%	34 11%	49 13% C	16 10%	0 -	105 35% GI	0 -
\$60,000 to just under \$70,000	58 6%	47 6%	10 5%	6 5%	21 7%	25 6%	5 3%	0 -	0 -	58 16% GH
\$70,000 to just under \$80,000	53 5%	43 5%	10 5%	3 3%	14 4%	23 6%	13 8% C	0 -	0 -	53 15% GH
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	84 8%	64 8%	20 10%	11 8%	14 5%	35 9%	23 15% DE	0 -	0 -	84 24% GH
\$100,000 and over	155 15%	124 15%	31 15%	9 7%	28 9%	59 15% CD	58 37% CDE	0 -	0 -	155 44% GH
Refused	128 13%	108 13%	20 10%	21 16%	43 14%	45 11%	14 9%	0 -	0 -	0 -