

Canada

**Harold Clarke, University of Windsor
Jane Jenson, Carleton University
Lawrence LeDuc, University of Windsor
Jon Pammett, Carleton University**

Canadian Election Study, 1974-1980

Study Documentation

August 6, 2020

Metadata Production

Metadata Producer(s)	Scholars Portal (SP) , Ontario Council of University Libraries
Production Date	August 20, 2017
Version	Version September 15, 2017 Version October 20, 2017
Identification	CES-E-1974-1980

Table of Contents

Overview.....	4
Scope & Coverage.....	4
Producers & Sponsors.....	5
Data Collection.....	5
Accessibility.....	5
Rights & Disclaimer.....	5
Files Description.....	6
CPS&PES&MBS&WEB 2011 final.....	6
Variables Group(s).....	7
1974 Canadian Election Study.....	7
1979 Canadian Election Study.....	7
1980 Canadian Election Study.....	7
Quebec Referendum Survey.....	7
ICPSR Variables.....	7
Weights.....	8
Geographic Variables.....	9
Respondent Identification.....	9
Geographic Variables.....	9
Respondent Identification.....	9
Geographic Variables.....	10
Respondent Identification.....	10
Respondent Identification.....	10
Sampling and Study Procedures.....	10
Weights.....	10
Weights.....	10
Sampling and Study Procedures.....	11
Sampling and Study Procedures.....	11
Weights.....	11
Sampling and Study Procedures.....	12
Weights.....	12
Political Efficacy and Cynicism.....	12
Interest.....	13
Electoral Activities.....	13
Community Identification and Evaluation.....	15
Personal Satisfaction.....	16
Government Responsibility.....	17
Perception of Canada.....	17
Issues I.....	18
Issues II.....	18
Party Identification - Federal.....	20
Contact and Media.....	21
Voting Habits - Federal.....	22
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations.....	23
Voting Habits II.....	24
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II.....	25
Party Identification - Provincial.....	27
Voting Habits - Provincial.....	28
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III.....	29
Voting Habits.....	29
Demographics.....	30
Members of Parliament Evaluation.....	31
Party Evaluation - Federal.....	31
Party Evaluation - Provincial.....	34
Demographics II.....	39

ICPSR Variables.....	43
Interest.....	43
Economic Satisfaction.....	44
Politics.....	44
Political Efficacy and Cynicism.....	45
Electoral Activities.....	46
Identification and Evaluation - Regional.....	47
Identification and Evaluation - Provincial.....	49
Identification - Community.....	51
Issues.....	52
Party Identification - Federal.....	55
Contact and Media.....	56
Voting Habits - Federal.....	57
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations.....	58
Voting Habits.....	59
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II.....	60
Party Evaluation - Provincial.....	63
Party Identification - Provincial.....	66
Voting Habits - Provincial.....	67
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III.....	68
Voting Habits - Provincial II.....	69
Social Class.....	69
Left-Right Wing.....	71
Government Role in Issues.....	71
Institutions.....	73
Perceptions Of.....	74
Members of Parliament Evaluation.....	74
Self.....	75
Demographics.....	76
Interest.....	79
Economic Satisfaction.....	79
Issues.....	80
Party Identification - Federal.....	82
Contact and Media.....	82
Voting Habits.....	83
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations.....	83
Voting Habits II.....	84
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II.....	85
Community Evaluation.....	86
Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III.....	86
Party Identification - Provincial.....	88
Quebec Referendum.....	89
Demographic.....	89
Quebec Options.....	90
Referendum Vote and Involvement.....	90
Political Party Identification and Evaluation.....	91
Canada's Evaluation.....	92
Demographics.....	92
Party Control.....	92
Mobility Data - Inter-provincial.....	92
Variables Description.....	94
CPS&PES&MBS&WEB 2011 final.....	95

Canadian Election Study, 1974-1980 (CES 1974-1980)

Étude électorale canadienne 1974-1980

Overview	
Type	Canadian Election Study
Identification	CES-E-1974-1980
Series	<p>The primary mandate of the Canadian Election Study is to provide a thorough account of the election, to underline the main reasons why people vote the way they do, to indicate what does and does not change during the campaign and from one election to another, and to highlight similarities and differences between voting and elections in Canada and in other democratic countries.</p> <p>The second mandate is to contribute to the development of scientific knowledge regarding the motivations of voters and the meanings of elections and election campaigns in democratic societies.</p> <p>The third mandate is to assemble a rich set of data about Canadians' attitudes and opinions on a wide variety of social, economic, and political issues, and to make that data publicly available to researchers in political science, sociology, economics, communications, and journalism.</p>
<p>Abstract</p> <p>This study is a continuation of the 1974 Canadian Election Study, which consisted of extensive personal interviews with a national sample of 2,562 respondents following the federal election of July 8, 1974. Immediately following the federal election of May 22, 1979, 1,295 of the original respondents were successfully contacted and interviewed, thereby creating a 1974-1979 panel study. In addition, a new national sample of the 1979 electorate and a supplementary sample of young voters (aged 18-23) were drawn and personal interviews utilizing the same questionnaire were conducted with respondents in these samples. After the federal election of February 18, 1980, 1,748 respondents in both the panel and cross-section samples were contacted by telephone and reinterviewed. No new respondents were added to the 1980 sample. When the Quebec referendum was called for May 20, 1980, a decision was made to contact by telephone Quebec respondents originally sampled in 1974 or 1979 and interviewed in 1980. Of these respondents, 325 were successfully contacted and reinterviewed. Approximately half of the interviews were conducted immediately prior to the Referendum, and the remaining half immediately afterward.</p> <p>The 1974 post-election survey covered a wide range of topics related to citizen participation in politics. The 1979 survey continued the theme of citizen interest and involvement in politics and probed respondents' attitudes about regions, provinces, and national unity. The 1980 telephone interview asked about vote choice in 1980, party identification, and the issue of energy. Questions on the Quebec Referendum centered around the respondents' views on constitutional options for Quebec.</p>	
Kind of Data	Survey data
Unit of Analysis	Individuals

Scope & Coverage	
Keywords	Debate, Leaders, Candidates, Votes, Voting, Media
Topics	Election, Politics, Public Opinion
Time Period(s)	1974
Countries	Canada
<p>Geographic Coverage</p> <p>Canada, Provinces</p>	
<p>Universe</p> <p>Canadian Electorate</p>	

Producers & Sponsors	
Primary Investigator(s)	Harold Clarke, University of Windsor Jane Jenson, Carleton University Lawrence LeDuc, University of Windsor Jon Pammett, Carleton University
Other Producer(s)	Institute for Social Research (ISR) , York University , Distributor
Funding Agency/ies	Elections Canada

Data Collection	
Time Period(s)	start 1974 end 1980

Accessibility	
Distributor(s)	Canadian Opinion Research Archive
<u>Citation Requirements</u> Publications based on CES data collection should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications.	

Rights & Disclaimer	
<u>Disclaimer</u> The original collector of the data and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.	
Copyright	Copyright (c) Institute for Social Research, 2012

Files Description

Dataset contains 1 file(s)

CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final	
# Cases	2761
# Variable(s)	1259

Variables Group(s)

Dataset contains 95 group(s)

Group 1974 Canadian Election Study

Subgroup(s)	Geographic Variables , Respondent Identification , Sampling and Study Procedures , Weights , Political Efficacy and Cynicism , Interest , Electoral Activities , Community Identification and Evaluation , Personal Satisfaction , Government Responsibility , Perception of Canada , Issues I , Issues II , Party Identification - Federal , Contact and Media , Voting Habits - Federal , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations , Voting Habits II , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II , Party Identification - Provincial , Voting Habits - Provincial , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III , Voting Habits , Demographics , Members of Parliament Evaluation , Party Evaluation - Federal , Party Evaluation - Provincial , Demographics II , ICPSR Variables , Party Control
--------------------	--

Group 1979 Canadian Election Study

Subgroup(s)	Geographic Variables , Respondent Identification , Weights , Sampling and Study Procedures , Interest , Economic Satisfaction , Political Efficacy and Cynicism , Electoral Activities , Identification and Evaluation - Regional , Identification and Evaluation - Provincial , Identification - Community , Issues , Party Identification - Federal , Contact and Media , Voting Habits - Federal , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations , Voting Habits , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II , Party Evaluation - Provincial , Party Identification - Provincial , Voting Habits - Provincial , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III , Voting Habits - Provincial II , Government Role in Issues , Perceptions Of , Members of Parliament Evaluation , Demographics , Mobility Data - Inter-provincial
--------------------	--

Group 1980 Canadian Election Study

Subgroup(s)	Geographic Variables , Respondent Identification , Sampling and Study Procedures , Weights , Interest , Economic Satisfaction , Issues , Party Identification - Federal , Contact and Media , Voting Habits , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations , Voting Habits II , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II , Community Evaluation , Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III , Party Identification - Provincial , Quebec Referendum , Demographic
--------------------	---

Group Quebec Referendum Survey

Subgroup(s)	Respondent Identification , Sampling and Study Procedures , Weights , Quebec Options , Referendum Vote and Involvement , Political Party Identification and Evaluation , Canada's Evaluation , Demographics
--------------------	---

Group ICPSR Variables

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1001	ICPSR STUDY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
2	v1002	ICPSR EDITION NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
3	v1003	ICPSR PART NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
4	v5001	ICPSR STUDY NUMBER-8079	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-
5	v5002	ICPSR EDITION NUMBER-1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
6	v5003	ICPSR PART NUMBER-001	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-

Group Weights							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v4001	1979 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979 NATIONAL CROSS-SECTION WEIGHT
2	v4002	1979 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1979 CROSS-SECTION FILTER
3	v4003	1979 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979 MARITIME CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
4	v4004	1979 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979 ATLANTIC PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
5	v4005	1979 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979 PRAIRIE PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
6	v4006	1979 WESTERN WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979 WESTERN PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
7	v4007	1980 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1980 NATIONAL CROSS-SECTION WEIGHT
8	v4008	1980 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1980 CROSS-SECTION FILTER
9	v4009	1980 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1980 MARITIME CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
10	v4010	1980 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
11	v4011	1980 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
12	v4012	1980 WESTERN WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1980 WESTERN PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
13	v4013	P74-79-80 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979-1980 NATIONAL PANEL WEIGHTS
14	v4014	P74-79-80 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1974-1979-1980 PANEL FILTER
15	v4015	P74-79-80 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
16	v4016	P74-79-80 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979-1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
17	v4017	P74-79-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979-1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
18	v4018	P74-79-80 WESTERN WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979-1980 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
19	v4019	P74-79 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979 NATIONAL PANEL WEIGHTS
20	v4020	P74-79 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1974-1979 PANEL FILTER
21	v4021	P74-79 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
22	v4022	P74-79 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
23	v4023	P74-79 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
24	v4024	P74-79 WESTERN WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1979 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
25	v4025	P79-80 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979-1980 PANEL WEIGHTS

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
26	v4026	P79-80 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1979-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
27	v4027	P79-80 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
28	v4028	P79-80 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979-1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
29	v4029	P79-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979-1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
30	v4030	P79-80 WESTERN WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1979-1980 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
31	v4031	P74-80 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1980 PANEL WEIGHTS
32	v4032	P74-80 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1974-1980 PANEL FILTER
33	v4033	P74-80 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
34	v4034	P74-80 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
35	v4035	P74-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
36	v4036	P74-80 WESTERN WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	1974-1980 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS
37	v4037	QUEBEC REFERENDUM WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	REFERENDUM WEIGHT
38	v4038	QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER

Group Geographic Variables

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v5	CONSTITUENCY	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
2	v1	PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	-

Group Respondent Identification

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	CASEID	RESPONDENT ID NUMBER	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-

Group Geographic Variables

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1005	1979 PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2744	17	-
2	v1016	1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-

Group Respondent Identification

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1004	1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-

Group Geographic Variables							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2002	PROVINCE OF INTERVIEW 80	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	PROVINCE
2	v2010	CONSTITUENCY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1748	1013	1980 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Group Respondent Identification							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2001	RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION 1980	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

Group Respondent Identification							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3001	RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80	discrete	numeric-4.0	325	2436	QUEBEC REFERENDUM RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

Group Sampling and Study Procedures							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	CASEID	RESPONDENT ID NUMBER	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-
2	v2	HALF SAMPLE NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
3	v5	CONSTITUENCY	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
4	v6	POLL	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
5	v7	WEEK OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	-
6	v8	LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
7	v1	PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	-

Group Weights							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3	1974 NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-8.3	2761	0	-
2	v4	1974 MARITIME SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-6.2	2761	0	-

Group Weights							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1006	1979 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-
2	v1007	1979 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
3	v1008	1979 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-
4	v1009	1979 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-
5	v1010	1979 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
6	v1011	1979 WESTERN WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-

Group Sampling and Study Procedures

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1004	1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-
2	v1012	1979 HALF SAMPLE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
3	v1013	RESPONDENT SAMPLE TYPE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
4	v1019	DATE OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	-
5	v1020	LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
6	v1538	1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-
7	v1005	1979 PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2744	17	-
8	v1014	1974 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
9	v1015	1974 POLL NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
10	v1016	1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
11	v1017	1979 POLL NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
12	v1018	MOVED OUT OF PROVINCE BETWEEN 74-79?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-

Group Sampling and Study Procedures

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2001	RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION 1980	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
2	v2003	HALF SAMPLE 1980 ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
3	v2012	DATE OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
4	v2013	LANGUAGE OF INTERVW	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED:
5	v2157	1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	1974 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
6	v2158	RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION 1979	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
7	v2002	PROVINCE OF INTERVIEW 80	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	PROVINCE
8	v2010	CONSTITUENCY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1748	1013	1980 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER
9	v2011	POLL NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	1980 POLL NUMBER

Group Weights

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
---	------	-------	------	--------	-------	---------	----------

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2004	1980 NATIONAL WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	WEIGHTING SECTION
2	v2005	1980 FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	1980 CROSS-SECTION FILTER
3	v2006	1980 MARITIME WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-
4	v2007	1980 ATLANTIC WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-
5	v2008	1980 PRAIRIE WEIGHT	discrete	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-
6	v2009	1980 WESTERN WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	-

Group Sampling and Study Procedures

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3001	RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80	discrete	numeric-4.0	325	2436	QUEBEC REFERENDUM RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
2	v3002	PRE(1)-POST(2) REFERENDUM WAVE	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	(PRE-POST) REFERENDUM DAY INTERVIEWS
3	v3007	DATE OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-2.0	325	2436	DATE OF INTERVIEW:
4	v3041	LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED:
5	v3042	RESPONDENT ID 1979	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
6	v3043	RESPONDENT ID 1980	discrete	numeric-4.0	325	2436	1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
7	v3005	CONSTITUENCY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	325	2436	-
8	v3006	POLL NUMBER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	REFERENDUM POLL NUMBER

Group Weights

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3003	QUEBEC REFERENDUM WEIGHT	continuous	numeric-4.2	2761	0	REFERENDUM WEIGHT
2	v3004	QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER:1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER

Group Political Efficacy and Cynicism

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v20	MP'S LOSE TOUCH	discrete	numeric-1.0	2088	673	AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE. GENERALLY, THOSE ELECTED TO PARLIAMENT SOON LOSE TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE.
2	v21	GOVERNMENT DOESNT CARE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2088	673	I DON'T THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT CARES MUCH WHAT PEOPLE LIKE ME THINK.
3	v22	POLITICS COMPLICATED	discrete	numeric-1.0	2088	673	SOMETIMES,POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT SEEM SO COMPLICATED THAT A PERSON

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							LIKE ME CAN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON.
4	v23	DO NOT HAVE SAY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2088	673	PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES.
5	v24	SO MANY VOTERS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2088	673	SO MANY OTHER PEOPLE VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS THAT IT DOESN'T MATTER VERY MUCH WHETHER I VOTE OR NOT.

Group Interest

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v10	INTEREST IN ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1296	1465	WE HAVE FOUND THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES DON'T PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO ELECTIONS. HOW ABOUT YOURSELF? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE VERY INTERESTED IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, FAIRLY INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED IN IT?
2	v11	INTEREST IN POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1297	1464	WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER YOU PAY MUCH ATTENTION TO POLITICS GENERALLY. I MEAN FROM DAY TO DAY, WHEN THERE ISN'T A BIG ELECTION CAMPAIGN GOING ON. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FOLLOW POLITICS VERY CLOSELY, FAIRLY CLOSELY, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?
3	v12	PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FEDERAL, PROVINCIAL, LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	792	1969	GENERALLY, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FEDERAL POLITICS, PROVINCIAL POLITICS, OR LOCAL POLITICS?
4	v13	LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT MOST IMPORTANT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1229	1532	AS FAR AS YOU ARE CONCERNED PERSONALLY, WHICH GOVERNMENT IS MORE IMPORTANT IN AFFECTING HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY GET ON, THE ONE IN OTTAWA, THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) OR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (CITY, TOWNSHIP, ETC.)?

Group Electoral Activities

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v25	READ NEWSPAPER-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
2	v26	DISCUSS POLITICS-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
3	v27	CONVINCE FRIENDS-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?
4	v28	WORK IN COMMUNITY-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	624	2137	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?
5	v29	ATTEND MEETING-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
6	v30	CONTACT OFFICIALS-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
7	v31	CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?
8	v32	SIGN OR STICKER-ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	625	2136	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
9	v33	READ NEWSPAPER-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
10	v34	DISCUSS POLITICS-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
11	v35	CONVINCE FRIENDS-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?
12	v36	WORK IN COMMUNITY-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?
13	v37	ATTEND MEETING-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
14	v38	CONTACT OFFICIALS-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	618	2143	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
15	v39	CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	619	2142	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?
16	v40	SIGN OR STICKER-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	619	2142	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
17	v41	READ NEWSPAPERS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	622	2139	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
18	v42	DISCUSS POLITICS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	622	2139	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
19	v43	CONVINCE FRIENDS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?
20	v44	WORK IN COMMUNITY-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?
21	v45	ATTEND MEETING-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
22	v46	CONTACT OFFICIALS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
23	v47	CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
24	v48	SIGN OR STICKER- PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	619	2142	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
25	v49	READ NEWSPAPER- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
26	v50	DISCUSS POLITICS- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	620	2141	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
27	v51	CONVINCE FRIENDS- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	619	2142	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?
28	v52	WORK IN COMMUNITY- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	617	2144	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?
29	v53	ATTEND MEETING- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	618	2143	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
30	v54	CONTACT OFFICIALS- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	618	2143	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
31	v55	CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	618	2143	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?
32	v56	SIGN OR STICKER- LOCAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	617	2144	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

Group Community Identification and Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v57	REGION R LIVES IN	discrete	numeric-2.0	2747	14	PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS? (IF YES) WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?
2	v58	OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA	discrete	numeric-4.0	750	2011	WHAT ARE THE OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA?
3	v59	FEEL CLOSER TO FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1272	1489	WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FEEL CLOSER TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA, OR TO YOUR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
4	v60	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL	discrete	numeric-4.0	1058	1703	ARE ANY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL THAN OTHERS? (IF YES) WHICH ONES?
5	v61	FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?
6	v62	PROVINCE AS PLACE TO LIVE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) NOW, AS A PLACE TO LIVE, COULD YOU TELL ME, AGAIN USING THE THERMOMETER, HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
7	v63	FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?
8	v64	FEEL ABOUT REGION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT THIS REGION OF (NAME REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B., IF SAME AS PROVINCE, GO TO Q18F.)?
9	v65	REGION AS PLACE TO LIVE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) NOW SPECIFICALLY, AS A PLACE TO LIVE IN, HOW WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS REGION OF (NAME REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B.)?
10	v66	FEEL ABOUT CANADA	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?
11	v67	CANADA AS A PLACE TO LIVE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) NOW SPECIFICALLY, AS A COUNTRY TO LIVE IN, HOW WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL ABOUT CANADA?
12	v68	FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF CANADA	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?
13	v69	FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE UNITED STATES?
14	v70	FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND?
15	v71	FEEL ABOUT FRANCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT FRANCE?

Group Personal Satisfaction

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v14	MATERIAL SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	669	2092	v14 question details
2	v15	GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON MATERIAL SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	649	2112	DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
3	v16	MATERIAL STATE IN 4 YEARS	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
4	v17	ECONOMIC SITUATION COMPARED WITH GROWING UP	discrete	numeric-1.0	668	2093	GENERALLY, IF YOU WERE COMPARING YOUR PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION WITH THAT OF YOUR FAMILY WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE MUCH BETTER OFF NOW, SOMEWHAT BETTER OFF NOW, ABOUT THE SAME NOW, SOMEWHAT WORSE

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							OFF NOW, OR MUCH WORSE NOW?
5	v18	LIFE SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	668	2093	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?
6	v19	GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON LIFE SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	652	2109	DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?

Group Government Responsibility

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v72	PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE	discrete	numeric-4.0	953	1808	IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA?
2	v73	PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE	discrete	numeric-4.0	964	1797	WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?
3	v74	GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2695	66	EDUCATION
4	v75	GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2659	102	FOREIGN AFFAIRS
5	v76	GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2664	97	LOCAL GOVERNMENT
6	v77	GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2707	54	HOSPITAL INSURANCE
7	v78	GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2695	66	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE
8	v79	GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR ECONOMY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2688	73	THE ECONOMY

Group Perception of Canada

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v82	MAP- 1ST RESPONSE PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	TYPE OF RESPONSE (FIRST MENTION)
2	v83	MAP- 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.
3	v84	MAP- 2ND RESPONSE PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	TYPE OF RESPONSE (SECOND MENTION)
4	v85	MAP- 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	CONTENT (SECOND MENTION)
5	v86	MAP- 3RD RESPONSE PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	TYPE OF RESPONSE (THIRD MENTION)
6	v87	MAP - 3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	CONTENT (THIRD MENTION)
7	v88	MAP- 4TH RESPONSE PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	TYPE OF RESPONSE (FOURTH MENTION)
8	v89	MAP- 4TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	CONTENT (FOURTH MENTION)
9	v90	MAP- 5TH RESPONSE PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	TYPE OF RESPONSE (FIFTH MENTION)
10	v91	MAP- 5TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-4.0	2761	0	CONTENT (FIFTH MENTION)

Group Issues I

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v92	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2634	127	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO YOU, PERSONALLY, IN THAT ELECTION?
2	v93	FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE	discrete	numeric-3.0	929	1832	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?
3	v94	ARTICULATENESS-1ST ISSUE	discrete	numeric-1.0	929	1832	ARTICULATENESS
4	v95	PARTY CLOSEST ON ISSUE	discrete	numeric-1.0	853	1908	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
5	v96	ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING	discrete	numeric-1.0	909	1852	HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?
6	v97	2ND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2349	412	WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE ELECTION?
7	v98	FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE	discrete	numeric-3.0	428	2333	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?
8	v99	ARTICULATENESS-2ND ISSUE	discrete	numeric-1.0	428	2333	ARTICULATENESS
9	v100	PARTY CLOSEST ON 2ND ISSUE	discrete	numeric-1.0	407	2354	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
10	v101	2ND ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING	discrete	numeric-1.0	432	2329	HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?

Group Issues II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v102	BILINGUALISM-LANGUAGE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2694	67	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE)
2	v103	BILINGUALISM-PRESCRIPTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2642	119	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (PRESCRIPTION)
3	v104	BILINGUALISM-REGIONAL, PROVINCIAL	discrete	numeric-2.0	2324	437	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (REGIONAL/PROVINCIAL MENTIONS)
4	v105	BILINGUALISM-COMPULSION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2234	527	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (COMPULSION)
5	v106	BILINGUALISM-PERSONAL, IMPERSONAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2755	6	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (PERSONAL - IMPERSONAL)
6	v107	BILINGUALISM-POSITIVE, NEGATIVE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2696	65	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE)
7	v108	BILINGUALISM-ARTICULATENESS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2760	1	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (ARTICULATENESS)
8	v109	BILINGUALISM-PARTY CLOSEST	discrete	numeric-1.0	1056	1705	Q25C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
9	v110	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-INEVITABLE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2402	359	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT FOREIGN INVESTMENT? (INEVITABILITY)
10	v111	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-CHARACTERISTICS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2681	80	CHARACTERISTICS OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT
11	v112	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-DOMINATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2351	410	DOMINATION
12	v113	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-ACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2442	319	ACTION
13	v114	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-POSITIVE, NEGATIVE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2704	57	POSITIVE/NEGATIVE
14	v115	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-ARTICULATENESS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2759	2	ARTICULATENESS
15	v116	FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-PARTY CLOSEST	discrete	numeric-1.0	333	2428	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
16	v117	INFLATION-CONTENT	discrete	numeric-2.0	2740	21	CONTENT
17	v118	INFLATION-CAUSES	discrete	numeric-2.0	2238	523	CAUSES
18	v119	INFLATION-ACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2241	520	ACTION
19	v120	INFLATION-HOW MUCH AFFECTED	discrete	numeric-1.0	654	2107	HOW MUCH WERE YOU PERSONALLY AFFECTED BY INFLATION OVER THE PAST YEAR OR SO. A GREAT DEAL, SOME, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?
20	v121	INFLATION-WAY AFFECTED	discrete	numeric-2.0	2735	26	IN WHAT WAY WERE YOU MOST AFFECTED?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
21	v122	INFLATION-ARTICULATE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	ARTICULATENESS
22	v123	INFLATION-PARTY CLOSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	415	2346	WHICH PARTY IS THE CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
23	v124	FAVOUR SEPARATISM	discrete	numeric-1.0	2107	654	THERE HAS BEEN QUITE A BIT OF TALK IN RECENT YEARS ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF QUEBEC SEPARATING FROM THE REST OF CANADA AND BECOMING AN INDEPENDENT COUNTRY. ARE YOU IN FAVOUR OF SEPARATISM OR OPPOSED TO IT?
24	v125	SEPARATISM-INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	554	2207	HOW STRONGLY DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?
25	v126	SEPARATISM LIKELY	discrete	numeric-1.0	618	2143	HOW LIKELY DO YOU THINK IT IS THAT QUEBEC ACTUALLY WILL SEPARATE AT SOME TIME IN THE FUTURE, VERY LIKELY, FAIRLY LIKELY, OR NOT VERY LIKELY?
26	v127	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT VS MINORITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2075	686	v127 question details
27	v128	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT-SWITCH	discrete	numeric-1.0	579	2182	IF YOU BELIEVED THAT ONE PARTY WAS MORE LIKELY TO BE ABLE TO FORM A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, BUT YOU DID NOT ORDINARILY VOTE FOR THAT PARTY, HOW LIKELY WOULD YOU BE TO VOTE FOR IT IN ORDER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, VERY LIKELY, SOMEWHAT LIKELY, OR NOT AT ALL LIKELY
28	v129	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT ISSUE INFLUENCE VOTE	discrete	numeric-1.0	242	2519	DID THIS QUESTION OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT HAVE A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOTHING AT ALL TO DO WITH THE WAY YOU VOTED IN THIS LAST ELECTION?

Group Party Identification - Federal

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v130	FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1221	1540	THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?
2	v131	FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2507	254	Q30A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?
3	v132	FEEL CLOSER TO FEDERAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	220	2541	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
4	v133	FEDERAL PARTY CLOSER TO	discrete	numeric-1.0	63	2698	Q31B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
5	v134	ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1252	1509	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?
6	v135	PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	403	2358	WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v136	WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1866	895	Q32C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY?
8	v137	WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1872	889	Q32D. WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v138	WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1872	889	Q32D. WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (SECOND MENTION)
10	v139	FATHER FEDERAL PARTY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1083	1678	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?
11	v140	FATHER FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	751	2010	Q33B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
12	v141	FATHER FEDERAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	744	2017	Q33C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q33B) WAS HE THEN?
13	v142	MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1071	1690	DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?
14	v143	MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1276	1485	Q34B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
15	v144	MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	547	2214	Q34C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q34B) WAS SHE THEN
16	v145	PARENTS FEDERAL POLITICS INTEREST	discrete	numeric-1.0	1174	1587	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN FEDERAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED,SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?

Group Contact and Media

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v146	CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	622	2139	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?
2	v147	PARTY CONTACT	discrete	numeric-2.0	233	2528	Q36B. WHICH ONES? (PROBE) ANY OTHERS?
3	v148	CANDIDATE CONTACT	discrete	numeric-2.0	101	2660	Q36C. WHICH PARTY WAS HE (WERE THEY)?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
4	v149	OTHER CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	617	2144	WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?
5	v150	OTHER PARTY CONTACT	discrete	numeric-2.0	496	2265	Q37B. WHICH PARTY OR PARTIES?
6	v151	HOW CONTACTED	discrete	numeric-1.0	510	2251	HOW DID THEY CONTACT YOU?
7	v152	CAMPAIGN-NEWSPAPER	discrete	numeric-1.0	624	2137	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU READ QUITE A BIT, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL ABOUT THE PARTIES, CANDIDATES, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
8	v153	CAMPAIGN-TELEVISION	discrete	numeric-1.0	621	2140	HOW ABOUT TELEVISION? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN DID YOU WATCH PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?
9	v154	CAMPAIGN-RADIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	618	2143	HOW ABOUT RADIO? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN DID YOU HEAR PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HEARD QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?
10	v155	MOST IMPORTANT MEDIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	611	2150	WHICH WOULD YOU SAY IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU IN GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT POLITICS, RADIO, TELEVISION, OR THE NEWSPAPERS?

Group Voting Habits - Federal

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v156	VOTE FREQUENCY-FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1294	1467	IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE IN CANADA, INCLUDING THE ONE HELD THIS JULY, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM, SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?
2	v157	ALWAYS VOTE SAME-FEDERAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	1210	1551	HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?
3	v158	FEDERL PARTY ALWAYS VOTED	discrete	numeric-1.0	599	2162	Q42C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
4	v159	CHOICE OR CONTEST-FEDERAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2050	711	Q42D. DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE, OR BECAUSE SOME

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?
5	v160	VOTED IN 1974	discrete	numeric-1.0	1259	1502	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S JULY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE AWAY, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?
6	v161	VOTE 1974	discrete	numeric-1.0	1033	1728	FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?
7	v162	WHY NOT VOTE 1974	discrete	numeric-2.0	1671	1090	Q43C. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE IN THE JULY ELECTION?
8	v163	PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED 1974	discrete	numeric-1.0	167	2594	IF YOU HAD VOTED, WHO WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v164	MOST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1200	1561	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT JULY ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
2	v165	2ND MOST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1152	1609	WHICH WOULD SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT?
3	v166	LEAST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1153	1608	WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS LEAST IMPORTANT?
4	v167	ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES	discrete	numeric-1.0	712	2049	Q44D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES, OR HIS STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
5	v168	WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1857	904	Q44E. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
6	v169	WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1857	904	Q44E. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
7	v170	PARTY-APPROACH OR ISSUES	discrete	numeric-1.0	441	2320	Q44F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
8	v171	WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1655	1106	Q44G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v172	WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1655	1106	Q44G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)

Group Voting Habits II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v172	WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1655	1106	Q44G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
2	v179	2ND CHOICE PARTY-1974	discrete	numeric-1.0	982	1779	IF, FOR SOME REASON, YOU HAD BEEN UNABLE TO VOTE FOR THE FEDERAL PARTY THAT YOU MOST PREFERRED IN THE RECENT ELECTION, WHICH OTHER FEDERAL PARTY WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?
3	v180	PARTY LEAST PREFERENCE-1974	discrete	numeric-1.0	1068	1693	WHICH OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES WOULD YOU LEAST WANT TO VOTE FOR?
4	v181	TIME OF VOTE DECISION	discrete	numeric-2.0	564	2197	AS YOU KNOW, THE ELECTION WAS HELD ON JULY 8, 1974. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?
5	v182	SURE ALL ALONG	discrete	numeric-1.0	555	2206	Q48B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR, OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?
6	v183	OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED	discrete	numeric-1.0	127	2634	Q48C. (IF OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED) WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v184	REAL REASON VOTED-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	563	2198	v184 question details
8	v185	REAL REASON VOTED-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	340	2421	v185 question details
9	v186	REAL REASON VOTED-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	174	2587	v186 question details
10	v173	VOTED IN 1972	discrete	numeric-1.0	1269	1492	THE LAST FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THE ONE IN JULY WAS IN OCTOBER 1972. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER OR NOT YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?
11	v174	VOTE IN 1972 FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1038	1723	WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR?
12	v175	WHY SWITCH 72-74,1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1638	1123	I NOTICED THAT YOU CHANGED YOUR VOTE FROM 1972 TO 1974. WAS THERE ANY SPECIAL REASON FOR CHANGING THE PARTY YOU VOTED FOR?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
13	v176	WHY SWITCH 72-74,2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1638	1123	WERE THERE ANY OTHER REASONS?
14	v177	VOTED IN 1968	discrete	numeric-1.0	1246	1515	THE FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN JUNE 1968. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?
15	v178	VOTE IN 1968 FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	809	1952	WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v187	LIKE TRUDEAU-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	LET'S START WITH THE LIBERALS, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. TRUDEAU? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
2	v188	LIKE LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?
3	v189	LIKE LIBERAL PARTY-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE LIBERAL PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
4	v190	LIKE STANFIELD-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	NOW, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. STANFIELD? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
5	v191	LIKE LOCAL PC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?
6	v192	LIKE PC PARTY-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
7	v193	LIKE LEWIS-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	HOW ABOUT THE N.D.P.? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. DAVID LEWIS? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
8	v194	LIKE LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL N.D.P. CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?
9	v195	LIKE NDP-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE N.D.P. PARTY TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
10	v196	LIKE CAQUETTE-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	HOW ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. CAQUETTE? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
11	v197	LIKE LOCAL SC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
12	v198	LIKE SC PARTY-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
13	v199	LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE	continuous	numeric-2.0	2761	0	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)
14	v200	LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)
15	v201	LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)
16	v202	DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (FIRST MENTION)
17	v203	DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
18	v204	DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	(THIRD MENTION)
19	v205	LIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. STANFIELD? (FIRST MENTION)
20	v206	LIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
21	v207	LIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	(THIRD MENTION)
22	v208	DISLIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. STANFIELD? (FIRST MENTION)
23	v209	DISLIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
24	v210	DISLIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	(THIRD MENTION)
25	v211	LIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. LEWIS? (FIRST MENTION)
26	v212	LIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
27	v213	LIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2085	676	(THIRD MENTION)
28	v214	DISLIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. LEWIS? (FIRST MENTION)
29	v215	DISLIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
30	v216	DISLIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2086	675	(THIRD MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
31	v217	LIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2084	677	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CAOUETTE? (FIRST MENTION)
32	v218	LIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2084	677	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
33	v219	LIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2084	677	(THIRD MENTION)
34	v220	DISLIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2084	677	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CAOUETTE? (FIRST MENTION)
35	v221	DISLIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2084	677	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)
36	v222	DISLIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2084	677	(THIRD MENTION)

Group Party Identification - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v223	PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1146	1615	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC,SAY) LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?
2	v224	PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1083	1678	Q60B HOW STRONGLY DO YOU GENERALLY FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?
3	v225	FEEL CLOSER TO PROVINCIAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	167	2594	WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
4	v226	PROVINCIAL PARTY CLOSER TO	discrete	numeric-1.0	47	2714	Q61B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
5	v227	ANY PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1228	1533	THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)?
6	v228	PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1290	1471	Q62B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v229	WHEN CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-2.0	1787	974	WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY, THAT IS, THE (NAME OF PARTY MENTIONED IN Q62B)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
8	v230	WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1787	974	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v231	WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1787	974	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
10	v232	FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1051	1710	Q63A. DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
11	v233	FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	705	2056	Q63B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT
12	v234	FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2160	601	Q63C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q63B) WAS HE THEN?
13	v235	MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1015	1746	DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
14	v236	MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	554	2207	Q64B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
15	v237	MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2014	747	Q64C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q64B) WAS SHE THEN?
16	v238	PARENTS PROVINCIAL POLITICAL INTERST	discrete	numeric-1.0	1125	1636	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?

Group Voting Habits - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v239	PROVINCIAL VOTER?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1294	1467	IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM , SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?
2	v240	ALWAYS VOTE SAME PROVINCIAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2632	129	IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?
3	v241	PROVINCIAL PARTY ALWAYS VOTED	discrete	numeric-1.0	2085	676	Q72C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
4	v242	CHOICE OR CONTEST	discrete	numeric-1.0	515	2246	DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?
5	v243	VOTED LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1183	1578	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?
6	v244	VOTE-LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1044	1717	Q73B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?
7	v245	WHY NOT VOTE-LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1625	1136	Q73C. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE IN THE LAST ELECTION?
8	v246	PROVINCIAL PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED	discrete	numeric-1.0	1563	1198	Q73D. IF YOU HAD VOTED IN THAT ELECTION, WHICH PARTY WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR.

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v247	MOST IMPORTANT-CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1150	1611	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
2	v248	2ND MOST IMPORTANT-CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1108	1653	Q74B. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT?
3	v249	LEAST IMPORTANT-CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1097	1664	Q74C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE LEAST IMPORTANT?
4	v250	ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES	discrete	numeric-1.0	639	2122	Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES OR HIS STAND ON ISSUES?
5	v251	WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1763	998	Q74E. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?
6	v252	WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1763	998	SECOND RESPONSE?
7	v253	PARTY-APPROACH OR ISSUES	discrete	numeric-1.0	461	2300	WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OT ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
8	v254	WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1614	1147	Q74G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?
9	v255	WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1614	1147	SECOND RESPONSE

Group Voting Habits

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v256	WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	244	2517	I NOTICE THAT YOU VOTED FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY IN THE PROVINCIAL ELECTION THAN IN

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR VOTING FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES IN THE TWO ELECTIONS?
2	v257	WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	244	2517	ANY OTHER REASONS?

Group Demographics

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v258	FATHER LIVING OR YEAR DIED	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	IS YOUR FATHER LIVING?
2	v259	FATHER AGE OR AGE DIED	discrete	numeric-2.0	577	2184	HOW OLD IS HE OR WAS HE THEN?
3	v260	FATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE	discrete	numeric-2.0	586	2175	WHAT IS (WAS) YOUR FATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION?
4	v261	FATHER RESIDENCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	586	2175	DOES (DID) YOUR FATHER LIVE IN A CITY, OR IN A TOWN OR VILLAGE, OR IN THE COUNTRY OR ON A FARM?
5	v262	FATHER OWN FARM	discrete	numeric-1.0	198	2563	DOES (DID) YOUR FATHER OWN HIS OWN FARM OR DOES (DID) HE WORK ON SOMEONE ELSE'S FARM?
6	v263	FATHER BORN IN CANADA	discrete	numeric-1.0	591	2170	WAS YOUR FATHER BORN IN CANADA?
7	v264	FATHER EDUCATION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2061	700	WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL THAT YOUR FATHER COMPLETED?
8	v265	GRANDFATHER LIVING OR YEAR DIED	discrete	numeric-1.0	308	2453	IS YOUR GRANDFATHER ON YOUR FATHER'S SIDE LIVING?
9	v266	GRANDFATHER AGE OR AGE DIED	discrete	numeric-2.0	354	2407	HOW OLD IS HE OR WAS HE THEN?
10	v267	GRANDFATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE	discrete	numeric-2.0	484	2277	WHAT IS(WAS) YOUR GRANDFATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION?
11	v268	GRANDFATHER RESIDENCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	533	2228	DOES (DID) YOUR GRANDFATHER LIVE IN A CITY, OR IN A TOWN OR VILLAGE, OR IN THE COUNTRY OR ON A FARM?
12	v269	GRANDFATHER OWN FARM	discrete	numeric-1.0	247	2514	DOES (DID) YOUR GRANDFATHER OWN HIS FARM OR DOES (DID) HE WORK ON SOMEONE ELSE'S FARM?
13	v270	GRANDFATHER BORN IN CANADA	discrete	numeric-1.0	552	2209	WAS YOUR GRANDFATHER ON YOUR FATHER'S SIDE BORN IN CANADA?
14	v271	GRANDFATHER EDUCATION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2061	700	WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL THAT YOUR GRANDFATHER COMPLETED?
15	v272	R HAVE CHILDREN	discrete	numeric-1.0	495	2266	DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN?
16	v273	SON OR DAUGHTER	discrete	numeric-1.0	430	2331	SON OR DAUGHTER?
17	v274	AGE OF OLDEST SON	discrete	numeric-2.0	361	2400	HOW OLD IS YOUR ELDEST SON?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
18	v275	SON OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE	discrete	numeric-2.0	196	2565	WHAT IS YOUR SON'S MAIN OCCUPATION?

Group Members of Parliament Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v276	MP-VOTERS	discrete	numeric-1.0	607	2154	VIEWS OF HIS RIDING'S VOTERS?
2	v277	MP-PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	604	2157	VIEWS OF HIS PARTY?
3	v278	MP-CIVIL SERVICE	discrete	numeric-1.0	560	2201	VIEWS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE?
4	v279	MP-GROUPS	discrete	numeric-1.0	580	2181	VIEWS OF ORGANIZED GROUPS THAT HE REPRESENTS?
5	v280	MP-FRIENDS AND ADVISERS	discrete	numeric-1.0	590	2171	VIEWS OF HIS ADVISERS AND FRIENDS?
6	v281	MP-OWN BELIEFS	discrete	numeric-1.0	601	2160	HIS OWN BELIEFS?
7	v282	R HAS WRITTEN MP	discrete	numeric-1.0	616	2145	-
8	v283	MP DO ANYTHING FOR R	discrete	numeric-1.0	616	2145	HAS A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DONE ANYTHING FOR YOU PERSONALLY?
9	v284	WHAT MP HAS DONE FOR R	discrete	numeric-2.0	75	2686	Q85B. WHAT WAS THIS?
10	v285	MP WOULD READ LETTER	discrete	numeric-1.0	541	2220	IF YOU WROTE A LETTER TO YOUR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, DO YOU THINK THAT HE WOULD READ IT?
11	v286	MP WOULD ANSWER LETTER	discrete	numeric-1.0	381	2380	Q86B. WOULD HE ANSWER IT?
12	v287	MP WOULD ACT ON PROBLEM	discrete	numeric-1.0	374	2387	IF YOU WROTE HIM ABOUT A SPECIFIC PROBLEM, DO YOU THINK HE WOULD TRY TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?

Group Party Evaluation - Federal

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v288	LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2731	30	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
2	v289	LIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	760	2001	FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY. ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
3	v290	LIKE LIBERAL - INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	760	2001	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
4	v291	LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2758	3	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
5	v292	LIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	305	2456	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
6	v293	LIKE LIBERAL- INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	305	2456	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
7	v294	DISLIKE LIBERAL- CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2747	14	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
8	v295	DISLIKE LIBERAL- ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	723	2038	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
9	v296	DISLIKE LIBERAL- INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	723	2038	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
10	v297	DISLIKE LIBERAL- CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
11	v298	DISLIKE LIBERAL- ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	274	2487	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
12	v299	DISLIKE LIBERAL- INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	274	2487	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
13	v300	LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2736	25	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
14	v301	LIKE PC- ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	512	2249	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
15	v302	LIKE PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	512	2249	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
16	v303	LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2755	6	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
17	v304	LIKE PC- ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	128	2633	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
18	v305	LIKE PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	128	2633	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
19	v306	DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2736	25	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
20	v307	DISLIKE PC- ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	589	2172	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
21	v308	DISLIKE PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	589	2172	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
22	v309	DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2757	4	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
23	v310	DISLIKE PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	154	2607	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
24	v311	DISLIKE PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	154	2607	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
25	v312	LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2724	37	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
26	v313	LIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	445	2316	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
27	v314	LIKE NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	445	2316	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
28	v315	LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2758	3	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (SECOND MENTION)
29	v316	LIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	136	2625	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
30	v317	LIKE NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	136	2625	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
31	v318	DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2696	65	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN APRTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
32	v319	DISLIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	483	2278	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
33	v320	DISLIKE NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	482	2279	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
34	v321	DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2760	1	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (SECOND MENTION)
35	v322	DISLIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	94	2667	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
36	v323	DISLIKE NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	94	2667	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
37	v324	LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2677	84	CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
38	v325	LIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	261	2500	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
39	v326	LIKE SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	261	2500	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
40	v327	LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
41	v328	LIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	64	2697	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
42	v329	LIKE SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	64	2697	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
43	v330	DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2649	112	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
44	v331	DISLIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	291	2470	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
45	v332	DISLIKE SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	291	2470	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
46	v333	DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2759	2	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
47	v334	DISLIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	46	2715	ARTICLUATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
48	v335	DISLIKE SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	46	2715	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
49	v336	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PARTIES-FEDERAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	1253	1508	SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT IT DOESN'T MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE WHICH PARTY IS IN POWER IN OTTAWA, WHILE OTHERS THINK THAT IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?

Group Party Evaluation - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v337	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	continuous	numeric-3.0	2761	0	-
2	v338	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	379	2382	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
3	v339	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	379	2382	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)
4	v340	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2445	316	(SECOND MENTION)
5	v341	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	137	2624	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
6	v342	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	137	2624	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
7	v343	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2411	350	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)
8	v344	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	370	2391	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
9	v345	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	370	2391	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
10	v346	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2447	314	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (SECOND MENTION)
11	v347	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	119	2642	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
12	v348	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	119	2642	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
13	v349	LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1772	989	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)
14	v350	LIKE UNION NATIONALE- ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	52	2709	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
15	v351	LIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	52	2709	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
16	v352	LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1777	984	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (SECOND MENTION) (QUEBEC ONLY)
17	v353	LIKE UNION NATIONALE- ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	9	2752	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
18	v354	LIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	9	2752	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
19	v355	DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1771	990	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
20	v356	DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-	discrete	numeric-1.0	82	2679	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
		ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE					
21	v357	DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	82	2679	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
22	v358	DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1777	984	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
23	v359	DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	19	2742	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
24	v360	DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	19	2742	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
25	v361	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2704	57	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)
26	v362	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	514	2247	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
27	v363	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	514	2247	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
28	v364	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2759	2	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (SECOND MENTION) (ALL PROVINCES)
29	v365	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	151	2610	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
30	v366	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	151	2610	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
31	v367	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2702	59	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION) (ALL PROVINCES)
32	v368	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	466	2295	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
33	v369	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	466	2295	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
34	v370	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
35	v371	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	117	2644	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
36	v372	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	117	2644	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
37	v373	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2393	368	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)
38	v374	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	305	2456	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
39	v375	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	305	2456	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
40	v376	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2445	316	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (SECOND MENTION)
41	v377	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	90	2671	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
42	v378	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	90	2671	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
43	v379	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2376	385	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
44	v380	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	333	2428	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
45	v381	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	333	2428	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
46	v382	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2447	314	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.? (SECOND MENTION) (NOT ASKED IN QUEBEC)
47	v383	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATE 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	113	2648	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
48	v384	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	113	2648	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
49	v385	LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1775	986	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
50	v386	LIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	130	2631	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
51	v387	LIKE PQ-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	130	2631	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
52	v388	LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1776	985	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC? (SECOND MENTION)
53	v389	LIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	47	2714	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
54	v390	LIKE PQ-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	47	2714	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
55	v391	DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1774	987	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS? (FIRST MENTION)
56	v392	DISLIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	178	2583	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
57	v393	DISLIKE PQ-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	178	2583	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
58	v394	DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1776	985	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS? (SECOND MENTION) (QUEBEC ONLY)
59	v395	DISLIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	51	2710	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
60	v396	DISLIKE PQ-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	51	2710	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
61	v397	LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2029	732	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? FIRST MENTION)
62	v398	LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	138	2623	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
63	v399	LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	138	2623	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
64	v400	LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2043	718	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? SECOND MENTION)
65	v401	LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	48	2713	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
66	v402	LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	48	2713	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
67	v403	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2029	732	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION) (ALBERTA, BRITISH COLUMBIA, MANITOBA, AND QUEBEC ONLY)
68	v404	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	190	2571	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
69	v405	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	190	2571	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)
70	v406	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2043	718	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)
71	v407	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	47	2714	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)
72	v408	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	47	2714	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)
73	v409	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PARTIES-PROVINCIAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	1228	1533	Q59A. SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT IT DOESN'T MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE WHICH PARTY IS IN POWER IN OTTAWA, WHILE OTHERS THINK THAT IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS? / Q59B. HOW ABOUT IN THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT? DOES IT MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE THERE?

Group Demographics II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v410	OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM R	discrete	numeric-2.0	1295	1466	WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION? WHAT EXACTLY DO YOU DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
2	v411	MANUAL/NON-MANUAL/FARM R	discrete	numeric-1.0	703	2058	WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION? WHAT EXACTLY DO YOU DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
3	v412	EXECUTIVE POSITION? R	discrete	numeric-1.0	297	2464	YOUR JOB AN EXECUTIVE POSITION OR WHAT?
4	v413	NO. OF EMPLOYEES R	discrete	numeric-2.0	103	2658	HOW MANY PEOPLE DOES YOUR COMPANY EMPLOY?
5	v414	NO.WORK UNDER R R	discrete	numeric-2.0	302	2459	HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE WORKING UNDER YOU?
6	v415	TYPE OF BUSINESS R	discrete	numeric-2.0	303	2458	WHAT DOES YOUR COMPANY DO?
7	v416	SPECIAL TRAINING R	discrete	numeric-1.0	134	2627	DID YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR YOUR JOB?
8	v417	SKILLED WORKER R	discrete	numeric-1.0	317	2444	DOES YOUR EMPLOYER REGARD YOU AS A SKILLED PERSON?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	v418	NO. WORK UNDER R R	discrete	numeric-2.0	310	2451	HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE WORKING UNDER YOU?
10	v419	YEARS EXPERIENCE R	discrete	numeric-2.0	318	2443	HOW MANY YEARS EXPERIENCE DO YOU HAVE ON THE JOB?
11	v420	OWN OR MANAGE FARM R	discrete	numeric-1.0	52	2709	DO YOU OWN THE FARM OR MANAGE IT?
12	v421	YEARS WORKED ON FARM R	discrete	numeric-2.0	10	2751	HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN WORKING ON A FARM?
13	v422	NO. ACRES ON FARM R	discrete	numeric-2.0	49	2712	HOW MANY ACRES IS THE FARM?
14	v423	MAIN PRODUCT OF FARM R	discrete	numeric-2.0	51	2710	WHAT IS THE MAIN PRODUCT?
15	v424	BLISHEN SCORE R	discrete	numeric-7.2	2761	0	-
16	v425	MARITAL STATUS R	discrete	numeric-1.0	1294	1467	ARE YOU MARRIED, WIDOWED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR ARE YOU SINGLE?
17	v426	STREAM CODE	discrete	numeric-1.0	771	1990	-
18	v427	OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2216	545	WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
19	v428	MANUAL/NON-MANUAL/ FARM SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	746	2015	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
20	v429	EXECUTIVE POSITION SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	225	2536	Q78D. IS (WAS) HIS JOB AN EXECUTIVE POSITION OR WHAT?
21	v430	NO. OF EMPLOYEES SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	94	2667	HOW MANY PEOPLE DOES (DID) HIS COMPANY EMPLOY?
22	v431	NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	200	2561	HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER HIM?
23	v432	TYPE OF BUSINESS SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	233	2528	Q78G. WHAT DOES (DID) HIS COMPANY DO?
24	v433	SPECIAL TRAINING SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	178	2583	Q78DE. DID HE HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR HIS JOB?
25	v434	SKILLED WORKER SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	388	2373	Q78F. DOES (DID) HIS EMPLOYER REGARD HIM AS A SKILLED PERSON?
26	v435	NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	356	2405	Q78G. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER HIM?
27	v436	YEARS EXPERIENCE SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	381	2380	Q78H. HOW MANY YEARS EXPERIENCE DOES (DID) HE HAVE ON THE JOB?
28	v437	OWN OR MANAGE FARM SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	90	2671	Q78D. DOES (DID) HE OWN THE FARM OR MANAGE IT?
29	v438	YEARS WORKED ON FARM SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	25	2736	Q78E. (IF FARM WORKER) HOW MANY YEARS HAS (HAD) HE BEEN WORKING ON A FARM?
30	v439	NO. ACRES ON FARM SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	78	2683	Q78G. HOW MANY ACRES IS (WAS) THE FARM?
31	v440	MAIN PRODUCT OF FARM SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	86	2675	Q78H. WHAT IS (WAS) THE MAIN PRODUCT?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
32	v441	BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-7.2	2761	0	-
33	v442	YEARS SCHOOL ATTENDED	discrete	numeric-2.0	1295	1466	HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOL DID YOU ATTEND?
34	v443	HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1281	1480	WHAT IS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL YOU REACHED?
35	v444	HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED	discrete	numeric-1.0	2749	12	DID YOU COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL?
36	v445	POST SECONDARY EDUCATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	602	2159	DID YOU EVER ATTEND UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, OR SOME OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL?
37	v446	DEGREE OBTAINED	discrete	numeric-1.0	409	2352	Q79E. DID YOU OBTAIN A DEGREE OR DEGREES?
38	v447	R THINKS OF SOCIAL CLASS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1255	1506	ONE HEARS A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES. DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS?
39	v448	SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS	discrete	numeric-1.0	584	2177	Q87B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?
40	v449	SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS-PROBE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2126	635	Q87C. (IF NO OR D.K. IN Q87A) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?
41	v450	FEEL CLOSE TO CLASS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1152	1609	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THEY HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH OTHER PEOPLE OF THEIR OWN CLASS, BUT OTHERS DON'T FEEL THIS WAY SO MUCH. HOW ABOUT YOU? WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL PRETTY CLOSE TO OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN ABOVE) PEOPLE, OR THAT YOU DON'T FEEL MUCH CLOSER TO THEM THAN YOU DO TO PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES?
42	v451	CONFLICT BETWEEN CLASSES	discrete	numeric-1.0	1237	1524	ON THE WHOLE, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS BOUND TO BE SOME CONFLICT BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES, OR DO YOU THINK THEY CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER WITHOUT ANY CONFLICT?
43	v452	RELIGION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1297	1464	WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION?
44	v453	FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTEND	discrete	numeric-1.0	1241	1520	ABOUT HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO TO CHURCH (SYNAGOGUE)? AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK, TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH, ONCE A MONTH, A FEW TIMES A YEAR OR LESS, NEVER?
45	v454	SUBJECTIVE RELIGIOUSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1233	1528	DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON, A

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							FAIRLY RELIGIOUS PERSON, OR A NOT VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON?
46	v455	COUNTRY OF BIRTH	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	IN WHAT COUNTRY WERE YOU BORN?
47	v456	YEAR CAME TO CANADA	discrete	numeric-2.0	175	2586	IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU COME TO LIVE IN CANADA?
48	v457	HOW LONG LIVED IN PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1298	1463	HOW MUCH OF YOUR LIFE HAVE YOU LIVED IN (NAME PROVINCE)?
49	v458	LIVED IN OTHER PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?
50	v459	LIVED IN NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
51	v460	LIVED IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
52	v461	LIVED IN NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
53	v462	LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
54	v463	LIVED IN QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
55	v464	LIVED IN ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
56	v465	LIVED IN MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
57	v466	LIVED IN SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
58	v467	LIVED IN ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
59	v468	LIVED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?
60	v469	ETHNICITY	discrete	numeric-2.0	1233	1528	CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT ETHNIC OR CULTURAL GROUP YOUR ANCESTORS WHO FIRST CAME TO NORTH AMERICA BELONGED TO? (ON THE MALE SIDE)
61	v470	LANGUAGE SPOKEN AS CHILD	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	WHAT LANGUAGE DID YOU FIRST LEARN AS A CHILD THAT YOU STILL SPEAK OR UNDERSTAND?
62	v471	LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USUALLY SPEAK AT HOME?
63	v472	SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGES	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	DO YOU SPEAK ANY OTHER LANGUAGES THAN THOSE YOU HAVE JUST MENTIONED?
64	v473	GREW UP CITY,FARM,ETC.	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q92A. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, WHERE DID YOU LIVE--MOSTLY IN A CITY OR SUBURB, MOSTLY IN A VILLAGE OR SMALL TOWN, OR MOSTLY ON A FARM?
65	v474	GREW UP NEAR LARGE CITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	899	1862	WAS THE (SUBURB, TOWN, VILLAGE, FARM) THAT YOU LIVED IN NEAR A LARGE CITY, OR NOT VERY NEAR?
66	v475	TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP	discrete	numeric-2.0	2752	9	DO YOU BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?
67	v476	FAMILY UNION MEMBERSHIP	discrete	numeric-1.0	1271	1490	DOES ANY MEMBER OF YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY (BESIDES

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							YOURSELF) BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?
68	v477	RESPONDENT AGE IN YEARS	discrete	numeric-2.0	1297	1464	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?
69	v478	FAMILY INCOME	discrete	numeric-1.0	1269	1492	IN WHICH OF THESE GROUPS DOES THE APPROXIMATE INCOME OF THE FAMILY FALL--THAT IS, THE INCOME OR EARNINGS OF ALL THE FAMILY MEMBERS LIVING HERE ADDED TOGETHER?
70	v479	RESPONDENT SEX	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	SEX
71	v480	COMMUNITY SIZE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	COMMUNITY SIZE

Group ICPSR Variables

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1001	ICPSR STUDY NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
2	v1002	ICPSR EDITION NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
3	v1003	ICPSR PART NUMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-

Group Interest

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1021	INTEREST IN ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2740	21	Q1. WE HAVE FOUND THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES DON'T PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO ELECTIONS. HOW ABOUT YOURSELF? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE VERY INTERESTED IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, FAIRLY INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED IN IT?
2	v1022	INTEREST IN POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2736	25	WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER YOU PAY MUCH ATTENTION TO POLITICS GENERALLY. I MEAN FROM DAY TO DAY, WHEN THERE ISN'T A BIG ELECTION CAMPAIGN GOING ON. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FOLLOW POLITICS VERY CLOSELY, FAIRLY CLOSELY, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?
3	v1023	MORE ATTENTION: FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2672	89	WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FEDERAL POLITICS, PROVINCIAL POLITICS, OR LOCAL POLITICS?
4	v1024	LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT MOST IMPORTANT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2584	177	AS FAR AS YOU ARE CONCERNED PERSONALLY, WHICH GOVERNMENT IS MORE IMPORTANT IN AFFECTING HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY GET ON, THE ONE IN OTTAWA, THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) OR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (NAME CITY, TOWNSHIP, ETC.)?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
5	v1025	YOUR GOVERNMENT: WHICH LEVEL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2705	56	WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR GOVERNMENT, WHICH GOVERNMENT COMES TO MIND, THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA OR THE GOVERNMENT OF (NAME PROVINCE)?

Group Economic Satisfaction

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1026	MATERIAL SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2730	31	WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?
2	v1027	GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON MATERIAL SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2683	78	Q6B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
3	v1028	MATERIAL STATE IN 4 YEARS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2583	178	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF THINGS AND LOOKING AHEAD OVER THE NEXT THREE OR FOUR YEARS, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WILL BE BETTER OFF, WORSE OFF, OR WILL THINGS STAY ABOUT THE SAME?
4	v1029	LIFE SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2728	33	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?
5	v1030	GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON LIFE SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2692	69	Q8B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?

Group Politics

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1031	'POLITICS'- MEANING 1ST	discrete	numeric-2.0	1269	1492	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT POLITICS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
2	v1032	'POLITICS'-MEANING 2ND	discrete	numeric-2.0	1351	1410	WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? (2ND MENTION)
3	v1033	'POLITICS'-MEANING 3RD	discrete	numeric-2.0	1353	1408	WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? (2ND MENTION)
4	v1034	'POLITICS'-LEVEL NAMED	discrete	numeric-1.0	399	2362	<MEANING OF POLITICS, LEVEL OF REFERENCE>

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
5	v1035	'POLITICS'-POSITIVE/ NEGATIVE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2630	131	<MEANING OF POLITICS, EVALUATIVE REFERENCE>
6	v1036	'POLTCS' SOLVE PROBLEMS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1235	1526	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT IT DOES NOT. DO YOU FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS, OR NOT?
7	v1037	'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	1334	1427	Q10B.1 CAN YOU THINK OF ANY EXAMPLES WHERE POLITICS HAS HELPED TO SOLVE PROBLEMS? ANYTHING ELSE?
8	v1038	'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	1353	1408	Q10B.2 CAN YOU THINK OF ANY EXAMPLES WHERE POLITICS HAS HELPED TO SOLVE PROBLEMS? (2ND MENTION)

Group Political Efficacy and Cynicism

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1039	PARTY IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAKE DIFFERENCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1313	1448	SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT IT DOESN'T MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE WHICH PARTY IS IN POWER IN OTTAWA, WHILE OTHERS THINK THAT IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?
2	v1040	PARTY IN PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT MAKE DIFFERENCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1283	1478	HOW ABOUT IN THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT? DOES IT MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE THERE?
3	v1041	MP'S LOSE TOUCH	discrete	numeric-1.0	2677	84	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE. GENERALLY, THOSE ELECTED TO PARLIAMENT SOON LOSE TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE.
4	v1042	GOVERNMENT DOESN'T CARE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2698	63	I DON'T THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT CARES MUCH WHAT PEOPLE LIKE ME THINK.
5	v1043	POLITICS COMPLICATED	discrete	numeric-1.0	2721	40	SOMETIMES, POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT SEEM SO COMPLICATED THAT A PERSON LIKE ME CAN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON.
6	v1044	PEOPLE LIKE ME HAVE NO SAY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2712	49	PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES.
7	v1045	SO MANY VOTERS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2718	43	PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES.
8	v1046	GOVERNMENT DISHONEST	discrete	numeric-1.0	2554	207	MANY PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT ARE DISHONEST.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	v1047	GOVERNMENT WASTES TAXES	discrete	numeric-1.0	2651	110	PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT WASTE A LOT OF THE MONEY WE PAY IN TAXES.
10	v1048	CAN TRUST GOVERNMENT DO WHAT IS RIGHT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2657	104	MOST OF THE TIME WE CAN TRUST PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT.
11	v1049	GOVERNMENT SMART PEOPLE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2670	91	MOST OF THE PEOPLE RUNNING GOVERNMENT ARE SMART PEOPLE WHO USUALLY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING.
12	v1050	CANADA: REDUCE MILITARY SPEND	discrete	numeric-1.0	2531	230	CANADA SHOULD REDUCE ITS PRESENT LEVEL OF MILITARY SPENDING.
13	v1051	CANADA: REDUCE FORGEIN AID	discrete	numeric-1.0	2596	165	CANADA SHOULD REDUCE ITS FOREIGN AID.

Group Electoral Activities

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1052	READ NEWSPAPER-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1348	1413	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
2	v1053	DISCUSS POLITICS-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1348	1413	HOW OFTEN DOES R> DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
3	v1054	CONVINCE FRIENDS-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1347	1414	HOW OFTEN DOES R> TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU
4	v1055	ATTEND MEETING-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1348	1413	HOW OFTEN DOES R> ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
5	v1056	CONTACT OFFICIALS-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1347	1414	HOW OFTEN DOES R> CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
6	v1057	CAMPAIGN WORK-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1344	1417	HOW OFTEN DOES R> SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE?
7	v1058	CONTRIBUTE MONEY-FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1344	1417	HOW OFTEN DOES R> CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE.
8	v1059	READ NEWSPAPERS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1346	1415	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
9	v1060	DISCUSS POLITICS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1343	1418	HOW OFTEN DOWS R> DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
10	v1061	CONVINCE FRIENDS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1342	1419	HOW OFTEN DOES R> TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU? (HALF SAMPLE 2 ONLY)
11	v1062	ATTEND MEETING-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1342	1419	HOW OFTEN DOES R> ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
12	v1063	CONTACT OFFICIALS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1343	1418	HOW OFTEN DOES R> ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
13	v1064	CAMPAIGN WORK-PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1342	1419	HOW OFTEN DOES R> SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
14	v1065	CONTRIB MONEY- PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1339	1422	HOW OFTEN DOES R> CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE?

Group Identification and Evaluation - Regional

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1066	CANADA DIVIDED IN REGIONS?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2466	295	PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS.
2	v1067	R LIVES IN: REGION CODED	discrete	numeric-2.0	1133	1628	Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?
3	v1068	R LIVES IN: NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
4	v1069	R LIVES IN: PEI	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
5	v1070	R LIVES IN: NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2C NOVA SCOTIA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
6	v1071	R LIVES IN: NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
7	v1072	R LIVES IN: QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2E QUEBEC MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
8	v1073	R LIVES IN: ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2F ONTARIO MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
9	v1074	R LIVES IN: MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2G MANITOBA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
10	v1075	R LIVES IN: SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2H SASKATCHEWAN MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
11	v1076	R LIVES IN: ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2I ALBERTA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
12	v1077	R LIVES IN: BRITISH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	Q15B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.
13	v1078	COMMON FEEL WITH REGION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1419	1342	DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE A LOT IN COMMON, OR NOT MUCH IN COMMON, WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS REGION OF (REGION NAMED IN Q15B - "WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?")
14	v1079	REGION PAY FAIR SHARE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1449	1312	IN TERMS OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION PAYS ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE COST, MORE THAN

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?
15	v1080	UNFAIR COST: 1ST MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	469	2292	WHAT COSTS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?
16	v1081	UNFAIR COST: 2ND MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	479	2282	WHAT COSTS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
17	v1082	UNFAIR COST: 3RD MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	485	2276	WHAT COSTS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (THIRD MENTION)
18	v1083	REGION GET FAIR BENEFITS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1331	1430	IN TERMS OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION RECEIVES ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?
19	v1084	ANY REGION PAY TOO MUCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1010	1751	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE?
20	v1085	PAY TOO MUCH: REGION MENTIONED	discrete	numeric-2.0	196	2565	Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?
21	v1086	PAY TOO MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	NEWFOUNDLAND MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
22	v1087	PAY TOO MUCH: PEI	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	P.E.I. MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
23	v1088	PAY TOO MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	NOVA SCOTIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
24	v1089	PAY TOO MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	NEW BRUNSWICK MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
25	v1090	PAY TOO MUCH: QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	QUEBEC MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
26	v1091	PAY TOO MUCH: ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	ONTARIO MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
27	v1092	PAY TOO MUCH: MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	MANITOBA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
28	v1093	PAY TOO MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	SASKATCHEWAN MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
29	v1094	PAY TOO MUCH: ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	ALBERTA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
30	v1095	PAY TOO MUCH: BRITISH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	BRITISH COLUMBIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.
31	v1096	ANY REGION GET TOO MUCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1128	1633	ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?
32	v1097	GET TOO MUCH: REGION	discrete	numeric-2.0	354	2407	Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?
33	v1098	GET TOO MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
34	v1099	GET TOO MUCH: PEI	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
35	v1100	GET TOO MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2C NOVA SCOTIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
36	v1101	GET TOO MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
37	v1102	GET TOO MUCH: QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2E QUEBEC MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
38	v1103	GET TOO MUCH: ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2F ONTARIO MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
39	v1104	GET TOO MUCH: MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2G MANITOBA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
40	v1105	GET TOO MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2H SASKATCHEWAN MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
41	v1106	GET TOO MUCH: ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2I ALBERTA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
42	v1107	GET TOO MUCH: BRISITH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	783	1978	Q20B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.
43	v1108	WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 1ST	discrete	numeric-2.0	691	2070	WHY DO YOU THINK SOME REGIONS PAY MORE OR SOME REGIONS RECEIVE MORE THAN OTHERS?
44	v1109	WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 2ND	discrete	numeric-2.0	691	2070	WHY DO YOU THINK SOME REGIONS PAY MORE OR SOME REGIONS RECEIVE MORE THAN OTHERS?
45	v1110	WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 3RD	discrete	numeric-2.0	215	2546	(IF "MORE" OR "LESS" IN Q17A AND/OR IN Q18 OR IF "YES" IN Q19A AND/OR IN Q20A) WHY DO YOU THINK SOME REGIONS PAY MORE OR SOME REGIONS RECEIVE MORE THAN OTHERS? (THIRD MENTION)

Group Identification and Evaluation - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1111	ANY PROVINCE PAY TOO MUCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2108	653	WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA?
2	v1112	PROVINCE PAY MUCH:GENERAL MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
3	v1113	PROV PAY MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
4	v1114	PROV PAY MUCH: PEI	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
5	v1115	PROV PAY MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2C NOVA SCOTIA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
6	v1116	PROV PAY MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
7	v1117	PROV PAY MUCH: QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2E QUEBEC (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
8	v1118	PROV PAY MUCH: ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2F ONTARIO (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
9	v1119	PROV PAY MUCH: MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2G MANITOBA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
10	v1120	PROV PAY MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2H SASKATCHEWAN (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
11	v1121	PROV PAY MUCH: ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2I ALBERTA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
12	v1122	PROV PAY MUCH: BRITISH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1242	1519	Q22B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
13	v1123	ANY PROVINCE GET TOO MUCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2079	682	WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?
14	v1124	PROVINCE GET TOO MUCH: GENERAL MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1636	1125	-
15	v1125	PROV GET MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
16	v1126	PROV GET MUCH: PEI	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
17	v1127	PROV GET MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2C NOVA SCOTIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
18	v1128	PROV GET MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
19	v1129	PROV GET MUCH: QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2E QUEBEC (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
20	v1130	PROV GET MUCH: ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2F ONTARIO (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
21	v1131	PROV GET MUCH: MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2G MANITOBA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
22	v1132	PROV GET MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2H SASKATCHEWAN (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
23	v1133	PROV GET MUCH: ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2I HNEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
24	v1134	PROV GET MUCH: BRISITSH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1349	1412	Q23B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
25	v1135	ANY PROVINCE MORE POWER?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2225	536	WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?
26	v1136	POWERFUL PROVINCE: GENERAL MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	79	2682	Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?
27	v1137	POWERFUL PROVINCE: NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
28	v1138	POWERFUL PROVINCE: PEI	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
29	v1139	POWERFUL PROVINCE: NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2C NOVA SCOTIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
30	v1140	POWERFUL PROVINCE: NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
31	v1141	POWERFUL PROVINCE: QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2E QUEBEC (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
32	v1142	POWERFUL PROVINCE: ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2F ONTARIO (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
33	v1143	POWERFUL PROVINCE: MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2G MANITOBA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
34	v1144	POWERFUL PROVINCE: SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2H SASKATCHEWAN (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
35	v1145	POWERFUL PROVINCE: ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2I ALBERTA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
36	v1146	POWERFUL PROVINCE: BRITISH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	1675	1086	Q23B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
37	v1147	FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)?

Group Identification - Community

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1147	FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)?
2	v1148	FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?
3	v1149	FEEL ABOUT REGION	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q25C. (IF REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B) HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT THIS REGION OF (NAME REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B. IF SAME AS PROVINCE, GO TO Q25D.)?
4	v1150	FEEL ABOUT CANADA	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q25D. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?
5	v1151	FEEL ABT GOVT OF CANADA	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q25E. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?
6	v1152	FEEL ABOUT PARLIAMENT	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q25F. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT PARLIAMENT?
7	v1153	FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q25G. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE UNITED STATES?

Group Issues

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1154	MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2205	556	WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?
2	v1155	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: FEEL STRONG	discrete	numeric-1.0	1923	838	Q26B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE? (STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)
3	v1156	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: DO WHAT?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1923	838	-
4	v1157	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1923	838	-
5	v1158	PARTY CLOSEST ON ISSUE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1726	1035	Q26C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
6	v1159	ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1866	895	Q26D. HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?
7	v1160	2ND MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1794	967	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?
8	v1161	2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: FEEL STRONG	discrete	numeric-1.0	1178	1583	Q27B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?
9	v1162	2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: DO WHAT?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1178	1583	-
10	v1163	2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1178	1583	Q27B.3 (R/S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)
11	v1164	PARTY CLOSEST ON 2ND ISSUE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1178	1583	Q27C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
12	v1165	2ND ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1146	1615	Q27D. HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?
13	v1166	NATIONAL UNITY-MEANING 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	1247	1514	I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS NATIONAL UNITY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN NATIONAL UNITY IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
14	v1167	NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	651	2110	Q28A.2 (NATIONAL UNITY) (SECOND RESPONSE)
15	v1168	NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	219	2542	Q28A.3 (NATIONAL UNITY) (THIRD RESPONSE)
16	v1169	NATIONAL UNITY-WHY PROBLEM-1	discrete	numeric-2.0	2498	263	WHY DO YOU THINK NATIONAL UNITY HAS BEEN A PROBLEM IN CANADA?
17	v1170	NATIONAL UNITY-WHY PROBLEM-2	discrete	numeric-2.0	2739	22	Q28B.2 (NATIONAL UNITY, A PROBLEM?) (SECOND RESPONSE)
18	v1171	NATIONAL UNITY-PARTY CLOSEST	discrete	numeric-1.0	1007	1754	(IF 'NATIONAL UNITY' MENTIONED IN Q26A (NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?) OR Q27A (WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?))
19	v1172	WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2676	85	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON THE ISSUE OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS ARE MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
20	v1173	WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2743	18	Q29A.2 (WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS) (SECOND RESPONSE)
21	v1174	WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2742	19	Q29A.3 (WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS) (THIRD RESPONSE)
22	v1175	FEEL ABOUT WAGE/PRICE CONTROL	discrete	numeric-1.0	1071	1690	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS?
23	v1176	PARTY CLOSEST WAGE/PRICE CONTROLS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1019	1742	Q29C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
24	v1177	MAJORITY VS MINORITY GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1287	1474	SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT IT IS BETTER WHEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS A MAJORITY OF SEATS IN PARLIAMENT, WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT MINORITY GOVERNMENTS CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE, WHICH DO YOU FEEL IS BETTER?
25	v1178	SWITCH FOR MAJORITY GOVERNMENT?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1247	1514	IF YOU BELIEVED THAT ONE PARTY WAS MORE LIKELY TO

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							BE ABLE TO FORM A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, BUT YOU DID NOT ORDINARILY VOTE FOR THAT PARTY, HOW LIKELY WOULD YOU BE TO VOTE FOR IT IN ORDER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, VERY LIKELY, SOMEWHAT LIKELY, OR NOT VERY LIKELY?
26	v1179	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT ISSUE INFLUENCE VOTE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1258	1503	DID THIS QUESTION OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT HAVE A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR VERY LITTLE TO DO WITH THE WAY YOU VOTED IN THIS LAST ELECTION?
27	v1180	SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION MEANING1	discrete	numeric-2.0	563	2198	THE QUEBEC GOVERNMENT WOULD LIKE TO NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION WITH THE REST OF CANADA. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
28	v1181	SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION MEANING2	discrete	numeric-2.0	734	2027	Q31.2 (SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION) (SECOND RESPONSE)
29	v1182	RENEWED FEDERALISM MEANING1	discrete	numeric-2.0	451	2310	MANY PEOPLE THESE DAYS ARE TALKING ABOUT RENEWED FEDERALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM-- RENEWED FEDERALISM-- IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
30	v1183	RENEWED FEDERALISM MEANING2	discrete	numeric-2.0	734	2027	WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM RENEWED FEDERALISM IS MENTIONED?
31	v1184	QUEBEC OPTION:NO CHANGE	discrete	numeric-1.0	673	2088	AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) NO CHANGE.
32	v1185	QUEBEC OPTION:RENEWED FEDERALISM	discrete	numeric-1.0	461	2300	Q33B. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) RENEWED FEDERALISM.
33	v1186	QUEBEC OPTION:SPECIAL STATUS	discrete	numeric-1.0	488	2273	Q33C. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) SPECIAL STATUS IN CONFEDERATION.
34	v1187	QUEBEC OPTION:SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	517	2244	Q33D. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION.
35	v1188	QUEBEC OPTION:INDEPENDENCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	668	2093	Q33E. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) INDEPENDENCE.
36	v1189	REFERENDUM VOTE IF 'INDEPENDENCE'	discrete	numeric-1.0	651	2110	THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC IS PLANNING A REFERENDUM ON THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF QUEBEC. IF THE QUESTION IN THE REFERENDUM WERE TO BE "ARE YOU FOR INDEPENDENCE",

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?
37	v1190	REFERENDUM VOTE IF 'SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION'	discrete	numeric-1.0	513	2248	Q34B. IF THE QUESTION WERE TO BE "ARE YOU FOR SOVEREIGNTYASSOCIATION", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?
38	v1191	REFERENDUM VOTE:'NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION'	discrete	numeric-1.0	533	2228	Q34C. IF THE QUESTION WERE TO BE "DO YOU GIVE THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC A MANDATE TO NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?

Group Party Identification - Federal

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1192	FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2491	270	THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?
2	v1193	FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2183	578	Q35B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q35A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?
3	v1194	FEEL CLOSE TO PARTY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	495	2266	Q36A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
4	v1195	FEDERAL PARTY CLOSE TO	discrete	numeric-1.0	162	2599	Q36B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
5	v1196	ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	2642	119	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?
6	v1197	PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	824	1937	Q37B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v1198	WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-2.0	656	2105	Q37C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?
8	v1199	WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY:RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	771	1990	Q37D.1 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v1200	WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY:RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	789	1972	REASON FOR CHANGING PARTISANSHIP. (SECOND MENTION)
10	v1201	FATHER FEDERAL PARTY PREFERENCE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2220	541	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?
11	v1202	FATHER FED PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1537	1224	Q38B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
12	v1203	FATHER FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1504	1257	Q38C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q38B) WAS HE THEN?
13	v1204	MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY PREFERENCE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2209	552	Q39A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?
14	v1205	MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1201	1560	Q39B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
15	v1206	MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1179	1582	Q39C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q39B) WAS SHE THEN?
16	v1207	PARENTS' INTEREST: FEDERAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2429	332	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN FEDERAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED, SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?
17	v1208	PARENTS WORK IN CAMPAIGN	discrete	numeric-1.0	2443	318	DID YOUR MOTHER OR FATHER EVER WORK ACTIVELY FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE HERE IN CANADA?

Group Contact and Media

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1209	DID R HAVE CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1342	1419	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?
2	v1210	WHICH PARTY CONTACTED	discrete	numeric-2.0	563	2198	Q41B. WHICH ONES? (PROBE) ANY OTHERS?
3	v1211	WHICH PARTY CANDIDATE CONTACTED	discrete	numeric-2.0	562	2199	Q41C. WHICH PARTY WAS HE/SHE (WERE THEY)?
4	v1212	OTHER CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1331	1430	WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?
5	v1213	WHICH PARTY CONTACTED	discrete	numeric-2.0	1032	1729	Q42B. WHICH PARTY OR PARTIES?
6	v1214	HOW CONTACTED?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1078	1683	Q42C. HOW DID THEY CONTACT YOU?
7	v1215	ASKED FOR CONTRIBUTION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1046	1715	Q42D. DID ANY OF THEM ASK FOR A CONTRIBUTION?
8	v1216	CAMPAIGN IN NEWSPAPER	discrete	numeric-1.0	1348	1413	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU READ QUITE A BIT, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL ABOUT THE PARTIES, CANDIDATES, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWSPAPERS?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	v1217	WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	WHICH NEWSPAPERS DO YOU READ REGULARLY?
10	v1218	WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	WHICH NEWSPAPERS DO YOU READ REGULARLY?
11	v1219	WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	WHICH NEWSPAPERS DO YOU READ REGULARLY?
12	v1220	CAMPAIGN ON TELEVISION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1346	1415	HOW ABOUT TELEVISION? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN DID YOU WATCH PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?
13	v1221	WATCH LEADER TV DEBATES	discrete	numeric-1.0	1331	1430	DID YOU SEE THE DEBATES BETWEEN THE PARTY LEADERS ON TELEVISION ON SUNDAY, MAY 13TH?
14	v1222	DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	644	2117	Q44C.1. WHAT WERE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE DEBATES, IN GENERAL?
15	v1223	DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	645	2116	Q44C.2 WHAT WERE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE DEBATES, IN GENERAL? (SECOND MENTION)
16	v1224	DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	645	2116	Q44C.3 WHAT WERE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE DEBATES, IN GENERAL? (THIRD MENTION)
17	v1225	CAMPAIGN ON RADIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	1330	1431	HOW ABOUT RADIO? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN DID YOU HEAR PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HEARD QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?
18	v1226	MOST IMPORT MEDIA?	discrete	numeric-2.0	1344	1417	WHICH WOULD YOU SAY IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU IN GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT POLITICS, RADIO, TELEVISION, OR THE NEWSPAPERS?
19	v1227	WATCH COMMONS TV DEBATES	discrete	numeric-1.0	1340	1421	SINCE PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS HAVE BEEN SHOWN ON TELEVISION, HAVE YOU SEEN THESE FREQUENTLY, OCCASIONALLY, OR NOT AT ALL?
20	v1228	TV: CHANGED OPINION OF PARLIAMENT?	discrete	numeric-1.0	819	1942	FROM WHAT YOU HAVE SEEN ON TELEVISION, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOUR OPINION ABOUT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT HAS GONE UP, GONE DOWN, OR REMAINED THE SAME?

Group Voting Habits - Federal

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
---	------	-------	------	--------	-------	---------	----------

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1229	VOTE FREQUENCY-FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2737	24	IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE IN CANADA, INCLUDING THE ONE HELD THIS MAY, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM, SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?
2	v1230	ALWAYS VOTE SAME-FEDERAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2356	405	HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?
3	v1231	FEDERAL PARTY ALWAYS VOTED	discrete	numeric-1.0	1054	1707	Q48C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
4	v1232	CHOICE OR NO CONTEST-FEDERAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	1236	1525	Q48D. DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE, OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?
5	v1233	VOTED IN 1979 FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2697	64	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S MAY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?
6	v1234	HOW VOTE IN 1979 ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2234	527	Q49B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?
7	v1235	HOW WOULD VOTE-79	discrete	numeric-1.0	251	2510	Q49C. IF YOU HAD VOTED, WHO WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1236	MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2572	189	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
2	v1237	2ND MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2474	287	Q50B. WHICH WOULD SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?
3	v1238	3RD MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2441	320	Q50C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS LEAST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?
4	v1239	ISSUE OR PERSONAL STAND ON ISSUES	discrete	numeric-1.0	1496	1265	Q50D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
5	v1240	WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	629	2132	Q50E.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
6	v1241	WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	629	2132	Q50E.2 (IF STAND ON ISSUES) WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
7	v1242	ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH	discrete	numeric-1.0	975	1786	Q50F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
8	v1243	WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	361	2400	Q50G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v1244	WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	379	2382	Q50G.2 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)

Group Voting Habits

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1245	VOTED IN BY-ELECTION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	313	2448	THERE WAS A FEDERAL BY-ELECTION IN THIS AREA IN (MONTH & YEAR). DID YOU VOTE IN THAT BY-ELECTION?
2	v1253	2ND CHOICE PARTY-79 ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2215	546	IF, FOR SOME REASON, YOU HAD BEEN UNABLE TO VOTE FOR THE FEDERAL PARTY THAT YOU MOST PREFERRED IN THE RECENT ELECTION, WHICH OTHER FEDERAL PARTY WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?
3	v1254	PARTY LEAST PREFERENCE-79 ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2295	466	WHICH OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES WOULD YOU LEAST WANT TO VOTE FOR?
4	v1255	WHEN DECIDE HOW TO VOTE?	discrete	numeric-2.0	1162	1599	AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON MAY 22, 1979. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?
5	v1256	SURE ALL ALONG HOW TO VOTE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1170	1591	Q55B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?
6	v1257	WHICH OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED?	discrete	numeric-1.0	237	2524	Q55C. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v1258	REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	1125	1636	v1258 question details
8	v1259	REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	1213	1548	Q56.2 MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID (SECOND MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	v1260	REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	1213	1548	Q56.3 MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID (THIRD MENTION)
10	v1246	HOW VOTE IN BY-ELECT	discrete	numeric-1.0	207	2554	Q51B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR THEN?
11	v1247	VOTED IN 1974 FEDERAL ELECTION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2653	108	THE LAST FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THIS ONE WAS IN JULY, 1974. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER OR NOT YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?
12	v1248	HOW VOTED IN 1974 FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2069	692	Q52B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR THEN?
13	v1249	WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPNOSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	433	2328	Q52C.1 I NOTICED THAT YOU CHANGED YOUR VOTE FROM 1974 TO 1979. WAS THERE ANY SPECIAL REASON FOR CHANGING THE PARTY YOU VOTED FOR?
14	v1250	WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	431	2330	Q52C.2 WERE THERE ANY OTHER REASONS?
15	v1251	VOTED IN 1972 FEDERAL ELECTION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2517	244	THE FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN 1972. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?
16	v1252	HOW VOTED IN 1972 ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1630	1131	Q53B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1261	TRUDEAU THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2689	72	LET'S START WITH THE LIBERALS, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. TRUDEAU? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
2	v1262	LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2319	442	Q57B. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
3	v1263	LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2643	118	Q57C. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE LIBERAL PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
4	v1264	CLARK THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2611	150	Q57D. NOW, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. CLARK? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
5	v1265	LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2218	543	Q57E. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
6	v1266	PC PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2571	190	Q57F. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
7	v1267	BROADBENT THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2446	315	Q57G. HOW ABOUT THE N.D.P.? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							LEADER, MR. BROADBENT? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
8	v1268	LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1872	889	Q57H. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL N.D.P. CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
9	v1269	NDP THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q57I. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE N.D.P. PARTY TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
10	v1270	ROY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	640	2121	Q57J. HOW ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. ROY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
11	v1271	LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	456	2305	Q57K. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
12	v1272	SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	634	2127	Q57L. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
13	v1273	LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1345	1416	NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
14	v1274	LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q58A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)
15	v1275	LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q58A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)
16	v1276	DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1344	1417	Q58B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
17	v1277	DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q58B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)
18	v1278	DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2744	17	Q58B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)
19	v1279	LIKE CLARK- 1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2735	26	Q59A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?
20	v1280	LIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2744	17	Q59A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)
21	v1281	LIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2744	17	Q59A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
22	v1282	DISLIKE CLARK-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2732	29	Q59B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
23	v1283	DISLIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q59B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)
24	v1284	DISLIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q59B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)
25	v1285	LIKE BROADBENT-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1342	1419	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
26	v1286	LIKE BROADBENT-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2744	17	Q60A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)
27	v1287	LIKE BROADBENT-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q60A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)
28	v1288	DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	1340	1421	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
29	v1289	DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q60B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)
30	v1290	DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	1354	1407	Q60B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)
31	v1291	LIKE ROY-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	352	2409	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
32	v1292	LIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	374	2387	Q61A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)
33	v1293	LIKE ROY-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	374	2387	Q61A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)
34	v1294	DISLIKE ROY-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	370	2391	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
35	v1295	DISLIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	374	2387	Q61B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)
36	v1296	DISLIKE ROY-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	374	2387	Q61B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)
37	v1297	LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2724	37	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
38	v1298	LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2741	20	Q62A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY?
39	v1299	DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2727	34	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
40	v1300	DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2740	21	Q62B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY?
41	v1301	LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2726	35	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
42	v1302	LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2740	21	Q63A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?
43	v1303	DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2727	34	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
44	v1304	DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2740	21	Q63B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?
45	v1305	LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2727	34	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
46	v1306	LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2741	20	Q64A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY?
47	v1307	DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2727	34	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
48	v1308	DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2741	20	Q64B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY?
49	v1309	LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	730	2031	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
50	v1310	LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	733	2028	Q65A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
51	v1311	DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	730	2031	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
52	v1312	DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	733	2028	Q65B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?

Group Party Evaluation - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1346	PROVINCIAL PC LEADER THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1846	915	YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
2	v1347	PROVINCIAL PC PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1852	909	Q76B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
3	v1348	PROVINCIAL LIBERAL LEADER THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2033	728	Q77A. NOW THE LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
4	v1349	PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	2091	670	Q77B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
5	v1350	PROVINCIAL NDP LEADER THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1362	1399	Q78A. HOW ABOUT THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
6	v1351	PROVINCIAL NDP THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1442	1319	Q78B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
7	v1352	PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	435	2326	Q79A. NOW, THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
8	v1353	PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	1014	1747	Q79B.1 HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE
9	v1354	LEVESQUE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	706	2055	Q80A. HOW ABOUT THE LEADER OF THE PARTI QUEBECOIS, MR. LEVESQUE? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
10	v1355	PARTI QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	702	2059	Q80B. HOW ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
11	v1356	UNION NATIONALE LEADER THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	664	2097	Q81A. HOW ABOUT THE LEADER OF THE UNION NATIONALE, MR. BIRON? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
12	v1357	UNION NATIONALE PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	661	2100	Q81B. HOW ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
13	v1358	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
14	v1359	LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q82A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?
15	v1360	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q82B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
16	v1361	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q82B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?
17	v1362	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q83A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
18	v1363	LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q83A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY?
19	v1364	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q83B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
20	v1365	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q83B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY?
21	v1366	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q84A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
22	v1367	LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q84A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL N.D.P.?
23	v1368	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q84B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL N.D.P.? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
24	v1369	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q84B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL N.D.P.?
25	v1370	LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q85A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)
26	v1371	LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q85A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
27	v1372	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q85B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
28	v1373	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q85B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
29	v1374	LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q86A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)
30	v1375	LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q86A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS?
31	v1376	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q86B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS? (FIRST MENTION)
32	v1377	DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q86B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS ?
33	v1378	LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q87A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)
34	v1379	LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q87A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?
35	v1380	DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q87B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
36	v1381	DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	2761	0	Q87B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?

Group Party Identification - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1313	PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2442	319	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?
2	v1314	PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2296	465	HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q66A) DO YOU
3	v1315	CLOSER TO ANY PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	392	2369	WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
4	v1316	PROVINCIAL PARTY CLOSE TO	discrete	numeric-2.0	83	2678	Q67B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
5	v1317	ANY PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2617	144	THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?
6	v1318	PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-2.0	751	2010	Q68B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v1319	WHEN CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-2.0	687	2074	Q68C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY, THAT IS, THE (NAME OF PARTY MENTIONED IN Q68B) TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?
8	v1320	WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	751	2010	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v1321	WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	697	2064	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE (SECOND MENTION)
10	v1322	FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY PREFERENCE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2146	615	DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
11	v1323	FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1418	1343	Q69B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT
12	v1324	FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1391	1370	Q69C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q69B) WAS HE THEN?
13	v1325	MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY PREFERENCE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2142	619	DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
14	v1326	MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1165	1596	Q70B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
15	v1327	MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1146	1615	Q70C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q70B) WAS SHE THEN?
16	v1328	PARENTS' INTEREST:PROVINCIAL POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2354	407	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED, SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?

Group Voting Habits - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1329	VOTE IN PROVINCIAL ELECTION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2724	37	IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM , SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?
2	v1330	ALWAYS VOTE SAME PROVINCIAL PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2446	315	Q72B. IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?
3	v1331	WHICH PROVINCIAL PARTY VOTED FOR	discrete	numeric-2.0	1205	1556	Q72C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
4	v1332	CHOICE OR NO CONTEST-PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1165	1596	Q72D. DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?
5	v1333	VOTED LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2477	284	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?
6	v1334	HOW VOTED IN LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2119	642	Q73B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1335	PROVINCIAL:MOST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2342	419	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
2	v1336	PROVINCIAL:2ND IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2243	518	Q74B. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT?
3	v1337	PROVINCIAL:3RD IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2208	553	Q74C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE LEAST IMPORTANT?
4	v1338	ISSUE OR PERSONAL STAND ON ISSUES	discrete	numeric-1.0	1297	1464	Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON ISSUES?
5	v1339	PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	443	2318	Q74E.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?
6	v1340	PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE2	discrete	numeric-2.0	591	2170	Q74E.2 WHICH ISSUE ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
7	v1341	ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	981	1780	Q74F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
8	v1342	PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	283	2478	Q74G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	v1343	PROVINCIAL:WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	283	2478	Q74G.2 VWHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)

Group Voting Habits - Provincial II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1344	VOTED IN PENULTIM PROVINCIAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2380	381	THE PROVINCIAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN (SPECIFY YEAR). DO YOU REMEMBER WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?
2	v1345	HOW VOTED IN PENULTIM ELECTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1885	876	Q75B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR THEN?

Group Social Class

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1382	R THINKS OF SOCIAL CLASS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2625	136	ONE HEARS A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES. DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS?
2	v1383	SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1145	1616	WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?
3	v1384	SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS-FORCED	discrete	numeric-1.0	1435	1326	WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?
4	v1385	FEEL CLOSE TO OWN CLASS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2380	381	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THEY HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH OTHER PEOPLE OF THEIR OWN CLASS, BUT OTHERS DON'T FEEL THIS WAY SO MUCH. HOW ABOUT YOU? WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL PRETTY CLOSE TO OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN ABOVE) PEOPLE, OR THAT YOU DON'T FEEL MUCH CLOSER TO THEM THAN YOU DO TO PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES?
5	v1386	'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-1	discrete	numeric-2.0	2485	276	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN IN Q88B OR C) PEOPLE? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (FIRST MENTION)
6	v1387	'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-2	discrete	numeric-2.0	2507	254	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN IN Q88B OR C) PEOPLE? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (SECOND MENTION)
7	v1388	'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-3	discrete	numeric-2.0	2507	254	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN IN Q88B OR C) PEOPLE? WHAT KINDS

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (THIRD MENTION)
8	v1389	'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-1	discrete	numeric-2.0	2461	300	WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v1390	'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-2	discrete	numeric-2.0	2507	254	WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (2ND MENTION)
10	v1391	'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-3	discrete	numeric-2.0	2507	254	WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (THIRD MENTION)
11	v1392	CONFLICT BETWEEN CLASSES	discrete	numeric-1.0	2547	214	ON THE WHOLE, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS BOUND TO BE SOME CONFLICT BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES, OR DO YOU THINK THEY CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER WITHOUT ANY CONFLICT?
12	v1393	POLITICS AND CLASS CONFLICTS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1199	1562	Q90B. DOES POLITICS HELP TO RESOLVE THESE CONFLICTS, DOES IT MAKE THEM WORSE, OR DOES IT NOT HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THEM?
13	v1394	POLITICS HELP HARMONY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1181	1580	Q90C. DOES POLITICS HELP THEM GET ALONG TOGETHER, MAKES THINGS WORSE, OR DOES POLITICS NOT HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH IT?
14	v1395	ANY CLASS GET TOO MUCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2238	523	DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES?
15	v1396	CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-1ST	discrete	numeric-2.0	1385	1376	Q91B.1 WHICH <CLASS GETS TOO MANY BENEFITS>? (FIRST MENTION)
16	v1397	CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-2ND	discrete	numeric-2.0	1407	1354	Q91B.2 WHICH <CLASS GETS TOO MANY BENEFITS>? (SECOND MENTION)
17	v1398	UNDESERVED BENEFITS-1	discrete	numeric-2.0	1323	1438	Q91C.1 WHAT BENEFITS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
18	v1399	UNDESERVED BENEFITS-2	discrete	numeric-2.0	1407	1354	Q91C.2 WHAT BENEFITS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
19	v1400	ANY CLASS PAY TOO MUCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2198	563	DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?
20	v1401	CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-1ST	discrete	numeric-2.0	1254	1507	Q92B.1 WHICH <CLASS PAYS MORE COSTS>? (FIRST MENTION)
21	v1402	CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-2ND	discrete	numeric-2.0	168	2593	Q92B.2 WHICH <CLASS PAYS MORE COSTS>? (SECOND ENTION)
22	v1403	WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-1ST?	discrete	numeric-2.0	2737	24	Q93.1 WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ONE SOCIAL CLASS GETS MORE OR ANOTHER CLASS PAYS MORE THAN THE OTHERS? (FIRST MENTION)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
23	v1404	WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-2ND?	discrete	numeric-2.0	2743	18	Q93.2 WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ONE SOCIAL CLASS GETS MORE OR ANOTHER CLASS PAYS MORE THAN THE OTHERS? (SECOND MENTION)
24	v1405	WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-3RD?	discrete	numeric-2.0	2743	18	Q93.3 WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ONE SOCIAL CLASS GETS MORE OR ANOTHER CLASS PAYS MORE THAN THE OTHERS? (THIRD MENTION)

Group Left-Right Wing

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1406	LEFT-RIGHT SELF PLACEMNT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2069	692	WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR OWN POLITICAL OPINIONS, WHERE WOULD YOU PUT YOURSELF ON THIS SCALE?
2	v1407	LIBERALS:LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1994	767	Q94B. NOW, WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY ON THIS LEFT/RIGHT SCALE
3	v1408	PC: LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1954	807	Q94C. HOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THEM ON THE LEFT/RIGHT SCALE?
4	v1409	NDP: LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1830	931	Q94D. HOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THEM ON THE LEFT/RIGHT SCALE?
5	v1410	SOCIAL CREDIT LEFT-RIGHT	discrete	numeric-1.0	381	2380	Q94E. AND HOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THEM ON THE LEFT/RIGHT SCALE?

Group Government Role in Issues

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1411	GOVERNMENT ROLE:WELFARE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2675	86	PROVIDE WELFARE SERVICES FOR ANYONE WHO NEEDS THEM.
2	v1412	WELFARE FOR ALL-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2266	495	Q95B. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES <PROVIDE WELFARE SERVICES?
3	v1413	GOVERNMENT ROLE: DEFENSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	18	Q95C. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) KEEP OUR ARMED FORCES STRONG ENOUGH TO PROTECT US FROM A POSSIBLE ATTACK FROM ANY SOURCE.
4	v1414	ARMY STRONG-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2035	726	Q95D. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (KEEP ARMED FORCES STRONG)?
5	v1415	GOVERNMENT ROLE: LIFE PROTECT?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2617	144	Q95E. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) GUARANTEE THE PROTECTION

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							OF THE LIVES AND PROPERTY OF ALL PEOPLE.
6	v1416	LIFE/PROPERTY PROTECT-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2267	494	Q95F. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (PROTECT LIVES AND PROPERTY)?
7	v1417	GOVERNMENT ROLE: GUARANTEE WORK?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2681	80	Q95G. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE WHO WANTS TO WORK HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO.
8	v1418	WORK FOR ALL-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2458	303	Q95H. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (KEEP PEOPLE EMPLOYED)?
9	v1419	GOVERNMENT ROLE: CIVIL RIGHTS?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2501	260	Q95I. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT THE PERSONAL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS OF PEOPLE NEVER ARE ENDANGERED BY THE POLICE, THE COURTS, OR THE CIVIL SERVICE.
10	v1420	CIVIL RIGHTS-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2198	563	Q95J. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (PROTECT PERSONAL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS)?
11	v1421	GOVERNMENT ROLE: INFLATION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2675	86	Q95K. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT INFLATION IS KEPT UNDER CONTROL?
12	v1422	FIGHT INFLATION-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2542	219	Q95L. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (CONTROL INFLATION)?
13	v1423	GOVERNMENT ROLE: TAXATION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2670	91	Q95M. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT EVERYONE PAYS THEIR FAIR SHARE OF TAXES WHETHER THEY ARE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS, RICH OR POOR.
14	v1424	FAIR TAXES-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2490	271	Q95N. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (INSURE THAT EVERYONE PAYS TAXES)?
15	v1425	GOVERNMENT ROLE: FOREIGN INVESTMENT?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2457	304	Q95O. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) LIMIT FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND CONTROL OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES BY FOREIGN OWNERSHIP.
16	v1426	FOREIGN INVESTMENT-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2080	681	Q95P. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (LIMIT FOREIGN INVESTMENT)?
17	v1427	GOVERNMENT ROLE: REGIONAL EQUALITY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2580	181	Q95Q. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD INSURE THAT PEOPLE IN EVERY REGION OF CANADA HAVE A DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING BY PASSING LAWS THAT BENEFIT ALL REGIONS EQUALLY.
18	v1428	REGIONAL EQUALITY-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2215	546	Q95R. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (INSURE AN EQUAL STANDARD OF LIVING)?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
19	v1429	GOVERNMENT ROLE: EQUAL POLITICAL POWE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2486	275	Q95S. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT NO PERSON OR GROUP HAS MORE OPPORTUNITY TO INFLUENCE POLITICAL DECISIONS THAN OTHERS?
20	v1430	EQUAL POLITICAL POWER-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1909	852	Q95T. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (MAINTAIN POLITICAL EQUALITY)?
21	v1431	GOVERNMENT ROLE: LANGUAGE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2590	171	Q95U. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE THEIR CHILDREN TAUGHT IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE, EVEN IN AREAS IN WHICH THEY ARE A MINORITY.
22	v1432	LANGUAGE RIGHTS- ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1748	1013	Q95V. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (INSURE FREEDOM OF LANGUAGE)?
23	v1433	SUPPORT FEDERAL 'REGIME'-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2549	212	v1433 question details
24	v1434	LAW EQUAL: RICH/ POOR-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2529	232	Q96B. IN SOME COUNTRIES THERE MAY BE ONE LAW FOR THE RICH AND ANOTHER FOR THE POOR BUT THAT IS NOT THE WAY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WORKS IN CANADA.
25	v1435	FEDERAL SYSTEM GOOD-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2283	478	Q96C. ALTHOUGH DIVIDING POWERS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MAY HAVE PRESENTED PROBLEMS AT TIMES, ON THE WHOLE THE BENEFITS OF OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM FAR OUTWEIGH THE COSTS.

Group Institutions

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1436	PARLIAMENT MOST IMPORTANT INSTITUTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2542	219	Q96D. PARLIAMENT MAY HAVE BECOME LESS IMPORTANT IN SOME COUNTRIES, BUT IN CANADA IT CONTINUES TO BE OUR MOST IMPORTANT POLITICAL INSTITUTION.
2	v1437	PARTIES WORK FOR ALL-ATTITUDE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2558	203	Q96E. OVER THE YEARS, POLITICAL PARTIES GENERALLY HAVE TRIED TO LOOK AFTER THE BEST INTERESTS OF ALL CANADIANS, NOT JUST THE INTERESTS OF THOSE WHO VOTE FOR THEM.
3	v1438	COURTS ACT QUICK AND FAIR	discrete	numeric-1.0	2369	392	Q96F. OVER THE YEARS, THE FEDERAL COURTS GENERALLY HAVE ACTED SPEEDILY AND TREATED PEOPLE FAIRLY.
4	v1439	FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE HELPS ALL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2415	346	Q96G. GENERALLY SPEAKING, THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE DOES ITS BEST TO HELP SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF CANADIANS.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
5	v1440	LEADERS DO GOOD WORK	discrete	numeric-1.0	2572	189	Q96H. OVER THE YEARS, LEADERS OF ALL PARTIES AND OUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT GENERALLY HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB OF GOVERNING THE COUNTRY.
6	v1441	KEEP CANADA TOGETHER-IMPORTANT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2585	176	Q96I. KEEPING CANADA TOGETHER AS A COUNTRY IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN ANY OTHER PROBLEM WE FACE.
7	v1442	INTEREST GROUPS BEHAVE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2320	441	Q96J. IN SOME OTHER COUNTRIES, INTEREST GROUPS LIKE BUSINESS, LABOUR OR FARMERS GROUPS HAVE HAD TOO MUCH SAY IN POLITICS BUT THIS HASN'T BEEN THE CASE IN CANADA.
8	v1443	CIVIL SERVICE TREATS ALL EQUAL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2355	406	Q96K. ALTHOUGH THERE MAY HAVE BEEN MINOR EXCEPTIONS, OVER THE YEARS THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE GENERALLY HAS TREATED ALL CANADIANS EQUALLY.

Group Perceptions Of

Subgroup(s)	Politics , Social Class , Left-Right Wing , Institutions , Self
--------------------	---

Group Members of Parliament Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1444	MP'S CONSIDER MY VIEWS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2554	207	-
2	v1445	MP'S WORK FOR RIDING	discrete	numeric-1.0	2572	189	Q97B. (HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT A FEDERAL MP WOULD) TRY HARD TO DO OR GET SOMETHING FOR HIS RIDING IF PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF ASKED HIM OR HER FOR SOMETHING OR NEEDED SOMETHING.
3	v1446	MP'S HELP PERSONAL PROBLEMS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2505	256	Q97C. (HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT A FEDERAL MP WOULD) TRY HARD TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT A SPECIFIC PERSONAL OR FAMILY PROBLEM THAT A PERSON LIKE YOURSELF APPROACH HIM OR HER WITH.
4	v1447	MP'S ARE APPROACHABLE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2519	242	Q97D. (HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT A FEDERAL MP WOULD) MAKE HIMSELF OR HERSELF AVAILABLE AT HOME IN HIS OR HER CONSTITUENCY OFFICE AND IN OTTAWA TO PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF IF THEY SHOULD NEED TO CALL ON HIM OR HER.
5	v1448	EVER CONTACTED MP?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2692	69	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, HAVE YOU ACTUALLY EVER TALKED WITH, WRITTEN TO, OR IN ANY OTHER WAY CONTACTED A

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ABOUT ANY PROBLEMS?
6	v1449	DID MP DO ANYTHING FOR YOU?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2671	90	Q98BC. HAS A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ACTUALLY EVER DONE ANYTHING FOR YOU OR FOR A MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY?
7	v1450	RATE MP: AVAILABLE TO RIDING	discrete	numeric-1.0	2347	414	BEING AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE RIDING.
8	v1451	RATE MP: EXPLAINING GOVERNMENT ACTIONS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2336	425	Q99B. (JOB MPS DO IN) EXPLAINING TO THE PEOPLE WHAT KINDS OF THINGS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS THINKING ABOUT DOING.
9	v1452	RATE MP: WORK IN PARLIAMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2078	683	Q99C. (JOB MPS DO IN) TAKING PART IN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, QUESTION PERIOD, AND COMMITTEE WORK AND SO FORTH.
10	v1453	RATE MP: HELP RIDING	discrete	numeric-1.0	1999	762	Q99D. (JOB MPS DO IN) HELPING PEOPLE IN THE RIDING WHO HAVE PROBLEM WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SOLVE THEM.
11	v1454	RATE MP: RIDING PROJECTS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2192	569	Q99E. <JOB MPS DO IN> GETTING PROJECTS AND OTHER THINGS THE RIDING NEEDS.

Group Self

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1455	'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2706	55	NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'
2	v1456	'WHO AM I'-1ST DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.12 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 1ST RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
3	v1457	'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2398	363	Q100.21 "WHO AM I?" (SECOND MENTION)
4	v1458	'WHO AM I'-2ND DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.22 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 2ND RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
5	v1459	'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	1908	853	Q100.31 "WHO AM I?" (THIRD MENTION)
6	v1460	'WHO AM I'-3RD DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.32 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 3RD RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
7	v1461	'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	613	2148	Q100.41 "WHO AM I?" (FOURTH MENTION)
8	v1462	'WHO AM I'-4TH DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.42 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 4TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
9	v1463	'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	175	2586	Q100.51 "WHO AM I?" (FIFTH MENTION)
10	v1464	'WHO AM I'-5TH DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.52 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 5TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
11	v1465	'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	48	2713	Q100.61 "WHO AM I?" (SIXTH MENTION)
12	v1466	'WHO AM I'-6TH DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.62 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 6TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
13	v1467	'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	13	2748	Q100.71 "WHO AM I?" (SEVENTH MENTION)
14	v1468	'WHO AM I'-7TH DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.72 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 7TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
15	v1469	'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE	discrete	numeric-3.0	2	2759	Q100.81 "WHO AM I?" (EIGHTH MENTION)
16	v1470	'WHO AM I'-8TH DETAILS	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q100.82 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 8TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".

Group Demographics

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1471	OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM	discrete	numeric-2.0	2743	18	Q101AB. WHAT IS (WAS) YOUR OCCUPATION? WHAT EXACTLY DO (DID) YOU DO?
2	v1472	OCCUPATION-TYPE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1954	807	-
3	v1473	COMPANY ACTIVITY	discrete	numeric-2.0	1773	988	Q101D.1 WHAT DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY DO?
4	v1474	MAIN FARM PRODUCT	discrete	numeric-2.0	121	2640	WHAT IS (WAS) THE MAIN PRODUCT?
5	v1475	MANUAL-SPECIAL TRAINING	discrete	numeric-1.0	836	1925	DID YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR YOUR JOB?
6	v1476	SIZE OF FARM	discrete	numeric-1.0	115	2646	-
7	v1477	SELF-EMPLOYED?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1935	826	ARE (WERE) YOU SELF-EMPLOYED OR DO (DID) YOU WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE?
8	v1478	ORGANIZATION SIZE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1844	917	HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES YOURSELF, DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY?
9	v1479	WORK UNDER R	discrete	numeric-1.0	1767	994	Q101I. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER YOU?
10	v1480	SUPERVISE WORK?	discrete	numeric-1.0	768	1993	Q101J. DO (DID) YOU SUPERVISE THEIR WORK?
11	v1481	SAY IN HIRING,FIRING	discrete	numeric-1.0	702	2059	Q101K. HOW MUCH SAY DO (DID) YOU HAVE IN THEIR HIRING, FIRING, PAY OR PROMOTIONS?
12	v1482	SAY IN OWN WORK	discrete	numeric-1.0	1744	1017	Q101L. HOW MUCH SAY DO (DID) YOU HAVE IN WHAT YOU YOURSELF DO (DID) IN YOUR WORK?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
13	v1483	NO. OF YEARS AT SAME JOB	discrete	numeric-2.0	1868	893	Q101M. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?
14	v1484	BLISHEN SCORE-R	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-
15	v1485	MARITAL STATUS	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	18	ARE YOU MARRIED, WIDOWED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR ARE YOU SINGLE?
16	v1486	STREAM CODE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2740	21	-
17	v1487	OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2705	56	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
18	v1488	OCCUPATION-TYPE-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2498	263	-
19	v1489	COMPANY ACTIVITY-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2113	648	WHAT DOES (DID) HIS/HER COMPANY DO?
20	v1490	MAIN FARM PRODUCT-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	285	2476	WHAT IS (WAS) THE MAIN PRODUCT?
21	v1491	MANUAL-SPECIAL TRAINING-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1163	1598	DID HE/SHE HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR HIS/HER JOB? (IF 'YES') WHAT SORT OF TRAINING?
22	v1492	SIZE OF FARM-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	244	2517	Q103E.2 HOW MANY ACRES IS (WAS) THE FARM? (FARMING ONLY)
23	v1493	SELF EMPLOYED?-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2487	274	Q103G. IS (WAS) HE/SHE SELF-EMPLOYED OR DOES (DID) HE/SHE WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE?
24	v1494	ORGANIZATION SIZE-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2169	592	Q103H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES HIM/HER, DOES (DID) HIS/HER COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY?
25	v1495	WORK UNDER SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1896	865	Q103I. HOW MANY ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER HIM/HER?
26	v1496	SUPERVISE WORK?-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	1032	1729	DOES (DID) HE/SHE SUPERVISE THEIR WORK?
27	v1497	SAY IN HIRING,FIRING-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	893	1868	HOW MUCH SAY DOES (DID) HE/SHE HAVE IN THEIR HIRING, FIRING, PAY OR PROMOTIONS?
28	v1498	SAY IN OWN WORK-SPOUSE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2001	760	Q103L. HOW MUCH SAY DOES (DID) HE/SHE HAVE IN WHAT HE/SHE DOES (DID) IN HIS/HER WORK?
29	v1499	NO. OF YEARS AT SAME WORK	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q103M. HOW MANY YEARS HAS(HAD) HE/SHE BEEN DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?
30	v1500	BLISHEN SCORE-SPOUSE	continuous	numeric-4.0	2761	0	-
31	v1501	NO. OF YEARS OF SCHOOL	discrete	numeric-2.0	2683	78	HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOL DID YOU ATTEND?
32	v1502	EDUCATION-HIGHEST GRADE	discrete	numeric-2.0	2651	110	WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL YOU REACHED?
33	v1503	COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL	discrete	numeric-1.0	2675	86	DID YOU COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
34	v1504	POST SECONDARY EDUCATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	DID YOU EVER ATTEND UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, OR SOME OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL?
35	v1505	DEGREE OBTAINED?	discrete	numeric-1.0	911	1850	Q104E. DID YOU OBTAIN A DEGREE OR DEGREES?
36	v1506	RELIGION	discrete	numeric-2.0	2724	37	WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION?
37	v1507	FREQUENCY CHURCH ATTEND	discrete	numeric-1.0	2556	205	ABOUT HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO TO CHURCH (SYNAGOGUE)? AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK, TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH, ONCE A MONTH, A FEW TIMES A YEAR OR LESS, OR NEVER?
38	v1508	SUBJECTIVE RELIGIOSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	2553	208	DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON, A FAIRLY RELIGIOUS PERSON, OR A NOT VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON?
39	v1509	LANGUAGE SPOKEN AS CHILD	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	18	WHAT LANGUAGE DID YOU FIRST LEARN AS A CHILD THAT YOU STILL SPEAK OR UNDERSTAND?
40	v1510	LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	18	WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USUALLY SPEAK AT HOME?
41	v1511	SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGES?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2744	17	Q106CD. DO YOU SPEAK ANY OTHER LANGUAGES THAN THOSE YOU HAVE JUST MENTIONED?
42	v1512	TRADE UNION MEMBER	discrete	numeric-1.0	2738	23	DO YOU BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?
43	v1513	RESPONDENT'S UNION	discrete	numeric-2.0	589	2172	Q107B. (IF YES) WHICH ONE?
44	v1514	FAMILY UNION MEMBERSHIP	discrete	numeric-1.0	2661	100	DOES ANY MEMBER OF YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY (BESIDES YOURSELF) BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?
45	v1515	FAMILY: WHICH UNION?	discrete	numeric-2.0	587	2174	-
46	v1516	FAMILY INCOME	discrete	numeric-1.0	2659	102	Q108. IN WHICH OF THESE GROUPS DOES THE APPROXIMATE INCOME OF THE FAMILY FALL-- THAT IS, THE INCOME OR EARNINGS OF ALL THE FAMILY MEMBERS LIVING HERE ADDED TOGETHER?
47	v1517	COUNTRY OF BIRTH	discrete	numeric-2.0	2718	43	IN WHAT COUNTRY WERE YOU BORN?
48	v1518	YEAR CAME TO CANADA	discrete	numeric-2.0	376	2385	IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU COME TO LIVE IN CANADA?
49	v1519	HOW LONG LIVED IN PROVINCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2712	49	HOW MUCH OF YOUR LIFE HAVE YOU LIVED IN (NAME PROVINCE)?
50	v1531	HOW LONG LIVED HERE	discrete	numeric-2.0	1400	1361	ABOUT HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?
51	v1532	ETHNICITY	discrete	numeric-2.0	2564	197	CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT ETHNIC OR CULTURAL GROUP YOUR ANCESTORS WHO FIRST CAME TO NORTH AMERICA BELONGED TO? (ON THE MALE SIDE)
52	v1533	GREW UP: CITY, FARM, ETC	discrete	numeric-2.0	2722	39	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, WHERE DID YOU LIVE - MOSTLY IN A CITY OR SUBURB, MOSTLY IN

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							A VILLAGE OR SMALL TOWN, OR MOSTLY ON A FARM OR RURAL AREA?
53	v1534	GREW UP NEAR LARGE CITY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2689	72	WAS THE (SUBURB, TOWN, VILLAGE, FARM) THAT YOU LIVED IN NEAR A LARGE CITY, OR NOT VERY NEAR?
54	v1535	AGE OF RESPONDENT	discrete	numeric-2.0	2721	40	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?
55	v1536	COMMUNITY SIZE	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	18	COMMUNITY SIZE
56	v1537	SEX OF RESPONDENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	RESPONDENT'S SEX

Group Interest

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2014	INTEREST IN ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1746	1015	WE HAVE FOUND THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES DON'T PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO ELECTIONS. HOW ABOUT YOURSELF? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE VERY INTERESTED IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, FAIRLY INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED IN IT?
2	v2015	INTEREST IN POLITICS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1744	1017	WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER YOU PAY MUCH ATTENTION TO POLITICS GENERALLY. I MEAN FROM DAY TO DAY, WHEN THERE ISN'T A BIG ELECTION CAMPAIGN GOING ON. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FOLLOW POLITICS VERY CLOSELY, FAIRLY CLOSELY, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?

Group Economic Satisfaction

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2016	MATERIAL SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	900	1861	v2016 question details
2	v2017	GOVERNMENT IMPACT MATERIAL SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	887	1874	Q3B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
3	v2018	MATERIAL SATISFACTION IN 4 YEARS	discrete	numeric-1.0	847	1914	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF THINGS AND LOOKING AHEAD OVER THE NEXT THREE OR FOUR YEARS, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WILL BE BETTER OFF, WORSE OFF, OR WILL THINGS STAY ABOUT THE SAME?
4	v2019	LIFE SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	899	1862	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?
5	v2020	GOVERNMENT IMPACT LIFE SATISFACTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	889	1872	Q5B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?

Group Issues

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2021	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-1ST MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1353	1408	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?
2	v2022	CONCERN ON ISSUE 1	discrete	numeric-1.0	1169	1592	Q6B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE? (STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)
3	v2023	ACTION ON ISSUE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	640	2121	Q6B.2 (R'S FEELINGS ABOUT MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (PRESCRIPTION/ACTION CALLED FOR ON ISSUE CODED HERE)
4	v2024	FOR/AGAINST ISSUE 1	discrete	numeric-1.0	1347	1414	Q6B.3 (R'S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)
5	v2025	PARTY CLOSE-ISSUE 1	discrete	numeric-1.0	1170	1591	Q6C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
6	v2026	IMPACT ON VOTE-ISSUE 1	discrete	numeric-1.0	1308	1453	Q6D. HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?
7	v2027	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-2ND MENTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1664	1097	Q7A. WERE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU THINK WERE IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?
8	v2028	CONCERN ON ISSUE 2	discrete	numeric-1.0	881	1880	Q7B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS (ISSUE MENTIONED IN Q7A.)? (STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)
9	v2029	ACTION ON ISSUE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	875	1886	Q7B.2 (R'S FEELINGS ABOUT MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (PRESCRIPTION/ACTION CALLED FOR ON ISSUE CODED HERE)
10	v2030	FOR/AGAINST ISSUE 2	discrete	numeric-1.0	881	1880	(R'S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)
11	v2031	PARTY CLOSE ISSUE 2	discrete	numeric-1.0	809	1952	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
12	v2032	IMPACT ON VOTE-ISSUE 2	discrete	numeric-1.0	857	1904	HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?
13	v2033	ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	839	1922	I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							ELECTION, THAT IS THE ISSUE OF ENERGY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED? (FIRST MENTION)
14	v2034	ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	876	1885	Q8A.2 WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED? (SECOND MENTION)
15	v2035	ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	878	1883	Q8A.3 WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED? (THIRD MENTION)
16	v2036	PARTY CLOSEST-ENERGY	discrete	numeric-1.0	655	2106	Q8C. (IF "ENERGY" MENTIONED IN Q6A OR Q7A, RECORD ANSWER FROM Q6C OR Q7C AUTOMATICALLY) WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
17	v2037	FOR/AGAINST-PC BUDGET	discrete	numeric-1.0	802	1959	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON THE BUDGET WHICH WAS INTRODUCED IN PARLIAMENT LAST DECEMBER BY THE FORMER CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE ...
18	v2038	PC BUDGET-FEELINGS 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	845	1916	Q9B. (IF "CONSERVATIVE BUDGET" MENTIONED IN Q6A OR Q7A, RECORD ANSWERS FROM Q6B OR Q7B TO Q9B AUTOMATICALLY) WHY DID YOU FEEL THIS WAY? ANY OTHER REASON?
19	v2039	PC BUDGET-FEELINGS 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	902	1859	FEELING ABOUT BUDGET (SECOND MENTION).
20	v2040	MAJORITY VS MINORITY GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	817	1944	SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT IT IS BETTER WHEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS A MAJORITY OF SEATS IN PARLIAMENT, WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT MINORITY GOVERNMENTS CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE. WHICH DO YOU FEEL IS BETTER?
21	v2041	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT -WOULD SWITCH?	discrete	numeric-1.0	798	1963	Q10B. IF YOU BELIEVED THAT ONE PARTY WAS MORE LIKELY TO BE ABLE TO FORM A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, BUT YOU DID NOT ORDINARILY VOTE FOR THAT PARTY, HOW LIKELY WOULD YOU BE TO VOTE FOR IT IN ORDER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, VERY LIKELY, SOMEWHAT LIKELY, OR NOT VERY LIKELY?
22	v2042	IMPORT OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	804	1957	Q10C. DID THIS QUESTION OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT HAVE A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR VERY LITTLE TO DO WITH THE WAY YOU VOTED IN THIS LAST ELECTION?

Group Party Identification - Federal							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2043	FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1452	1309	THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?
2	v2044	FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	296	2465	Q11B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q11A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?
3	v2045	FEEL CLOSE TO FEDERAL PARTY?	discrete	numeric-1.0	279	2482	Q12A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
4	v2046	FEDERAL PARTY LEANING	discrete	numeric-1.0	103	2658	Q12B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
5	v2047	ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	1704	1057	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?
6	v2048	PAST FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	637	2124	Q13B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v2049	WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	Q13C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?
8	v2050	WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	612	2149	Q13D.1 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v2051	WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	Q13D.2 REASON FOR CHANGING PARTISANSHIP. (SECOND MENTION)

Group Contact and Media							
#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2052	PERSONAL CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	840	1921	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS
2	v2053	WHO CONTACTED	continuous	numeric-2.0	2761	0	-
3	v2054	CONTACT BY WHICH PARTY	discrete	numeric-2.0	127	2634	Q14C. WHICH PARTY WAS HE/SHE (WERE THEY)?
4	v2055	PHONE CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	833	1928	Q15A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?
5	v2056	WHO CONTACTED BY PHONE	discrete	numeric-2.0	638	2123	Q15A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?
6	v2057	FORM OF CAMPAIGN CONTACT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	0	-
7	v2058	FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: NEWSPAPER	discrete	numeric-1.0	843	1918	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU READ QUITE A BIT, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL ABOUT THE PARTIES, CANDIDATES, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
8	v2059	FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: TELEVISION	discrete	numeric-1.0	843	1918	HOW ABOUT TELEVISION? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, DID YOU WATCH PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?
9	v2060	FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: RADIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	839	1922	HOW ABOUT RADIO? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, DID YOU HEAR PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HEARD QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?

Group Voting Habits

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2061	VOTED IN 80 FEDERAL ELECTION?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1747	1014	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?
2	v2062	VOTE IN 80 FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-1.0	1440	1321	Q19B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?
3	v2063	WHY NOT VOTE 80 FEDERAL ELECTION	discrete	numeric-2.0	216	2545	Q19C. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE IN THE FEBRUARY ELECTION?
4	v2064	PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED IN 80	discrete	numeric-1.0	175	2586	Q19D. IF YOU HAD VOTED, WHO WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
---	------	-------	------	--------	-------	---------	----------

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2065	MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1653	1108	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
2	v2066	2ND MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1577	1184	Q20B. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?
3	v2067	LEAST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1539	1222	Q20C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS LEAST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?
4	v2068	ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES?	discrete	numeric-1.0	899	1862	Q20D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
5	v2069	CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	376	2385	Q20E.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? ANYTHING ELSE?
6	v2070	CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	422	2339	Q20E.2 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
7	v2071	PARTY: ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH	discrete	numeric-1.0	674	2087	Q20F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
8	v2072	PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	278	2483	Q20G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)
9	v2073	PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	1743	1018	Q20G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)

Group Voting Habits II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2074	WHEN DECIDE 80 VOTE	discrete	numeric-2.0	752	2009	AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON FEBRUARY 18, 1980. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?
2	v2075	SURE ABOUT VOTE ALL ALONG	discrete	numeric-1.0	747	2014	Q21B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?
3	v2076	OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED	discrete	numeric-1.0	146	2615	Q21C. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
4	v2077	REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	734	2027	v2077 question details
5	v2078	REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	781	1980	Q22.2 (MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID) (SECOND MENTION)
6	v2079	REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	781	1980	Q22.3 (MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID) (THIRD MENTION)

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2080	TRUDEAU FEELING THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1719	1042	LET'S START WITH THE LIBERALS, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. TRUDEAU? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
2	v2081	LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1559	1202	Q23B. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
3	v2082	LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1702	1059	Q23C. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE LIBERAL PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
4	v2083	CLARK FEELING THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1694	1067	Q23D. NOW, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. CLARK? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
5	v2084	LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1559	1202	Q23E. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
6	v2085	PC PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1697	1064	Q23F. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
7	v2086	BROADBENT THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1669	1092	Q23G. HOW ABOUT THE N.D.P.? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. BROADBENT? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
8	v2087	LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1368	1393	Q23H. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL N.D.P. CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
9	v2088	NDO THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1635	1126	Q23I. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE N.D.P. PARTY TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
10	v2089	FAB ROY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	408	2353	Q23J. HOW ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. ROY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
11	v2090	LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	221	2540	Q23K. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YO UR LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
12	v2091	SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-3.0	413	2348	Q23L. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?

Group Community Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2092	PROVINCE GENERAL-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1726	1035	Q24A. NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS. FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)?
2	v2093	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1709	1052	-
3	v2094	CANADA GENERAL-THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1728	1033	Q24C. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?
4	v2095	CANADA GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1693	1068	Q24D. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?
5	v2096	USA THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	1630	1131	Q24E. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE UNITED STATES?

Group Leader, Candidate, Party Evaluations III

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2097	LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	842	1919	NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?
2	v2098	LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	416	2345	Q25A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU?
3	v2099	LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	170	2591	Q25A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)
4	v2100	DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	841	1920	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?
5	v2101	DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	199	2562	Q25B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)
6	v2102	DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	55	2706	Q25B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)
7	v2103	LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	842	1919	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?
8	v2104	LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	223	2538	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)
9	v2105	LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	71	2690	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)
10	v2106	DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	842	1919	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?
11	v2107	DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)
12	v2108	DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	0	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)
13	v2109	LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	840	1921	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?
14	v2110	LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	301	2460	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)
15	v2111	LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	111	2650	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)
16	v2112	DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	841	1920	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?
17	v2113	DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	60	2701	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)
18	v2114	DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	9	2752	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)
19	v2115	LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	207	2554	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?
20	v2116	LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	28	2733	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)
21	v2117	LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	5	2756	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)
22	v2118	DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	208	2553	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?
23	v2119	DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	29	2732	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)
24	v2120	DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	3	2758	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)
25	v2121	LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	899	1862	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? ANYTHING ELSE?
26	v2122	LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	902	1859	Q29A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
27	v2123	DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	900	1861	Q29B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
28	v2124	DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	902	1859	Q29B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY
29	v2125	LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	899	1862	Q30A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
30	v2126	LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	902	1859	Q30A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY
31	v2127	DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	900	1861	Q30B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
32	v2128	DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	902	1859	Q30B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY
33	v2129	LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	900	1861	Q31A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
34	v2130	LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	902	1859	Q31A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY
35	v2131	DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	901	1860	Q31B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)
36	v2132	DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	902	1859	Q31B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY
37	v2133	LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	238	2523	Q32A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
38	v2134	LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	238	2523	Q32A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY
39	v2135	DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1	discrete	numeric-3.0	238	2523	Q32B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
40	v2136	DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2	discrete	numeric-3.0	238	2523	Q32B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY

Group Party Identification - Provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
---	------	-------	------	--------	-------	---------	----------

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2137	PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-2.0	1602	1159	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC, SAY: LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?)
2	v2138	PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	1485	1276	HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q33A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?
3	v2139	PROVINCIAL INDEPENDENT-LEAN?	discrete	numeric-1.0	238	2523	Q34A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
4	v2140	PROVINCIAL PARTY FEEL CLOSE	discrete	numeric-2.0	72	2689	Q34B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
5	v2141	ANY PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1695	1066	THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?
6	v2142	PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-2.0	520	2241	Q35B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?
7	v2143	WHEN CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID	discrete	numeric-2.0	477	2284	Q35C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY, THAT IS, THE (NAME OF PARTY MENTIONED IN Q35B) TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?
8	v2144	WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-1	discrete	numeric-2.0	520	2241	Q35D.1 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? ANYTHING ELSE?
9	v2145	WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-2	discrete	numeric-2.0	30	2731	Q35D.2 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (SECOND MENTION)

Group Quebec Referendum

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2146	QUEBEC REFERENDUM VOTE	discrete	numeric-1.0	376	2385	WILL YOU VOTE YES OR NO?
2	v2147	QUEBEC REFERENDUM TURNOUT	discrete	numeric-1.0	424	2337	DO YOU PLAN TO VOTE IN THE REFERENDUM?

Group Demographic

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v2148	UNEMPLOYED SINCE MAY 79?	discrete	numeric-1.0	1747	1014	AND NOW A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU. HAVE YOU BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
2	v2149	DATE UNEMPLOYMENT BEGIN	discrete	numeric-2.0	182	2579	Q37B. IN WHAT MONTH DID YOU BECOME UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF?
3	v2150	DATE BACK TO WORK	discrete	numeric-2.0	183	2578	Q37C. IN WHAT MONTH DID YOU GO BACK TO WORK?
4	v2151	MARITAL STATUS	discrete	numeric-1.0	1748	1013	ARE YOU MARRIED, WIDOWED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR ARE YOU SINGLE?
5	v2152	SPOUSE UNEMPLOYMENT SINCE MAY 79	discrete	numeric-1.0	1245	1516	HAS YOUR (HUSBAND/WIFE/ SPOUSE) BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?
6	v2153	DATE SPOUSE UNEMPLOYMENT BEGAN	discrete	numeric-2.0	90	2671	Q39B. IN WHAT MONTH DID HE/ SHE BECOME UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF?
7	v2154	DATE SPOUSE BACK TO WORK	discrete	numeric-2.0	90	2671	Q39C. IN WHAT MONTH DID HE/ SHE GO BACK TO WORK?
8	v2155	AGE IN YEARS	discrete	numeric-2.0	1734	1027	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?
9	v2156	SEX OF RESPONDENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	1748	1013	RESPONDENT'S SEX:

Group Quebec Options

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3008	QUEBEC OPTIONS: NO CHANGE	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	NO CHANGE
2	v3009	QUEBEC OPTION: RENEWED FEDERALISM	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q1B. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) RENEWED FEDERALISM.
3	v3010	QUEBEC OPTION: SPECIAL STATUS	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q1C. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) SPECIAL STATUS IN CONFEDERATION.
4	v3011	QUEBEC OPTION: SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q1D. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION.
5	v3012	QUEBEC OPTION: INDEPENDENCE	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q1E. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) INDEPENDENCE.

Group Referendum Vote and Involvement

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3013	REFERENDUM TURNOUT	discrete	numeric-1.0	315	2446	DO YOU PLAN TO/DID YOU VOTE IN THE REFERENDUM?
2	v3014	REFERENDUM VOTE: YES/NO	discrete	numeric-1.0	291	2470	Q2BC. DID YOU/WILL YOU VOTE YES OR NO?
3	v3015	WHEN DID R DECIDE REFERENDUM VOTE	discrete	numeric-2.0	262	2499	CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR APPROXIMATE DATE WITHIN WEEKS BEFORE THE REFERENDUM, ONE WEEK, TWO WEEKS, ETC.)
4	v3016	WAS R SURE ABOUT REFERENDUM VOTE	discrete	numeric-1.0	262	2499	Q3B. HAVE YOU BEEN/WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG HOW

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGH YOU MIGHT VOTE DIFFERENTLY?
5	v3017	REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	282	2479	v3017 question details
6	v3018	REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	103	2658	REASON WHY R VOTED/WILL VOTE (YES/NO) IN REFERENDUM? (SECOND MENTION)
7	v3019	REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	24	2737	REASON WHY R VOTED/WILL VOTE (YES/NO) IN REFERENDUM? (THIRD MENTION)
8	v3020	DID R ATTEND PUBLIC RALLY	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	ATTEND A RALLY OR PUBLIC MEETING?
9	v3021	DID R WEAR CAMPAIGN BUTTON	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q5B. (DID YOU) WEAR A BUTTON OR PUT UP A SIGN?
10	v3022	DID R SIGN CAMPAIGN PETITION	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q5C. (DID YOU) SIGN A PETITION?
11	v3023	DID R CONVINCE OTHERS ABOUT VOTE	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q5D. (DID YOU) TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?
12	v3024	DID R WORK IN REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q5E. (DID YOU) SPEND TIME WORKING IN THE CAMPAIGN?
13	v3025	DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	Q5F. (DID YOU) CONTRIBUTE MONEY?

Group Political Party Identification and Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3026	PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION	discrete	numeric-1.0	292	2469	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A PARTI QUEBECOIS, LIBERAL, UNION NATIONALE, CREDITISTE, OR WHAT?
2	v3027	PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	283	2478	Q6B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q6A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?
3	v3028	IS R PARTY LEANER	discrete	numeric-1.0	32	2729	Q7A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
4	v3029	PROVINCIAL PARTY LEANING	discrete	numeric-1.0	16	2745	Q7B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
5	v3030	RYAN FEELING THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	321	2440	FIRST THE LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. RYAN? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
6	v3031	PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	321	2440	Q8B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							HERE IN QUEBEC TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
7	v3032	LEVESQUE FEELING THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	320	2441	Q8C. HOW ABOUT THE LEADER OF THE PARTI QUEBECOIS, MR. LEVESQUE? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
8	v3033	PARTY QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	318	2443	Q8D. HOW ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
9	v3034	QUEBEC PROVINCE:FEELINGS	discrete	numeric-2.0	325	2436	FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF QUEBEC?
10	v3035	QUEBEC GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	314	2447	Q9B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE OF QUEBEC?

Group Canada's Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3036	CANADA: FEELING THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	323	2438	Q9C. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?
2	v3037	CANADIAN GOVERNMENT: THERMOMETER	discrete	numeric-2.0	320	2441	Q9D. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?

Group Demographics

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v3039	AGE OF RESPONDENT	discrete	numeric-2.0	324	2437	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?
2	v3040	SEX OF RESPONDENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	325	2436	SEX:

Group Party Control

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v80	SAME PARTY RUN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT	discrete	numeric-1.0	2688	73	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT THE SAME POLITICAL PARTY SHOULD NOT CONTROL BOTH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA AND THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE?) AT THE SAME TIME, BUT OTHERS SAY THAT IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?
2	v81	SAME PARTY RUN-INTENSITY	discrete	numeric-1.0	311	2450	HOW STRONGLY DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT?

Group Mobility Data - Inter-provincial

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	v1520	EVER LIVED IN OTHR PROVINCE?	discrete	numeric-1.0	2721	40	HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
2	v1521	LIVED IN NEWFOUNDLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	747	2014	Q109E.1 (DID R LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND?)
3	v1522	LIVED IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	discrete	numeric-1.0	747	2014	Q109E.2 (DID R LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND?)
4	v1523	LIVED IN NOVA SCOTIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	748	2013	Q109E.3 (DID R LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA?)
5	v1524	LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK	discrete	numeric-1.0	747	2014	Q109E.4 (DID R LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK)
6	v1525	LIVED IN QUEBEC	discrete	numeric-1.0	749	2012	Q109E.5 (DID R LIVE IN QUEBEC?)
7	v1526	LIVED IN ONTARIO	discrete	numeric-1.0	750	2011	Q109E.6 (DID R LIVE IN ONTARIO?)
8	v1527	LIVED IN MANITOBA	discrete	numeric-1.0	748	2013	Q109E.7 (DID R LIVE IN MANITOBA?)
9	v1528	LIVED IN SASKATCHEWAN	discrete	numeric-1.0	748	2013	Q109E.8 (DID R LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN?)
10	v1529	LIVED IN ALBERTA	discrete	numeric-1.0	748	2013	Q109E.9 (DID R LIVE IN ALBERTA?)
11	v1530	LIVED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA	discrete	numeric-1.0	748	2013	Q109E.10 (DID R LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA?)

Variables Description

Dataset contains 1259 variable(s)

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

CASEID: RESPONDENT ID NUMBER

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9248] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2277.19 /-] [StdDev=2900.281 /-]
Universe	All respondents

v2: HALF SAMPLE NUMBER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	53.0%
1	Half Sample One	673	24.4%
2	Half Sample Two	625	22.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3: 1974 NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHT

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1250] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	53.0%
0.125		58	2.1%
0.5		263	9.5%
1		651	23.6%
1.25		326	11.8%
125	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
500	NEWFOUNDLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
1000	QUEBEC, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA, BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
1250	ONTARIO	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v4: 1974 MARITIME SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHT

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-100] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	N.A.	2440	88.4%
0.25		58	2.1%
1		263	9.5%
25	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
100	NEWFOUNDLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v5: CONSTITUENCY

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-999] [Missing=*]
--------------------	--

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v5: CONSTITUENCY

Statistics [NW/ W] [Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Universe All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BONAVISTA-TRINITY-CONCEPTION (085, 128, 173, 182)	20	0.7%
2	GANDER TWILLINGATE (025, 128, 173, 192)	13	0.5%
3	HUMBER-ST. GEORGE'S-ST. BARBE (006, 060, 141, 173)	17	0.6%
4	ST. JOHN'S EAST (007, 012, 134, 163, 179)	17	0.6%
101	CARDIGAN (013, 036, 044, 051)	11	0.4%
102	EGMONT (003, 023, 044, 068)	12	0.4%
103	HILLSBOROUGH (011, 018, 038, 042, 056, 081)	24	0.9%
104	MALPEQUE (005, 037, 054)	11	0.4%
201	ANNAPOLIS VALLEY (023, 046, 056, 103, 165)	20	0.7%
202	CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS-CANSO (011, 036, 097, 107, 176)	21	0.8%
203	CENTRAL NOVA (051, 081, 088, 151, 173)	17	0.6%
204	CUMBERLAND-COLCHESTER NORTH (011, 020, 083, 117, 143)	21	0.8%
205	DARTMOUTH-HALIFAX EAST (015, 058, 131, 135, 240)	17	0.6%
206	HALIFAX-EAST HANTS (021, 039, 055, 080, 121)	22	0.8%
301	FUNDY-ROYAL (021, 022, 053, 057, 073, 177)	20	0.7%
302	MADAWASKA-VICTORIA (021, 028, 065, 096, 099)	19	0.7%
303	RESTIGOUCHE (019, 045, 065, 112, 118, 134)	22	0.8%
304	SAINT JOHN-LANCASTER (065, 066, 073, 087, 109, 127)	17	0.6%
401	ARGENTEUIL-DEUX-MONTAGNES (030, 123, 152, 162)	12	0.4%
402	CHICOUTIMI (037, 084, 085, 149)	12	0.4%
403	FRONTENAC (051, 061, 148, 165)	16	0.6%
404	GASPE (032, 085, 124, 129)	12	0.4%
405	HULL (043, 051, 180, 281)	10	0.4%
406	LAPORTE (058, 091, 095, 101)	11	0.4%
407	LAPRAIRIE (033, 149, 222, 236, 288)	13	0.5%
408	LEVIS (074, 131, 167, 182)	8	0.3%
409	LONGUEUIL (024, 035, 047, 062, 147)	6	0.2%
410	LOTBINIERE (087, 110, 161, 221)	16	0.6%
411	AHUNTSIC (125, 177, 203, 219)	12	0.4%
412	MONTREAL-BOURASSA (077, 089, 147, 286)	6	0.2%
413	DOLLARD (130, 193, 200, 274)	9	0.3%
414	GAMELIN (066, 095, 137, 150)	9	0.3%
415	LACHINE (003, 046, 064, 202)	8	0.3%
416	LAFONTAINE (073, 097, 098, 119)	8	0.3%
417	MAISONNEUVE-ROSEMONT (001, 143, 160, 207)	10	0.4%
418	MOUNT ROYAL (004, 014, 114, 178)	5	0.2%
419	PORTNEUF (033, 084, 096, 171, 197)	17	0.6%
420	QUEBEC EAST (095, 096, 164, 189)	10	0.4%
421	RICHMOND (049, 094, 144, 152)	19	0.7%
422	ROBERVAL (007, 050, 089, 111)	8	0.3%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v5: CONSTITUENCY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
423	SAINT-HYACINTHE (073, 108, 117, 118)	15	0.5%
424	SAINT-MAURICE (094, 098, 104, 165)	16	0.6%
425	SHERBROOKE (123, 157, 202, 237)	8	0.3%
426	TERREBONNE (110, 125, 218, 267, 335)	10	0.4%
427	TROIS-RIVIERES-METROPOLITAIN (035, 048, 138, 190)	17	0.6%
428	VAUDREUIL (065, 081, 090, 157, 185)	11	0.4%
501	ALGOMA (037, 055, 102, 133)	15	0.5%
502	BRANT (036, 109, 239, 240)	13	0.5%
503	FORT WILLIAM (044, 072, 083, 126)	11	0.4%
504	HALTON (026, 057, 089, 138, 239)	16	0.6%
505	HAMILTON EAST (004, 008, 053, 085)	9	0.3%
506	HASTINGS (068, 080, 125, 161)	16	0.6%
507	HURON-MIDDLESEX (081, 093, 099, 107)	15	0.5%
508	KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS (013, 085, 165, 250)	13	0.5%
509	KITCHENER (100, 143, 176, 217)	8	0.3%
510	LAMBTON-KENT (002, 043, 097, 169)	13	0.5%
511	MIDDLESEX (008, 042, 178, 267)	8	0.3%
512	NORTHUMBERLAND-DURHAM (005, 024, 061, 122)	13	0.5%
513	ONTARIO (044, 127, 178, 193)	18	0.7%
514	OTTAWA WEST (025, 136, 141, 190, 210)	8	0.3%
515	PEEL-DUFFERIN-SIMCOE (045, 074, 140, 209, 222)	15	0.5%
516	MISSISSAUGA (079, 215, 242, 246, 253)	13	0.5%
517	SARNIA-LAMBTON (045, 090, 133, 150)	8	0.3%
518	SIMCOE-NORTH (010, 083, 119, 161)	10	0.4%
519	BROADVIEW (007, 012, 085, 087)	8	0.3%
520	DON VALLEY (121, 166, 281, 312)	8	0.3%
521	TORONTO LAKESHORE (071, 124, 153, 187)	13	0.5%
522	ROSEDALE (032, 105, 182, 183)	5	0.2%
523	ST. PAULS (020, 142, 150, 168)	13	0.5%
524	YORK CENTRE (140, 160, 167, 283, 359)	5	0.2%
525	YORK-SCARBOROUGH (047, 207, 255, 286, 506)	11	0.4%
526	YORK-WEST (007, 149, 156, 167)	10	0.4%
527	WELLINGTON-GREY-DUFFERIN-WATERLOO (117, 137, 142, 147)	14	0.5%
528	WINDSOR-WALKERVILLE (078, 117, 126, 145)	17	0.6%
601	BRANDON-SOURIS (015, 026, 065, 121, 165)	17	0.6%
602	MARQUETTE (051, 094, 124, 160)	21	0.8%
603	WINNIPEG NORTH (056, 078, 105, 192, 204)	19	0.7%
604	WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE (027, 074, 136, 176, 197)	12	0.4%
701	BATTLEFORD-KINDERSLEY (002, 042, 067, 084)	19	0.7%
702	MOOSE JAW (042, 096, 129, 175)	16	0.6%
703	REGINA EAST (004, 040, 093, 116, 200)	18	0.7%
704	SASKATOON-HUMBOLDT (001, 088, 207, 274)	18	0.7%
801	BATTLE RIVER (013, 038, 120, 147, 165)	13	0.5%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v5: CONSTITUENCY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
802	CALGARY SOUTH (027, 029, 177, 203, 281)	17	0.6%
803	EDMONTON CENTRE (036, 120, 128, 209)	8	0.3%
804	MEDICINE HAT (082, 110, 158, 187, 213)	16	0.6%
805	PALLISER (004, 047, 101, 119, 182, 187)	13	0.5%
806	WETASKIWIN (030, 041, 055, 076, 186)	21	0.8%
901	BURNABY-RICHMOND-DELTA (004, 024, 065, 090, 128, 208)	23	0.8%
902	BURNABY-SEYMOUR (002, 030, 097, 225, 229)	15	0.5%
903	FRASER VALLEY WEST (014, 065, 090, 126, 153, 220)	19	0.7%
904	OKANAGAN-KOOTENAY (020, 055, 112, 170, 192)	13	0.5%
905	SURREY-WHITE ROCK (026, 064, 114, 130, 189)	12	0.4%
906	VANCOUVER KINGSWAY (030, 039, 063, 126, 155)	7	0.3%
907	VANCOUVER QUADRA (004, 018, 047, 126, 198)	13	0.5%
908	VICTORIA (119, 141, 174, 188, 199)	7	0.3%
999		1463	53.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v6: POLL

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POLL NUMBER 1	2	0.1%
2	POLL NUMBER 2	15	0.5%
3	POLL NUMBER 3	3	0.1%
4	POLL NUMBER 4	15	0.5%
5	POLL NUMBER 5	8	0.3%
6	POLL NUMBER 6	5	0.2%
7	POLL NUMBER 7	7	0.3%
8	POLL NUMBER 8	6	0.2%
10	POLL NUMBER 10	3	0.1%
11	POLL NUMBER 11	11	0.4%
12	POLL NUMBER 12	3	0.1%
13	POLL NUMBER 13	6	0.2%
14	POLL NUMBER 14	5	0.2%
15	POLL NUMBER 15	8	0.3%
18	POLL NUMBER 18	9	0.3%
19	POLL NUMBER 19	5	0.2%
20	POLL NUMBER 20	7	0.3%
21	POLL NUMBER 21	15	0.5%
22	POLL NUMBER 22	5	0.2%
23	POLL NUMBER 23	7	0.3%
24	POLL NUMBER 24	6	0.2%
25	POLL NUMBER 25	4	0.1%
26	POLL NUMBER 26	11	0.4%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v6: POLL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	POLL NUMBER 27	8	0.3%
28	POLL NUMBER 28	3	0.1%
29	POLL NUMBER 29	3	0.1%
30	POLL NUMBER 30	13	0.5%
32	POLL NUMBER 32	5	0.2%
33	POLL NUMBER 33	5	0.2%
35	POLL NUMBER 35	7	0.3%
36	POLL NUMBER 36	13	0.5%
37	POLL NUMBER 37	10	0.4%
38	POLL NUMBER 38	7	0.3%
39	POLL NUMBER 39	4	0.1%
40	POLL NUMBER 40	5	0.2%
41	POLL NUMBER 41	2	0.1%
42	POLL NUMBER 42	17	0.6%
43	POLL NUMBER 43	7	0.3%
44	POLL NUMBER 44	18	0.7%
45	POLL NUMBER 45	7	0.3%
46	POLL NUMBER 46	3	0.1%
47	POLL NUMBER 47	6	0.2%
48	POLL NUMBER 48	5	0.2%
49	POLL NUMBER 49	5	0.2%
50	POLL NUMBER 50	2	0.1%
51	POLL NUMBER 51	18	0.7%
53	POLL NUMBER 53	7	0.3%
54	POLL NUMBER 54	2	0.1%
55	POLL NUMBER 55	19	0.7%
56	POLL NUMBER 56	13	0.5%
57	POLL NUMBER 57	6	0.2%
58	POLL NUMBER 58	5	0.2%
60	POLL NUMBER 60	6	0.2%
61	POLL NUMBER 61	6	0.2%
62	POLL NUMBER 62	0	
63	POLL NUMBER 63	4	0.1%
64	POLL NUMBER 64	4	0.1%
65	POLL NUMBER 65	19	0.7%
66	POLL NUMBER 66	7	0.3%
67	POLL NUMBER 67	2	0.1%
68	POLL NUMBER 68	4	0.1%
71	POLL NUMBER 71	3	0.1%
72	POLL NUMBER 72	3	0.1%
73	POLL NUMBER 73	8	0.3%
74	POLL NUMBER 74	9	0.3%
76	POLL NUMBER 76	5	0.2%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v6: POLL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	POLL NUMBER 77	0	
78	POLL NUMBER 78	9	0.3%
79	POLL NUMBER 79	1	0.0%
80	POLL NUMBER 80	9	0.3%
81	POLL NUMBER 81	9	0.3%
82	POLL NUMBER 82	5	0.2%
83	POLL NUMBER 83	13	0.5%
84	POLL NUMBER 84	14	0.5%
85	POLL NUMBER 85	14	0.5%
87	POLL NUMBER 87	11	0.4%
88	POLL NUMBER 88	8	0.3%
89	POLL NUMBER 89	5	0.2%
90	POLL NUMBER 90	17	0.6%
91	POLL NUMBER 91	3	0.1%
93	POLL NUMBER 93	8	0.3%
94	POLL NUMBER 94	15	0.5%
95	POLL NUMBER 95	5	0.2%
96	POLL NUMBER 96	10	0.4%
97	POLL NUMBER 97	15	0.5%
98	POLL NUMBER 98	6	0.2%
99	POLL NUMBER 99	8	0.3%
100	POLL NUMBER 100	4	0.1%
101	POLL NUMBER 101	7	0.3%
102	POLL NUMBER 102	3	0.1%
103	POLL NUMBER 103	3	0.1%
104	POLL NUMBER 104	5	0.2%
105	POLL NUMBER 105	2	0.1%
107	POLL NUMBER 107	9	0.3%
108	POLL NUMBER 108	3	0.1%
109	POLL NUMBER 109	6	0.2%
110	POLL NUMBER 110	10	0.4%
111	POLL NUMBER 111	5	0.2%
112	POLL NUMBER 112	8	0.3%
114	POLL NUMBER 114	3	0.1%
116	POLL NUMBER 116	3	0.1%
117	POLL NUMBER 117	19	0.7%
118	POLL NUMBER 118	11	0.4%
119	POLL NUMBER 119	7	0.3%
120	POLL NUMBER 120	4	0.1%
121	POLL NUMBER 121	6	0.2%
122	POLL NUMBER 122	4	0.1%
123	POLL NUMBER 123	6	0.2%
124	POLL NUMBER 124	11	0.4%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v6: POLL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
125	POLL NUMBER 125	6	0.2%
126	POLL NUMBER 126	16	0.6%
127	POLL NUMBER 127	7	0.3%
128	POLL NUMBER 128	12	0.4%
129	POLL NUMBER 129	8	0.3%
130	POLL NUMBER 130	4	0.1%
131	POLL NUMBER 131	8	0.3%
133	POLL NUMBER 133	7	0.3%
134	POLL NUMBER 134	7	0.3%
135	POLL NUMBER 135	2	0.1%
136	POLL NUMBER 136	1	0.0%
137	POLL NUMBER 137	5	0.2%
138	POLL NUMBER 138	6	0.2%
140	POLL NUMBER 140	7	0.3%
141	POLL NUMBER 141	4	0.1%
142	POLL NUMBER 142	8	0.3%
143	POLL NUMBER 143	8	0.3%
144	POLL NUMBER 144	5	0.2%
145	POLL NUMBER 145	3	0.1%
147	POLL NUMBER 147	8	0.3%
148	POLL NUMBER 148	6	0.2%
149	POLL NUMBER 149	7	0.3%
150	POLL NUMBER 150	6	0.2%
151	POLL NUMBER 151	2	0.1%
152	POLL NUMBER 152	7	0.3%
153	POLL NUMBER 153	6	0.2%
155	POLL NUMBER 155	0	
156	POLL NUMBER 156	5	0.2%
157	POLL NUMBER 157	4	0.1%
158	POLL NUMBER 158	2	0.1%
160	POLL NUMBER 160	10	0.4%
161	POLL NUMBER 161	12	0.4%
162	POLL NUMBER 162	4	0.1%
163	POLL NUMBER 163	5	0.2%
164	POLL NUMBER 164	5	0.2%
165	POLL NUMBER 165	20	0.7%
166	POLL NUMBER 166	4	0.1%
167	POLL NUMBER 167	3	0.1%
168	POLL NUMBER 168	2	0.1%
169	POLL NUMBER 169	1	0.0%
170	POLL NUMBER 170	1	0.0%
171	POLL NUMBER 171	2	0.1%
173	POLL NUMBER 173	18	0.7%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v6: POLL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
174	POLL NUMBER 174	3	0.1%
175	POLL NUMBER 175	3	0.1%
176	POLL NUMBER 176	11	0.4%
177	POLL NUMBER 177	7	0.3%
178	POLL NUMBER 178	9	0.3%
179	POLL NUMBER 179	3	0.1%
180	POLL NUMBER 180	3	0.1%
182	POLL NUMBER 182	8	0.3%
183	POLL NUMBER 183	3	0.1%
185	POLL NUMBER 185	3	0.1%
186	POLL NUMBER 186	4	0.1%
187	POLL NUMBER 187	9	0.3%
188	POLL NUMBER 188	0	
189	POLL NUMBER 189	5	0.2%
190	POLL NUMBER 190	6	0.2%
192	POLL NUMBER 192	9	0.3%
193	POLL NUMBER 193	8	0.3%
197	POLL NUMBER 197	6	0.2%
198	POLL NUMBER 198	4	0.1%
199	POLL NUMBER 199	2	0.1%
200	POLL NUMBER 200	4	0.1%
202	POLL NUMBER 202	4	0.1%
203	POLL NUMBER 203	7	0.3%
204	POLL NUMBER 204	6	0.2%
207	POLL NUMBER 207	11	0.4%
208	POLL NUMBER 208	2	0.1%
209	POLL NUMBER 209	2	0.1%
210	POLL NUMBER 210	3	0.1%
213	POLL NUMBER 213	1	0.0%
215	POLL NUMBER 215	1	0.0%
217	POLL NUMBER 217	1	0.0%
218	POLL NUMBER 218	5	0.2%
219	POLL NUMBER 219	4	0.1%
220	POLL NUMBER 220	3	0.1%
221	POLL NUMBER 221	4	0.1%
222	POLL NUMBER 222	6	0.2%
225	POLL NUMBER 225	0	
229	POLL NUMBER 229	0	
236	POLL NUMBER 236	4	0.1%
237	POLL NUMBER 237	1	0.0%
239	POLL NUMBER 239	7	0.3%
240	POLL NUMBER 240	8	0.3%
242	POLL NUMBER 242	3	0.1%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v6: POLL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
246	POLL NUMBER 246	5	0.2%
250	POLL NUMBER 250	6	0.2%
253	POLL NUMBER 253	3	0.1%
255	POLL NUMBER 255	4	0.1%
267	POLL NUMBER 267	2	0.1%
274	POLL NUMBER 274	6	0.2%
281	POLL NUMBER 281	9	0.3%
283	POLL NUMBER 283	0	
286	POLL NUMBER 286	3	0.1%
288	POLL NUMBER 288	4	0.1%
312	POLL NUMBER 312	0	
335	POLL NUMBER 335	2	0.1%
359	POLL NUMBER 359	0	
506	POLL NUMBER 506	2	0.1%
999		1463	53.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v7: WEEK OF INTERVIEW

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEEK OF AUGUST 4, 1974	2	0.1%
2	WEEK OF AUGUST 11, 1974	31	1.1%
3	WEEK OF AUGUST 18, 1974	82	3.0%
4	WEEK OF AUGUST 25, 1974	161	5.8%
5	WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1974	199	7.2%
6	WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1974	205	7.4%
7	WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 15, 1974	190	6.9%
8	WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1974	177	6.4%
9	WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1974	111	4.0%
10	WEEK OF OCTOBER 6, 1974	48	1.7%
11	WEEK OF OCTOBER 13, 1974	17	0.6%
12	WEEK OF OCTOBER 20, 1974	11	0.4%
13	WEEK OF OCTOBER 27, 1974	27	1.0%
14	WEEK OF NOVEMBER 3, 1974	20	0.7%
15	WEEK OF NOVEMBER 10, 1974	4	0.1%
16	WEEK OF NOVEMBER 17, 1974	6	0.2%
17	WEEK OF NOVEMBER 24, 1974	1	0.0%
18	WEEK OF DECEMBER 1, 1974	1	0.0%
19	WEEK OF DECEMBER 8, TO DECEMBER 21, 1974	5	0.2%
99		1463	53.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v8: LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ENGLISH	977	35.4%
2	FRENCH	313	11.3%
5	OTHER, WITH HELP OF INTERPRETER	8	0.3%
9		1463	53.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1: PROVINCE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	Newfoundland	67	2.4%
1	Prince Edward Island	58	2.1%
2	Nova Scotia	118	4.3%
3	New Brunswick	78	2.8%
4	Quebec	314	11.4%
5	Ontario	326	11.8%
6	Manitoba	69	2.5%
7	Saskatchewan	71	2.6%
8	Alberta	88	3.2%
9	British Columbia	109	3.9%
99	No 1971 Interview	1463	53.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v10: INTEREST IN ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1296 /-] [Invalid=1465 /-]
Universe	All respondents

Literal question	WE HAVE FOUND THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES DON'T PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO ELECTIONS. HOW ABOUT YOURSELF? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE VERY INTERESTED IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, FAIRLY INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED IN IT?
Notes	Q1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	402	31.0%
2	FAIRLY INTERESTED	507	39.1%
3	SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	282	21.8%
4	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	105	8.1%
8	D.K.	1465	
9	N.A.	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v11: INTEREST IN POLITICS








Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1297 /-] [Invalid=1464 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER YOU PAY MUCH ATTENTION TO POLITICS GENERALLY. I MEAN FROM DAY TO DAY, WHEN THERE ISN'T A BIG ELECTION CAMPAIGN GOING ON. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FOLLOW POLITICS VERY CLOSELY, FAIRLY CLOSELY, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?
Notes	Q2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY CLOSELY	197	 15.2%
2	FAIRLY CLOSELY	603	 46.5%
3	NOT MUCH AT ALL	497	 38.3%
8	D.K.	1464	
9	N.A.	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v12: PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FEDERAL, PROVINCIAL, LOCAL POLITICS



Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=792 /-] [Invalid=1969 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	GENERALLY, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FEDERAL POLITICS, PROVINCIAL POLITICS, OR LOCAL POLITICS?
Notes	Q3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FEDERAL	240	 30.3%
2	PROVINCIAL	152	 19.2%
3	LOCAL	62	 7.8%
4	ALL ABOUT EQUALLY	218	 27.5%
5	FEDERAL & PROVINCIAL EQ.	96	 12.1%
6	FEDERAL & LOCAL EQ.	13	 1.6%
7	PROVINCIAL & LOCAL EQ.	11	 1.4%
8	D.K.	1471	
9	N.A.	498	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.






v13: LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT MOST IMPORTANT

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1229 /-] [Invalid=1532 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	AS FAR AS YOU ARE CONCERNED PERSONALLY, WHICH GOVERNMENT IS MORE IMPORTANT IN AFFECTING HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY GET ON, THE ONE IN OTTAWA, THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) OR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (CITY, TOWNSHIP, ETC.)?
Notes	Q4 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FEDERAL	412	 33.5%
2	PROVINCIAL	405	 33.0%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final





v13: LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT MOST IMPORTANT

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	LOCAL	115	 9.4%
4	ALL ABOUT EQUALLY	177	 14.4%
5	FEDERAL & PROVINCIAL EQ.	93	 7.6%
6	FEDERAL & LOCAL EQ.	9	 0.7%
7	PROVINCIAL & LOCAL EQ.	18	 1.5%
8	D.K.	1532	
9	N.A.	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v14: MATERIAL SATISFACTION




Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=669 /-] [Invalid=2092 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Literal question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ARE DOING THESE DAYS. FIRST, LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE -- THE THINGS YOU CAN BUY AND DO -- ALL THE THINGS THAT MAKE UP YOUR MATERIAL STANDARD OF LIVING. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?
Notes	Q5A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY SATISFIED	122	 18.2%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	321	 48.0%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	152	 22.7%
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	74	 11.1%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	N.A.	625	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v15: GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON MATERIAL SATISFACTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=649 /-] [Invalid=2112 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ARE DOING THESE DAYS. FIRST, LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE -- THE THINGS YOU CAN BUY AND DO -- ALL THE THINGS THAT MAKE UP YOUR MATERIAL STANDARD OF LIVING. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?
Literal question	DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
Notes	Q5B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL	255	 39.3%
2	SOMETHING	212	 32.7%
3	NOT MUCH	182	 28.0%
8	D.K.	1483	
9	N.A.	629	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v15: GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON MATERIAL SATISFACTION

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v16: MATERIAL STATE IN 4 YEARS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/4/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Literal question	DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
Notes	Q6 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BETTER OFF	150	24.2%
2	WORSE OFF	212	34.1%
3	ABOUT THE SAME	259	41.7%
4	D.K.	1515	
9	N.A.	625	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v17: ECONOMIC SITUATION COMPARED WITH GROWING UP

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=668 /-] [Invalid=2093 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Literal question	GENERALLY, IF YOU WERE COMPARING YOUR PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION WITH THAT OF YOUR FAMILY WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE MUCH BETTER OFF NOW, SOMEWHAT BETTER OFF NOW, ABOUT THE SAME NOW, SOMEWHAT WORSE OFF NOW, OR MUCH WORSE NOW?
Notes	Q7 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MUCH BETTER OFF NOW	232	34.7%
2	SOMEWHAT BETTER OFF NOW	199	29.8%
3	ABOUT THE SAME	140	21.0%
4	SOMEWHAT WORSE OFF NOW	70	10.5%
5	MUCH WORSE OFF NOW	27	4.0%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	N.A.	625	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v18: LIFE SATISFACTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=668 /-] [Invalid=2093 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Literal question	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?
Notes	Q8A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY SATISFIED	220	32.9%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final




v18: LIFE SATISFACTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	323	 48.4%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	96	 14.4%
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	29	 4.3%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	N.A.	625	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v19: GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON LIFE SATISFACTION






Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=652 /-] [Invalid=2109 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?
Literal question	DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?
Notes	Q8B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL	152	 23.3%
2	SOMETHING	243	 37.3%
3	NOT MUCH	257	 39.4%
8	D.K.	1479	
9	N.A.	630	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v20: MP'S LOSE TOUCH

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2088 /-] [Invalid=673 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING.
Literal question	AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE. GENERALLY, THOSE ELECTED TO PARLIAMENT SOON LOSE TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE.
Notes	Q9A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1486	 71.2%
1	STRONGLY AGREE	89	 4.3%
2	AGREE	292	 14.0%
3	DISAGREE	196	 9.4%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	25	 1.2%
9	N.A.	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v21: GOVERNMENT DOESNT CARE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
--------------------	--

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v21: GOVERNMENT DOESNT CARE




Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2088 /-] [Invalid=673 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE
Literal question	I DON'T THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT CARES MUCH WHAT PEOPLE LIKE ME THINK.
Notes	Q9B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1493	 71.5%
1	STRONGLY AGREE	89	 4.3%
2	AGREE	264	 12.6%
3	DISAGREE	214	 10.2%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	28	 1.3%
9	N.A.	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v22: POLITICS COMPLICATED

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2088 /-] [Invalid=673 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.
Literal question	SOMETIMES,POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT SEEM SO COMPLICATED THAT A PERSON LIKE ME CAN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON.
Notes	Q9C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1473	 70.5%
1	STRONGLY AGREE	119	 5.7%
2	AGREE	302	 14.5%
3	DISAGREE	171	 8.2%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	23	 1.1%
9	N.A.	673	






Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v23: DO NOT HAVE SAY

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2088 /-] [Invalid=673 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.
Literal question	PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES.
Notes	Q9D in the documentation.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final






v23: DO NOT HAVE SAY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1479	 70.8%
1	STRONGLY AGREE	96	 4.6%
2	AGREE	243	 11.6%
3	DISAGREE	237	 11.4%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	33	 1.6%
9	N.A.	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v24: SO MANY VOTERS





Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2088 /-] [Invalid=673 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.
Literal question	SO MANY OTHER PEOPLE VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS THAT IT DOESN'T MATTER VERY MUCH WHETHER I VOTE OR NOT.
Notes	Q9E in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1468	 70.3%
1	STRONGLY AGREE	19	 0.9%
2	AGREE	67	 3.2%
3	DISAGREE	317	 15.2%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	217	 10.4%
9	N.A.	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v25: READ NEWSPAPER-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
Notes	Q10A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	279	 44.6%
2	SOMETIMES	167	 26.7%
3	SELDOM	106	 17.0%
4	NEVER	73	 11.7%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v25: READ NEWSPAPER-ELECTION

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v26: DISCUSS POLITICS-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
Notes	Q10B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	181	29.0%
2	SOMETIMES	227	36.3%
3	SELDOM	139	22.2%
4	NEVER	78	12.5%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v27: CONVINCE FRIENDS-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?
Notes	Q10C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	54	8.6%
2	SOMETIMES	82	13.1%
3	SELDOM	82	13.1%
4	NEVER	407	65.1%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v28: WORK IN COMMUNITY-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=624 /-] [Invalid=2137 /-]
Universe	All respondents

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v28: WORK IN COMMUNITY-ELECTION

Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?
Notes	Q10D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	52	8.3%
2	SOMETIMES	126	20.2%
3	SELDOM	89	14.3%
4	NEVER	357	57.2%
8	D.K.	1464	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v29: ATTEND MEETING-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
Notes	Q10E in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	44	7.0%
2	SOMETIMES	96	15.4%
3	SELDOM	97	15.5%
4	NEVER	388	62.1%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	





Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v30: CONTACT OFFICIALS-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
Notes	Q10F in the documentation.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final





v30: CONTACT OFFICIALS-ELECTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	31	 5.0%
2	SOMETIMES	88	 14.1%
3	SELDOM	93	 14.9%
4	NEVER	413	 66.1%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v31: CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-ELECTION





Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?
Notes	Q10G in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	27	 4.3%
2	SOMETIMES	61	 9.8%
3	SELDOM	38	 6.1%
4	NEVER	499	 79.8%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v32: SIGN OR STICKER-ELECTION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=625 /-] [Invalid=2136 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DID EACH OF THESE THINGS IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, OFTEN,SOMETIMES,SELDOM,OR NEVER.
Literal question	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
Notes	Q10H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	40	 6.4%
2	SOMETIMES	70	 11.2%
3	SELDOM	26	 4.2%
4	NEVER	489	 78.2%
8	D.K.	1463	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v32: SIGN OR STICKER-ELECTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v33: READ NEWSPAPER-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
Notes	Q11A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	278	44.8%
2	SOMETIMES	166	26.7%
3	SELDOM	98	15.8%
4	NEVER	79	12.7%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v34: DISCUSS POLITICS-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
Notes	Q11B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	155	25.0%
2	SOMETIMES	229	36.9%
3	SELDOM	138	22.2%
4	NEVER	99	15.9%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v35: CONVINCE FRIENDS-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v35: CONVINCE FRIENDS-FEDERAL POLITICS

Notes Q11C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	45	7.2%
2	SOMETIMES	86	13.8%
3	SELDOM	63	10.1%
4	NEVER	427	68.8%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v36: WORK IN COMMUNITY-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?
Notes	Q11D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	42	6.8%
2	SOMETIMES	123	19.8%
3	SELDOM	93	15.0%
4	NEVER	362	58.4%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v37: ATTEND MEETING-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?
Notes	Q11E in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	39	6.3%
2	SOMETIMES	106	17.1%
3	SELDOM	91	14.7%
4	NEVER	385	62.0%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v38: CONTACT OFFICIALS-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=618 /-] [Invalid=2143 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
Notes	Q11F in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	25	4.0%
2	SOMETIMES	81	13.1%
3	SELDOM	100	16.2%
4	NEVER	412	66.7%
8	D.K.	1470	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v39: CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=619 /-] [Invalid=2142 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?
Notes	Q11G in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	27	4.4%
2	SOMETIMES	54	8.7%
3	SELDOM	44	7.1%
4	NEVER	494	79.8%
8	D.K.	1469	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.


v40: SIGN OR STICKER-FEDERAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=619 /-] [Invalid=2142 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW,COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS GENERALLY IN FEDERAL POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS RECENT ELECTION.
Literal question	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
Notes	Q11H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	33	5.3%
2	SOMETIMES	63	10.2%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final





v40: SIGN OR STICKER-FEDERAL POLITICS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	SELDOM	24	 3.9%
4	NEVER	499	 80.6%
8	D.K.	1469	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v41: READ NEWSPAPERS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS





Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=622 /-] [Invalid=2139 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
Notes	Q12A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	273	 43.9%
2	SOMETIMES	182	 29.3%
3	SELDOM	93	 15.0%
4	NEVER	74	 11.9%
8	D.K.	1466	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v42: DISCUSS POLITICS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=622 /-] [Invalid=2139 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
Literal question	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
Notes	Q12B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	170	 27.3%
2	SOMETIMES	232	 37.3%
3	SELDOM	125	 20.1%
4	NEVER	95	 15.3%
8	D.K.	1466	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v43: CONVINCE FRIENDS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v43: CONVINCE FRIENDS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Literal question TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?

Notes Q12C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	56	9.0%
2	SOMETIMES	92	14.8%
3	SELDOM	55	8.9%
4	NEVER	417	67.3%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v44: WORK IN COMMUNITY-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information [Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]

Statistics [NW/ W] [Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]

Universe Asked only to half-sample 2.

Pre-question HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?

Literal question WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?

Notes Q12D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	51	8.2%
2	SOMETIMES	115	18.5%
3	SELDOM	84	13.5%
4	NEVER	370	59.7%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v45: ATTEND MEETING-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information [Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]

Statistics [NW/ W] [Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]

Universe Asked only to half-sample 2.

Pre-question HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?

Literal question ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?

Notes Q12E in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	44	7.1%
2	SOMETIMES	99	16.0%
3	SELDOM	88	14.2%
4	NEVER	389	62.7%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v46: CONTACT OFFICIALS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
Literal question	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?
Notes	Q12F in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	26	4.2%
2	SOMETIMES	79	12.7%
3	SELDOM	85	13.7%
4	NEVER	430	69.4%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v47: CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
Literal question	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?
Notes	Q12G in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	27	4.3%
2	SOMETIMES	54	8.7%
3	SELDOM	39	6.3%
4	NEVER	501	80.7%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v48: SIGN OR STICKER-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=619 /-] [Invalid=2142 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
Literal question	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?
Notes	Q12H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	35	5.7%
2	SOMETIMES	64	10.3%
3	SELDOM	22	3.6%
4	NEVER	498	80.5%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

v48: SIGN OR STICKER-PROVINCIAL POLITICS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	1469	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v49: READ NEWSPAPER-LOCAL POLITICS





Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?
Notes	Q13A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	258	 41.6%
2	SOMETIMES	161	 26.0%
3	SELDOM	102	 16.5%
4	NEVER	99	 16.0%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v50: DISCUSS POLITICS-LOCAL POLITICS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=620 /-] [Invalid=2141 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?
Literal question	DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
Notes	Q13B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	163	 26.3%
2	SOMETIMES	200	 32.3%
3	SELDOM	127	 20.5%
4	NEVER	130	 21.0%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v51: CONVINCE FRIENDS-LOCAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=619 /-] [Invalid=2142 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?		
Literal question	TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?		
Notes	Q13C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	54	<div><div></div></div> 8.7%
2	SOMETIMES	82	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
3	SELDOM	59	<div><div></div></div> 9.5%
4	NEVER	424	<div><div></div></div> 68.5%
8	D.K.	1469	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v52: WORK IN COMMUNITY-LOCAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=617 /-] [Invalid=2144 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?		
Literal question	WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY TO TRY TO SOLVE SOME LOCAL PROBLEM?		
Notes	Q13D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	64	<div><div></div></div> 10.4%
2	SOMETIMES	137	<div><div></div></div> 22.2%
3	SELDOM	74	<div><div></div></div> 12.0%
4	NEVER	342	<div><div></div></div> 55.4%
8	D.K.	1471	
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v53: ATTEND MEETING- LOCAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=618 /-] [Invalid=2143 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?		
Literal question	ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?		
Notes	Q13E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	46	<div><div></div></div> 7.4%
2	SOMETIMES	91	<div><div></div></div> 14.7%
3	SELDOM	76	<div><div></div></div> 12.3%

# v53: ATTEND MEETING- LOCAL POLITICS				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
4	NEVER	405	<div></div>	65.5%
8	D.K.	1470		
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v54: CONTACT OFFICIALS-LOCAL POLITICS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=618 /-] [Invalid=2143 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?			
Literal question	CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?			
Notes	Q13F in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	37	<div></div>	6.0%
2	SOMETIMES	92	<div></div>	14.9%
3	SELDOM	77	<div></div>	12.5%
4	NEVER	412	<div></div>	66.7%
8	D.K.	1470		
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v55: CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY-LOCAL POLITICS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=618 /-] [Invalid=2143 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?			
Literal question	SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?			
Notes	Q13G in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	26	<div></div>	4.2%
2	SOMETIMES	41	<div></div>	6.6%
3	SELDOM	40	<div></div>	6.5%
4	NEVER	511	<div></div>	82.7%
8	D.K.	1470		
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v56: SIGN OR STICKER-LOCAL POLITICS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=617 /-] [Invalid=2144 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Pre-question	NOW, BRIEFLY, COULD YOU TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS WITH REGARD TO LOCAL OR MUNICIPAL POLITICS HERE IN (CITY OR TOWN)?			
Literal question	PUT A STICKER ON YOUR CAR OR PUT UP A SIGN, OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?			

# v56: SIGN OR STICKER-LOCAL POLITICS				
Notes		Q13H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	26	<div></div>	4.2%
2	SOMETIMES	43	<div></div>	7.0%
3	SELDOM	21	<div></div>	3.4%
4	NEVER	527	<div></div>	85.4%
8	D.K.	1471		
9	NOT ASKED OF HALF SAMPLE	673		
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>				
# v57: REGION R LIVES IN				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2747 /-] [Invalid=14 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Literal question		PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS? (IF YES) WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Notes		Q15A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	DOES NOT THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS	377	<div></div>	13.7%
1	NEWFOUNDLAND	5	<div></div>	0.2%
2	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	2	<div></div>	0.1%
3	NOVA SCOTIA	2	<div></div>	0.1%
4	NEW BRUNSWICK	0		
5	QUEBEC	63	<div></div>	2.3%
6	ONTARIO	63	<div></div>	2.3%
7	MANITOBA	4	<div></div>	0.1%
8	SASKATCHEWAN	0		
9	ALBERTA	2	<div></div>	0.1%
10	BRITISH COLUMBIA	19	<div></div>	0.7%
11	EAST, EASTERN	58	<div></div>	2.1%
12	WEST, WESTERN, THE WEST	135	<div></div>	4.9%
13	CENTRAL, CENTRE OF CANADA, MIDDLE	53	<div></div>	1.9%
14	CENTRAL EASTERN	3	<div></div>	0.1%
15	WEST CENTRAL	4	<div></div>	0.1%
16	ATLANTIC	37	<div></div>	1.3%
17	MARITIME AREA OR MARITIME PROVINCES (NEWFOUNDLAND, PRINCE E	56	<div></div>	2.0%
18	EAST, ATLANTIC PROVINCES, AREA OR REGION	3	<div></div>	0.1%
19	ATLANTIC REGION, MARITIME PROVINCES	14	<div></div>	0.5%
20	ATLANTIC CANADA AND NEW BRUNSWICK	0		
21	PACIFIC	7	<div></div>	0.3%
22	BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST, COASTAL REGION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	4	<div></div>	0.1%
23	WEST OF THE ROCKIES, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND WEST OF THE ROCKIE	5	<div></div>	0.2%

v57: REGION R LIVES IN

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	FAR WEST OR EXTREME WEST	2	0.1%
25	PRAIRIES, PRAIRIE (MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA)	40	1.5%
26	WESTERN PRAIRIES, WEST AND WESTERN PRAIRIES	2	0.1%
27	EAST COAST	0	
28	NORTHERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	3	0.1%
29	EASTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	7	0.3%
30	SOUTHERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	13	0.5%
31	WESTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	4	0.1%
32	CENTRAL (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	6	0.2%
33	SOUTH WESTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	8	0.3%
34	NORTH WESTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	0	
35	EAST CENTRAL (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	1	0.0%
36	NORTH EAST (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	1	0.0%
37	SOUTH EAST (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	1	0.0%
38	ENGLISH CENTRAL	0	
39	ENGLISH SPEAKING ST. LAWRENCE AND GREAT LAKES	0	
40	ENGLISH CANADA, ENGLISH SPEAKING, ENGLISH	19	0.7%
41	FRENCH CANADA	1	0.0%
42	FRENCH CANADIAN QUEBEC	2	0.1%
43	FRENCH SPEAKING, FRENCH REGION, FRANCOPHONE, FRENCH CANADA	1	0.0%
44	ENGLISH AND FRENCH SPEAKING	0	
45	CANADA	2	0.1%
46	MONTREAL OR SECTION OR SUBURB OF MONTREAL	12	0.4%
47	SAGUENAY	11	0.4%
48	LAC ST. JEAN	0	
49	GASPE, GASPE EAST, GASPE SUD	6	0.2%
50	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, TOWNSHIPS, ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, CITIES	26	0.9%
51	TORONTO OR SECTION OR SUBURB OF TORONTO	2	0.1%
52	BANANA BELT OF SOUTHERN ONTARIO, GOLDEN HORSESHOE	1	0.0%
53	GREAT LAKES REGION	2	0.1%
54	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, CITIES, TOWNS, TOWNSHIPS OR ELECTORAL	6	0.2%
55	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, CITIES, TOWNS, TOWNSHIPS OR ELECTORAL	4	0.1%
56	POOR, DEPRESSED, UNDERDEVELOPED, FORGOTTEN REGION	7	0.3%
57	RICH, WEALTHY, HIGH WAGE, MOST DEVELOPED, THE HAVES, UPPER C	6	0.2%
58	AVERAGE REGION (LIKE INCOME)	1	0.0%
59	EASTERN MOST EXPENSIVE (ESPECIALLY GAS)	0	
60	INDUSTRIAL	1	0.0%
61	CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL, INDUSTRIAL MIDLANDS	1	0.0%
62	INDUSTRIAL ONTARIO	0	
63	INDUSTRIAL EAST REGION	0	

# v57: REGION R LIVES IN			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
64	MANUFACTURING	2	0.1%
65	SOUTH INDUSTRIAL	1	0.0%
66	COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL	1	0.0%
67	CANADIAN BUSINESS	0	
68	CULTURAL AND BUSINESS AREA	1	0.0%
69	INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL, MINING AND FARMING	2	0.1%
70	AGRICULTURAL	2	0.1%
71	GRAIN BELT	3	0.1%
72	MIXED FARMING AND HEAVILY POPULATED	0	
73	CONTROLLING, INFLUENTIAL, MOST POWERFUL, GOVERNMENTAL REGION	2	0.1%
74	THE BEST IN CANADA OR COUNTRY, MOST FAVOURABLE	2	0.1%
75	THE REST OF CANADA, UNITED CANADA	2	0.1%
76	THE LUMBER REGION	0	
77	THE GARDEN OF CANADA	1	0.0%
78	MOUNTAIN OR FLAT REGION	0	
79	THE REGION THAT IS MORE OF A PART OF CANADA	0	
80	EQUIVALENT OF ULSTER	0	
81	REGION A CONTREVERSE	0	
82	PRIMARY	0	
83	HARD REGION, CENTRAL	0	
84	HEAVY HOSPITAL REGION	0	
85	JEWISH OR OTHER ETHNIC REGION (NOT ENGLISH OR FRENCH)	1	0.0%
86	NAMED OWN PROVINCE AND ONE OR MORE OTHER PROVINCE OR REGIONS	10	0.4%
87	LIBERAL	0	
88	D.K.	1593	58.0%
89	N.D.P.	0	
90	SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
91	SOCIALISTIC	2	0.1%
92	CAPITALISTIC	0	
93	MID WEST	2	0.1%
94	MID EAST	0	
95	ONTARIO, MOST PEOPLED	0	
96	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE, CONSERVATIVE	2	0.1%
97	LOWER CANADA	2	0.1%
98	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS, (SPECIFIC AREA OF SASKATCHEWA	1	0.0%
99	D.K. WHICH REGIONS	14	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9999] [Missing=*/8888/9999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=750 -] [Invalid=2011 -]		
Universe	All respondents		

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Literal question		WHAT ARE THE OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA?	
Notes		Q15B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	THERE ARE NO OTHER REGIONS, NONE	5	0.7%
1	NAMED THE OTHER NINE PROVINCES	6	0.8%
2	THE REST OR ALL OF OTHER PROVINCES (DID NOT NAME THE OTHER P	33	4.4%
3	EAST OR EASTERN	47	6.3%
4	EAST OR EASTERN AND MARITIMES AND NORTH WEST TERRITORIES (N.	4	0.5%
5	EAST OR EASTERN AND MARITIMES AND NORTHERN	7	0.9%
6	EAST AND QUEBEC AND PRAIRIES AND BRITISH COLUMBIA AND NORTHE	3	0.4%
7	EAST AND QUEBEC AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	0	
8	EAST AND QUEBEC AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	0	
9	EAST AND QUEBEC AND CENTRAL AND NORTHERN	0	
10	EAST AND QUEBEC AND WEST	11	1.5%
11	EAST AND QUEBEC, EASTERN AND QUEBEC	5	0.7%
12	EAST AND CENTRAL	7	0.9%
13	EAST AND CENTRAL AND WEST	3	0.4%
14	EAST AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES	0	
15	EAST AND WEST AND NORTHERN OR NORTH	10	1.3%
16	EAST AND PRAIRIES AND BRITISH COLUMBIA	1	0.1%
17	EAST AND PRAIRIES AND BRITISH COLUMBIA AND NORTH	1	0.1%
18	EAST AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	3	0.4%
19	EAST AND PRAIRIE, PRAIRIE PROVINCES	3	0.4%
20	EAST AND PRAIRIES, WEST COAST	2	0.3%
21	EAST AND WEST, FRENCH AND ENGLISH	1	0.1%
22	EAST AND WEST AND PACIFIC	0	
23	EASTERN (N.S., N.B., NFLD.) AND QUEBEC AND N.W.T.	0	
24	EAST (FROM N.B. ON) AND WEST	1	0.1%
25	EAST COAST AND WEST COAST	2	0.3%
26	EASTERN AND THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES	0	
27	EAST AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
28	EAST AND MARITIMES	13	1.7%
29	EASTERN CANADA (THE POOR REGION) AND QUEBEC (SPECIAL STATUS	1	0.1%
30	EASTERN AND ONT. AND MAN., ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
31	EAST AND NORTHERN ONT. AND N.W.T. OR THE NORTH WEST	1	0.1%
32	EASTERN AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
33	EAST AND MARITIMES AND QUEBEC AND NORTH AND PACIFIC	0	
34	EAST AND MARITIMES AND QUEBEC AND FRENCH CANADA	0	
35	EAST AND MARITIMES AND B.C.	3	0.4%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	EAST AND MARITIMES AND WEST AND PACIFIC	1	0.1%
37	EAST AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
38	EAST AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
39	MARITIMES	4	0.5%
40	MARITIMES AND QUEBEC AND ONT.	6	0.8%
41	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST	1	0.1%
42	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES	11	1.5%
43	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C.	5	0.7%
44	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	9	1.2%
45	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T. OR YUKON	6	0.8%
46	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WEST	6	0.8%
47	MARITIMES AND ONT.	2	0.3%
48	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	0	
49	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND WEST	6	0.8%
50	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL AND WEST	2	0.3%
51	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
52	MARITIMES , OTTAWA, ONT., PRAIRIES, WEST AND YUKON	0	
53	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND THE ROCKIES AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
54	MARITIMES AND WEST AND NORTH AND SOUTH	1	0.1%
55	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND WEST AND EXTREME WEST	0	
56	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
57	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND MID WEST	0	
58	MARITIMES AND WEST	11	1.5%
59	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	0	
60	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
61	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	2	0.3%
62	ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC (B.C.)	1	0.1%
63	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND MIDDLE PROVINCES AND B.C.	0	
64	ATLANTIC AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND N.W.T.	0	
65	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
66	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC (COAST)	0	
67	ATLANTIC AND MARITIMES AND NORTHERN QUE. AND 'BAS DU FLEUVE	0	
68	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND INDUSTRIAL AREA AND PRAIRIES AND ALTA	0	
69	P.E.I. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
70	P.E.I. AND N.B. AND QUE.	0	
71	P.E.I. AND N.B. AND N.S. AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND MA	0	
72	P.E.I. AND N.B. AND N.S. AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	0	
73	P.E.I. AND N.B. AND N.S. AND QUE. AND MAN.	0	
74	P.E.I. AND NFLD. AND CAPE BRETON AND CHARLOTTETOWN AND GASP	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	P.E.I. AND N.S. AND GASPE AND QUE. AND MONTREAL	1	0.1%
76	NFLD. AND HALIFAX AND TORONTO AND VANCOUVER	0	
77	NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND NORTH	1	0.1%
78	NFLD. AND QUE. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
79	NFLD. AND FRENCH CANADA AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
80	NFLD. AND OTTAWA	1	0.1%
81	NFLD. AND QUEBEC CITY AND GASPE AND NORTH OF QUEBEC AND OTT	1	0.1%
82	NFLD. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
83	NFLD. AND NORTH OF N.B. AND QUE.	0	
84	N.B. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND SASK.	0	
85	ST. JEAN N.B. AND HALIFAX AND QUE.	1	0.1%
86	N.B. AND WEST (OF ANGLO-PHONES)	0	
87	N.B. AND N.S. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND VANCOUVER	0	
88	N.B. AND ONT. AND SASK.	0	
89	N.B. AND N.S. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND INDIAN AND ESKIMO	0	
90	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND NORTHERN SA	1	0.1%
91	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PR	0	
92	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND GASPE AND URBAN AND RURAL QUE	1	0.1%
93	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND CAPE BRETON	0	
94	NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND	1	0.1%
95	NFLD. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALT	0	
96	NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.	1	0.1%
97	NFLD. AND FRENCH ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
98	NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA	0	
99	NFLD. AND QUE.	1	0.1%
100	EAST AND MARITIMES AND QUE.	5	0.7%
101	EAST AND MARITIMES AND ONT.	2	0.3%
102	EAST AND MARITIMES AND NORTH OR WEST	1	0.1%
103	EAST AND MARITIMES AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIE AND NORTH	0	
104	EAST AND MARITIMES AND CENTRAL	1	0.1%
105	EAST (ONT. AND QUE.) AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
106	TWO PARTS OF EAST, INDUSTRIAL REGION, ONT. AND QUE. AND MARI	1	0.1%
107	INDUSTRIALIZED EAST AND MARITIMES AND QUE.	0	
108	EAST AND ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC	0	
109	EAST AND ATLANTIC AND WEST	1	0.1%
110	EAST AND ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	0	
111	EAST AND ATLANTIC AND B.C.	0	

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
112	EAST AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
113	EAST AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
114	EAST AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
115	EAST AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
116	EAST AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES	3	0.4%
117	EAST AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTH	0	
118	EAST AND QUE. AND WEST AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
119	EAST AND QUE. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
120	EAST AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
121	EAST AND ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
122	EAST AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
123	EAST AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND NORTH	2	0.3%
124	EAST AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
125	EAST AND B.C.	2	0.3%
126	EAST AND NORTH	6	0.8%
127	EASTERN (ONT. AND QUE.)	0	
128	EAST OF MAN.	0	
129	EAST OF THE ROCKIES	0	
130	EAST AND WEST AND FAR WEST	0	
131	EAST AND MID WEST AND WEST	0	
132	FAR EASTERN AND EASTERN AND MID REGION AND NORTH	1	0.1%
133	EASTERN AND WESTERN AND FAR WEST AND NORTHERN	0	
134	EAST AND WEST AND SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN ONT.	1	0.1%
135	EAST AND WEST AND NORTH AND SOUTH	2	0.3%
136	EAST AND NORTHWEST	2	0.3%
137	EAST COAST AND PRAIRIES	0	
138	EAST AND QUE. AND WEST AND NORTH (B.C.)	0	
139	EAST AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND ARCTIC	1	0.1%
140	EAST AND MONTREAL AND WEST	0	
141	EAST AND MONTREAL AND ONT.	0	
142	EAST AND GREAT LAKES AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
143	POOR EAST OR MARITIMES AND RICH WEST	0	
144	EAST COAST AND WEST COAST AND YUKON AND PRAIRIES AND ST. LA	0	
145	EAST AND MARITIMES AND WEST	2	0.3%
146	EAST AND MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WEST	2	0.3%
147	EAST AND MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
148	EAST AND MARITIMES AND CENTRAL AND WEST	0	
149	EAST AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND ROCKIES AND B.C.	0	
150	EAST AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND RANDING COUNTY AND WEST	0	
151	EAST AND MARITIMES AND B.C. AND NORTH	2	0.3%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
152	EAST AND MARITIMES AND WEST COAST	0	
153	EAST AND MARITIMES AND MOUNTAINS AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND YUK	1	0.1%
154	EASTERN (TORONTO AND OTTAWA) AND MARITIMES (THREE SECTIONS)	0	
155	EASTERN INDUSTRIAL AND MARITIMES AND WEST COAST	1	0.1%
156	EASTERN AND ATLANTIC AND ROCKIES AND WESTERN	0	
157	EAST COAST (MARITIMES) AND QUE. AND REST OF ONT. AND PRAIRI	0	
158	EAST COAST AND QUE. AND CENTRAL PLAINS	1	0.1%
159	EAST COAST AND QUE. AND WESTERN	0	
160	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT.	1	0.1%
161	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
162	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
163	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND WEST	0	
164	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND ONT. AND WEST	0	
165	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND WESTERN ONT. AND MID WEST AND ALTA.	0	
166	MARITIMES AND NFLD. EAST, QUE. NORTH EAST REGION, PRAIRIES	0	
167	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE	0	
168	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
169	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
170	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND CENTRAL EASTERN AND WESTERN	0	
171	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND ROCKI	1	0.1%
172	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WESTERN ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
173	MARITIMES (EAST) AND QUE. AND REST OF ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND	2	0.3%
174	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND SOUTHERN ONT. AND MID WEST AND PACIFI	0	
175	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND	1	0.1%
176	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND OTTAWA DISTRICT AND ALTA. OR PRAIRIE	0	
178	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WINNIPEG AND B.C.	0	
179	THREE MARITIME PROVINCES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND THREE PRAIRI	1	0.1%
180	MARITIMES AND PART OF QUE. AND CENTRAL AND B.C. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
181	MARITIMES AND INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX OF ONT. AND WESTERN QUE. A	0	
182	MARITIMES AND FRENCH AND WESTERN	0	
183	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WEST AND NORTH	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
184	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND SUB ARCTIC AND	1	0.1%
185	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	3	0.4%
186	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WEST AND B.C.	2	0.3%
187	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
188	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
189	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
190	MARITIMES AND QUE.	2	0.3%
191	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND NORTH	2	0.3%
192	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND MID WEST AND WEST AND N.W.T.	0	
193	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WESTERN PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
194	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND Y	0	
195	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
196	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND WEST AND NORTH AND N.W.	1	0.1%
197	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND YUKO	1	0.1%
198	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND WEST AND PACIFIC	0	
199	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND WEST AND NORTH AND N.W.T	1	0.1%
200	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND N.W.T.	0	
201	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND WEST AND WEST COAST	0	
202	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND NORTH	1	0.1%
203	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE	2	0.3%
204	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND WEST AND NORTH WEST AND	0	
205	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
206	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
207	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
208	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND WEST AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
209	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND WEST AND NORTH	0	
210	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND WEST AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
211	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND WEST COAST AND N.W.T.	0	
212	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND LAB	1	0.1%
213	MARITIMES AND SOUTHERN ONT. AND WEST	0	
214	MARITIMES AND LABRADOR AND WEST AND NORTH WEST	0	
215	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
216	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
217	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTH	2	0.3%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
218	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
219	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND FAR WEST AND NORTH	0	
220	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND ARCTIC	0	
221	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	0	
222	MARITIMES AND GREAT LAKES AND N.W.T.	0	
223	MARITIMES AND GREAT LAKES AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC	1	0.1%
224	MARITIMES AND MID WEST AND FAR WEST AND N.W.T.	0	
225	MARITIMES AND WEST AND (VAST) NORTH	1	0.1%
226	MARITIMES AND WEST COAST	0	
227	MARITIMES AND MID WEST AND WESTERN	0	
228	MARITIMES AND NORTH	0	
229	MARITIMES AND VANCOUVER AND B.C.	1	0.1%
230	MARITIMES AND WESTERN CANADA AND UPPER CANADA	0	
231	MARITIMES AND WESTERN QUE. AND NORTH WEST	0	
232	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
233	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND FRENCH CANADA AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
234	MARITIMES (FISHERIES) AND SOUTHERN ONT. (FRUIT BELT) AND SA	1	0.1%
235	MARITIMES AND UPPER CANADA AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND NORTH	1	0.1%
236	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	0	
237	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND	1	0.1%
238	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND N.W.T.	0	
239	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	2	0.3%
240	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND	0	
241	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
242	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND N.W.T. OR NORTH WEST	2	0.3%
243	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND CENTRAL EAST AND B.C.	0	
244	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND CENTRAL ONT.	1	0.1%
245	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WEST AND NORTH WEST	2	0.3%
246	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
247	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND WEST AND B.C. AND NORTH	0	
248	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
249	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES	0	
250	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
251	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND ROCKY MOUNTA	1	0.1%
252	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND WEST AND B.C.	1	0.1%
253	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
254	MARITIMES AND ONT. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
255	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	0	
256	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	1	0.1%
257	MARITIMES AND WEST AND NORTH	1	0.1%
258	MARITIMES AND WESTERN PRAIRIES AND BIG NORTH	0	
259	MARITIMES AND GREAT LAKES AND PRAIRIES AND NORTHERN	0	
260	ATLANTIC AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND SEABOARD	0	
261	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST	1	0.1%
262	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C. AND YUKON	1	0.1%
263	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST C	0	
264	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND OTTAWA AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
265	ATLANTIC AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN	0	
266	ATLANTIC AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND N.W.T.	0	
267	ATLANTIC AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	1	0.1%
268	ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES AND WESTERN	2	0.3%
269	ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTH	0	
270	ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
271	ATLANTIC AND WEST AND NORTH	0	
272	ATLANTIC AND ALONG THE ST. LAWRENCE TO LAKES BETWEEN WINDSO	1	0.1%
273	EAST AND NFLD. AND WESTERN AND B.C.	1	0.1%
274	EAST AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
275	EAST COAST AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST	0	
276	EAST COAST AND MINING REGION AND TOURIST REGION AND LAKES A	1	0.1%
277	EAST COAST AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST COAST AND NORTH	1	0.1%
278	EAST COAST AND QUE. AND WEST AND NORTHERN	0	
279	EAST AND EAST COAST AND WEST COAST AND NORTH	0	
280	EAST AND QUE. AND HULL AND NORTH	0	
282	EAST AND THE BACKWOODS	1	0.1%
283	EAST AND NORTHERN ONT. AND WEST AND NORTHERN YUKON	0	
284	EAST AND NIAGARA PENNINSULA AND WEST AND FAR NORTH	1	0.1%
285	EAST AND FRENCH CANADA	1	0.1%
286	EAST AND CENTRAL AND MID WEST AND NORTH	1	0.1%
287	EAST AND ONT. AND WESTERN	0	
288	EAST AND ONT.	1	0.1%
289	EAST AND QUE.	4	0.5%
290	EAST AND MID WEST AND WEST AND NORTH	0	
291	EASTERN (NFLD. AND N.B. AND N.S.) AND QUE. AND WESTERN (B.C	0	
292	EAST (LESS PEOPLE) AND WEST (LESS PEOPLE)	0	

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
293	EAST AND ONT. (THE RICH ONE) AND ON AN ECONOMIC BASIS ITS B	1	0.1%
294	LOWER CANADA AND UPPER CANADA AND MID WEST AND FAR WEST (CO	1	0.1%
295	LABRADOR AND PACIFIC	1	0.1%
296	UPPER AND LOWER CANADA AND PRAIRIES	0	
297	UPPER CANADA AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	2	0.3%
298	UPPER CANADA AND PRAIRIES AND WESTERN AND NORTHERN	1	0.1%
299	UPPER CANADA AND WEST COAST	0	
300	UPPER CANADA AND WEST AND NORTH	0	
301	MIDDLE EAST AND CENTRAL CANADA AND WEST AND NORTH	0	
302	EAST AND N.S. AND WEST	1	0.1%
303	EAST COAST AND EASTERN CANADA AND NFLD. AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	0	
304	EAST COAST AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND	0	
305	EAST COAST AND QUE. AND OUT WEST AND B.C.	0	
306	POOR EASTERN PROVINCES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
307	EASTERN AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
308	EASTERN AND NORTHERN ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
309	EASTERN AND NORTHERN ONT. AND WESTERN	1	0.1%
310	EASTERN CANADA AND FRENCH REGION	0	
311	EAST AND WEST AND FRENCH AND ENGLISH	1	0.1%
312	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND ST. LAWRENCE	0	
313	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL AND MID WEST AND WEST	1	0.1%
314	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
315	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST OF ROCKIES	1	0.1%
316	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND MONTREAL AND TORONTO AND B.C.	1	0.1%
317	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND CENTRAL AND WEST COAST	0	
318	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL EASTERN AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	0	
319	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND PACIFIC AND N.W.T.	0	
320	MARITIMES AND PACIFIC COAST	1	0.1%
321	ATLANTIC AND LABRADOR AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	1	0.1%
322	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND ONT. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND	0	
323	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
324	NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND UPPER CANADA	1	0.1%
325	N.S. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND VANCOUVER	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
326	N.S. AND QUE. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
327	N.B. AND ONT.	0	
328	EASTERN PROVINCES AND WESTERN PROVINCES AND MONTREAL	1	0.1%
329	NFLD. AND N.B. AND MONTREAL AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
330	N.S. AND N.B. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND VANCOUVER	1	0.1%
331	N.S. AND N.B. AND QUE.	1	0.1%
332	NFLD. AND ONT. AND SASK. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
333	NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND WEST	0	
334	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND BIG NO	1	0.1%
335	P.E.I. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALT	0	
336	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND AMERICAN B.C.	1	0.1%
337	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND WEST	0	
338	NFLD. AND WESTERN	0	
339	MARITIMES AND SHIELD AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND FRENCH	0	
340	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC AND YUKON	0	
341	EASTERN AND MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES (MAN. AND SASK.	0	
342	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND ONT.	2	0.3%
343	EASTERN AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
344	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.	0	
345	EASTERN PROVINCES, EAST OF ONT.	0	
346	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	0	
347	HALIFAX AND SHIPPING AND OUT WEST	1	0.1%
348	EAST COAST AND MARITIMES AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND	0	
349	P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C. AND N.W	1	0.1%
350	EASTERN AND ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
351	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL EAST AND B.C.	1	0.1%
352	ATLANTIC AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
353	ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC AND ARCTIC	1	0.1%
354	NFLD. AND LABRADOR AND QUE. AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WES	1	0.1%
355	UPPER AND LOWER CANADA AND WESTERN AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	0	
356	NFLD. AND QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST	1	0.1%
357	NFLD. AND EASTERN STANDARD TIME AND CENTRAL STANDARD TIME	1	0.1%
358	UPPER CANADA AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
359	EASTERN AND FRENCH CANADIAN AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND PACI	0	
360	ATLANTIC AND QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC	0	
361	NFLD. AND MONTREAL	1	0.1%
362	EASTERN COAST AND EASTERN (QUE. AND ONT.) AND CENTRAL, MAN.	1	0.1%
363	EAST AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND B.C.	0	
364	EAST AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND B.C. AND FRANCOPHONE	0	
365	MARITIMES AND UPPER CANADA AND WEST	0	
366	MARITIMES AND NORTH QUE. AND NORTH OR SOUTH ONT. AND PRAIRI	0	
367	ATLANTIC AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND NORTH	0	
368	EAST AND TRUDEAU'S LAND	1	0.1%
369	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL AND WEST COAST	0	
370	EAST AND SOUTH AND NORTH	0	
371	THE EAST AND MARITIMES AND ROCKIES AND SOUTHERN B.C. AND B.	1	0.1%
372	MARITIMES AND QUE. AND SOUTHERN ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
373	MARITIMES AND NFLD. AND QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND THE WEST	1	0.1%
374	P.E.I. AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND LABRADOR AND MAN. AN	0	
375	EAST AND ONT. AND CENTRAL AND NORTH	0	
1001	QUE.	5	0.7%
1002	QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND B.C. AND N.W.T. OR NORTH	2	0.3%
1003	QUE. AND WESTERN OR WEST	6	0.8%
1004	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTH	3	0.4%
1005	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	2	0.3%
1006	QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST	7	0.9%
1007	QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND B.C.	4	0.5%
1008	QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND WEST	2	0.3%
1009	QUE. (SHOULDN'T BE FRENCH) AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AN	1	0.1%
1010	FRENCH CANADA	11	1.5%
1011	FRENCH SPEAKING CANADA	4	0.5%
1012	FRENCH QUE.	5	0.7%
1013	THE REST OF CANADA (ENGLISH), ENGLISH CANADA, ENGLISH REGION	3	0.4%
1014	FRENCH SPEAKING OR FRANCOPHONE EAST	2	0.3%
1015	FRENCH SPEAKING CANADA AND EASTERN AND WESTERN	0	
1016	EAST COAST FRENCH AND WEST COAST	0	
1017	FRANCOPHONE OR FRENCH AND ANGLOPHONE OR ENGLISH AND INDUSTR	0	
1018	FRENCH CANADIAN AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1019	FRENCH CANADA AND ATLANTIC AND WEST	1	0.1%
1020	ANGLOPHONE OR ENGLISH, INDUSTRIALIZED REGIONS	0	
1021	ENGLISH CANADA AND ACADIAN AND B.C. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
1022	FRENCH AND FISHERMEN AND CAPITALISTIC AND PACIFIC	1	0.1%
1023	FRENCH AND FISHING AND INDUSTRIAL AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	0	
1024	DEVELOPING QUE. AND FARMING WEST AND UNDERDEVELOPED NORTH	0	
1025	QUE. (SEPARATE REGION) AND OTTAWA ISOLATIONISTS AND DEPRESS	0	
1026	QUE. SEPARATE, UNITED OTHERWISE, ALL DIFFERENT PROVINCES, T	3	0.4%
1027	NORTHERN QUE. AND SOUTHERN QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND PRAIRI	0	
1028	WEST OF QUE. AND MONTREAL	0	
1029	QUE. AND MONTREAL AND OTHER BIG CITIES	1	0.1%
1030	QUE. AND MONTREAL	0	
1031	QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND B.C. AND UPPER CANADA	1	0.1%
1032	QUE. AND WEST AND UPPER CANADA	1	0.1%
1033	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
1034	QUE. AND WEST AND B.C.	2	0.3%
1035	QUE. AND B.C.	4	0.5%
1036	QUE. AND MID WEST	0	
1037	QUE. AND CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST	3	0.4%
1038	QUE. AND NORTH WEST	1	0.1%
1039	QUE. AND REST OF CANADA	2	0.3%
1040	NORTHERN QUE. AND WEST	0	
1041	QUE. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL	1	0.1%
1042	QUE. AND WESTERN AND OTHER PROVINCES EACH HAVE OWN REGION	1	0.1%
1043	QUE. AND ONT.	2	0.3%
1044	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	5	0.7%
1045	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND FAR WEST	0	
1046	QUE. AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND N.W.T.	2	0.3%
1047	QUE. AND ONT. AND NORTH CENTRAL AND WEST	1	0.1%
1048	QUE. AND ONT. AND WEST AND N.W.T.	3	0.4%
1049	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OR CITIES (NOT MONTREAL) OR TOWNS	18	2.4%
1050	MONTREAL	1	0.1%
1051	MONTREAL AND ONE OR MORE NON-QUE. CITIES OTHER THAN TORONTO	0	
1052	MONTREAL AND ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OR CITIES IN QUE.	5	0.7%
1053	MONTREAL AND OTTAWA AND ONE OR MORE AREAS OR CITIES IN QUE.	1	0.1%
1054	MONTREAL AND ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C. AND NORTHERN	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1055	MONTREAL AND ONT. AND MORE CITIES IN QUE.	2	0.3%
1056	(MONTREAL AND OTTAWA AND TORONTO) OLDER AREAS AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
1057	MONTREAL AND TORONTO AND ROBERVILLE AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1058	CHICOUTIMI AND TORONTO AND JAMES BAY	0	
1059	QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1060	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1061	QUE. AND TORONTO AND ABITIBI AND LAC ST. JEAN	0	
1062	QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1063	QUE. AND MONTREAL AND OTHER CITIES AND COUNTIES IN QUE. (NOT	0	
1064	QUE. AND MIDDLE AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
1065	QUE. AND OTTAWA AND MOUNTAINS	1	0.1%
1066	QUE. AND SEABOARD AND PRAIRIES AND WESTERN	1	0.1%
1067	FRENCH QUE. AND FRIENDLY WEST	0	
1068	FRENCH AND ENGLISH	0	
1069	FRENCH DOWN EAST	1	0.1%
1070	FRENCH AND POOR AND WEALTHY	1	0.1%
1071	FRENCH AND ONT. AND COASTAL BOTH ENDS AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T	1	0.1%
1072	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT MONTREAL) AND WEST	1	0.1%
1073	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. AND OTTAWA	1	0.1%
1074	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. AND TORONTO	0	
1075	FRENCH CANADA AND REST OF CANADA	1	0.1%
1076	QUE. AND ONT. AND B.C. AND N.W.T. OR NORTHERN CANADA	1	0.1%
1077	QUE. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND N.	1	0.1%
1078	QUE. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND NORTH	1	0.1%
1079	QUE. AND ONT. AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN	0	
1080	QUE. AND WESTERN ONT.	0	
1081	QUE. AND NORTHERN ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
1082	QUE. AND SOUTHERN ONT. AND NORTHERN MAN. AND PRAIRIES AND B	0	
1083	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES	2	0.3%
1084	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
1085	QUE. AND CENTRAL ONT.	1	0.1%
1086	QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1087	QUE. AND METRO AREA OF TORONTO	0	
1088	QUE. AND CENTRAL AND WESTERN AND UPPER CANADA AND NORTHERN C	1	0.1%
1089	QUE. AND CENTRAL AND WEST	1	0.1%
1090	QUE. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
1091	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC COAST	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1092	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND B.C. AND UPPER CANADA	1	0.1%
1093	QUE. AND RURAL WEST AND FAR WEST	0	
1094	CENTRAL QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
1095	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	1	0.1%
1096	QUE. AND CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTHERN	1	0.1%
1097	FRENCH SECTION AND INDUSTRIAL AND FARM AND LUMBER	1	0.1%
1098	FRENCH QUE. AND UPPER CANADA AND WESTERN	1	0.1%
1099	QUE. (IN A WORLD OF THEIR OWN) AND ONT. (WEALTHY WITHOUT WA	1	0.1%
1100	QUE. AND ONT. AND MAN. AND CENTRAL AND B.C.	0	
1101	MONTREAL AND WEST	0	
1102	QUE. AND ONT. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1103	QUE. IS TRYING TO BREAK AWAY FROM CANADA	0	
1104	QUE. AND BETWEEN PRAIRIES AND QUE.	1	0.1%
1105	VANCOUVER	0	
1106	QUE. (FRENCH REGION) AND WEALTHY REGIONS	1	0.1%
1107	QUE. AND ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC	0	
2001	CENTRAL AND WEST AND NORTHERN	7	0.9%
2002	CENTRAL AND NORTHERN	1	0.1%
2003	CENTRAL AND WESTERN	14	1.9%
2004	CENTRAL EAST AND WEST AND NORTH	2	0.3%
2005	CENTRAL (ONT. AND QUE.) AND WEST AND N.W.T. OR NORTHERN	2	0.3%
2006	CENTRAL (ONT. AND QUE.) AND WEST	1	0.1%
2007	CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
2008	CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	1	0.1%
2009	CENTRAL AND OTTAWA AND WEST	0	
2010	CENTRAL AND ONT. AND WEST	0	
2011	ONT.	4	0.5%
2012	ONT. AND WEST	3	0.4%
2013	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND REGINA	0	
2014	NORTHERN ONT.	1	0.1%
2015	SOUTHERN ONT. AND URBAN AND RURAL WESTERN CANADA	0	
2016	ONT. (UNILINGUAL) AND B.C. (INDEPENDENT)	1	0.1%
2017	ONT. AND ALTA.	0	
2018	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND THE OTHER PROVINCES	1	0.1%
2019	ONT. AND SASK. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2020	WEST OR WESTERN	16	2.1%
2021	WEST AND PRAIRIES AND NORTH	0	
2022	EAST AND WEST , WESTERN AND EASTERN	25	3.3%
2023	WEST AND PRAIRIES	3	0.4%
2024	WEST AND SOUTH AND NORTH	3	0.4%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2025	WEST AND PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	0	
2026	WESTERN CANADA AND ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS IN QUE. (NOT M	0	
2027	THE ROCKIES AND CANADIAN SHIELD AND COASTAL PLAINS	1	0.1%
2028	PRAIRIES AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION	0	
2029	SASK. AND VANCOUVER ISLAND AND WESTON AND NORTH YORK	1	0.1%
2030	ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.3%
2031	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
2032	PRAIRIES AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
2033	MAN.	0	
2034	MAN. AND SASK.	1	0.1%
2035	B.C.	0	
2036	CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND B.C.	2	0.3%
2037	CENTRAL OR MIDDLE AND PRAIRIES AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
2038	WEST AND NORTH	3	0.4%
2039	MIDDLE WEST	0	
2040	ONT. AND SASK. AND NORTH WEST AND 'BAS DU FLEUVE'	0	
2041	ONT. AND OTTAWA AND MONTREAL AND MAN.	0	
2042	ONT. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
2043	ONT. AND VANCOUVER	1	0.1%
2044	ONT. AND OTTAWA AND KINGSTON AND LAKE ST. JEAN AND CHARLEVOI	1	0.1%
2045	ONT. AND ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OR CITIES (NOT MONTREAL)	0	
2046	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
2047	ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
2048	WEST COAST	0	
2049	WILDERNESS AND PRAIRIES	0	
2050	TORONTO OR JUST NAMED ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF TORONTO	1	0.1%
2051	TORONTO AND ONE OR MORE NON-QUE. CITIES OTHER THAN OTTAWA	1	0.1%
2052	TORONTO AND OTTAWA AND MAN. AND WINNIPEG AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2053	TORONTO AND OTTAWA AND HALIFAX AND VANCOUVER	1	0.1%
2054	TORONTO AND HAMILTON AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2055	OTTAWA	1	0.1%
2056	FOOTHILL AND MOUNTAIN AREA	0	
2057	ONT. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2058	ONT. AND B.C. AND HIGHER INCOME AREA AND PRAIRIES AND NFLD.	0	
2059	ONT. AND MAN. AND THE OTHER PROVINCES	0	
2060	ONT. AND THE OTHER PROVINCES	1	0.1%
2061	ONT. AND WESTERN AND UPPER CANADA	1	0.1%
2062	RICH ONT. AND COMFORTABLE WEST COAST	1	0.1%

v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2063	CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND WEST AND NORTH	2	0.3%
2064	CENTRAL AND WEST AND FRENCH	0	
2065	CENTRAL AND WEST AND PACIFIC AND NORTH	1	0.1%
2066	PRAIRIES AND INDUSTRIAL	0	
2067	PRAIRIES AND B.C.	2	0.3%
2068	MARITIMES AND B.C. AND TRADE AND MANUFACTURING CENTRE	1	0.1%
2069	WEST AND FRENCH AND ENGLISH REGION AND FARMERS AND CITY PEOP	0	
2070	WEST AND UPPER CANADA	3	0.4%
2071	WEST AND B.C. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
2072	N.W.T. AND YUKON	1	0.1%
2073	SOUTH	0	
2074	ONT. AND ALTA. AND VANCOUVER	2	0.3%
2075	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2076	ONT. AND WEST AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2077	PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	1	0.1%
2078	CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND ROCKIES	0	
2079	PRAIRIES AND WEST COAST AND ARCTIC AND LAKE REGION	1	0.1%
2080	CENTRAL AND PRAIRIES AND B.C. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
2081	ONT. AND WEST AND NORTH	0	
2082	CENTRAL	0	
2083	GREAT LAKES AND GREAT PLAINS AND PACIFIC AND ARCTIC	0	
2084	CENTRAL AREAS AND WEST AND WEST COAST AND N.W.T.	0	
2085	ONT. AND UPPER CANADA	1	0.1%
3001	THE TEN PROVINCES OF CANADA	1	0.1%
3002	JUST NAMED A TOWNSHIP OR COUNTY IN OWN PROVINCE OTHER THAN Q	2	0.3%
3003	THE NINE OTHER PROVINCES	1	0.1%
3004	THE REST OF THE COUNTRY	2	0.3%
3005	WHEAT BELT	0	
3006	WHEAT BELT AND FISHING AND INDUSTRIAL AND MINERAL BELT	1	0.1%
3007	INDUSTRIAL AND FARMING AND FISHING	0	
3008	FOUR OTHER REGIONS	0	
3009	RICH AND POOR PROVINCES OR THE HAVES AND HAVE NOTS	2	0.3%
3010	THE HAVES OR CONTROLLING REGION	0	
3011	UPPER AND LOWER	1	0.1%
3012	FRUIT, LUMBER, MARKET GARDENING, MINING, FISHING, HUNTING, A	0	
3013	FARMING AND INDUSTRIAL	1	0.1%
3014	MID OR MIDDLE CLASS AND TOTALLY PARASITIC	0	
3015	MIDDLE REGION AND RICH REGION	1	0.1%
3016	MINING AND WHEAT FARMING	1	0.1%

# v58: OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3017	FOOD PRODUCING REGION	1	0.1%
3018	OIL AND GRAIN AND FISH REGION	0	
3019	POVERTY AND MIDDLE CLASS AND CAPITALISTIC AND INDIANS AND ES	0	
3020	LIBERAL	0	
3021	CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL AND SEPARATIST AND REST OF CANADA	1	0.1%
3022	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE AND N.D.P. AND COMMUNIST AND SOCIAL	0	
3023	NATURAL DIVISIONS, MINING AND FARMING AND FISHING ETC.	0	
3024	AGRICULTURAL OF THE WEST AND MINING AND FORESTRY OF THE NOR	0	
3025	LIBERAL REGION OF QUE.	0	
3026	RICH PROVINCES	0	
3027	NAMED OTHER LANGUAGE GROUPS ONLY (NOT ENGLISH OR FRENCH)	0	
3028	UNDERDEVELOPED REGION	0	
3029	NOT SO WEALTHY	0	
3030	MILITANT REGIONS	1	0.1%
8888	D.K., N.S.	41	
9999	N.A.	1970	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v59: FEEL CLOSER TO FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1272 /-] [Invalid=1489 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FEEL CLOSER TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA, OR TO YOUR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q16 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FEDERAL	337	26.5%
2	PROVINCIAL	633	49.8%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	197	15.5%
4	NEITHER	105	8.3%
8	D.K.	1489	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9999] [Missing=*/8888/9999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1058 /-] [Invalid=1703 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ARE ANY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL THAN OTHERS? (IF YES) WHICH ONES?		
Notes	Q17A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO	319	30.2%

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
2	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
3	NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.1%
4	NEW BRUNSWICK	1	0.1%
5	QUEBEC	93	8.8%
6	ONTARIO	113	10.7%
7	MANITOBA	5	0.5%
8	SASKATCHEWAN	4	0.4%
9	ALBERTA	28	2.6%
10	BRITISH COLUMBIA	18	1.7%
11	ONT. AND QUE.	144	13.6%
12	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN.	2	0.2%
13	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK.	1	0.1%
14	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	29	2.7%
15	ONT. AND QUE. AND B.C.	41	3.9%
16	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	21	2.0%
17	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
18	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
19	ONT. AND QUE. AND N.B.	0	
20	ONT. AND QUE. AND EAST	0	
21	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
22	ONT. AND QUE. AND WEST	0	
23	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
24	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
25	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
26	ONT. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES	0	
27	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES	0	
28	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA.	0	
29	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
30	ONT. AND MAN.	4	0.4%
31	ONT. AND B.C.	25	2.4%
32	ONT. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	2	0.2%
33	ONT. AND ALTA.	34	3.2%
34	ONT. AND P.E.I.	0	
35	ONT. AND THE WEST	2	0.2%
36	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
37	ONT. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	19	1.8%
38	ONT. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
39	ONT. AND NFLD. AND PRAIRIES	0	
40	ONT. AND NFLD. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
41	ONT. AND NFLD.	0	
42	ONT. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
43	ONT. AND N.S.	0	
44	ONT. AND N.S. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
45	ONT. AND N.B.	0	

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	ONT. AND N.B. AND MAN.	0	
47	ONT. AND EAST	0	
48	ONT. AND QUE. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA.	0	
49	ONT. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
50	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
51	ONT. AND QUE. AND SOME OF PRAIRIE PROVINCES	0	
52	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
53	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES AND ALTA.	0	
54	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE.	0	
55	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE. AND ALONG THE ST. LAWRENCE AND REGIO	0	
56	ONT. AND QUE. AND CENTRAL	0	
57	ONT. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
58	ONT. AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
59	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
60	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
61	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
62	ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
63	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
64	ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
65	ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
66	ONT. AND SASK.	1	0.1%
67	ONT. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
68	ONT. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
69	ONT. AND PRAIRIES	0	
70	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	0	
71	CENTRAL	0	
72	CENTRAL AND WEST	0	
73	ONT. AND VANCOUVER	0	
74	ONT. AND OIL PROVINCE	0	
75	ONT. AND NORTH EAST	0	
76	NORTHERN ONT.	0	
77	OTTAWA	1	0.1%
78	TORONTO	0	
79	ONT. , ALL HIGHLY INDUSTRIALIZED AREAS	0	
80	ONT. AND ALTA. AND WEST	0	
81	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
82	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	0	
83	ONT. AND NFLD. AND N.B.	0	
84	ONT. AND ATLANTICS	0	
85	ONT. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
86	ONT. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
87	ONT. AND N.B. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
88	ONT. AND WHEAT PROVINCES AND OUT WEST	1	0.1%
89	CENTRAL AND WESTERN PROVINCES	0	

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	TORONTO AREA AND B.C.	0	
91	ONT. AND MARITIMES	0	
92	ONT. AND ALL EASTERN PROVINCES	1	0.1%
93	ONT. AND MAN. AND N.B.	0	
94	ONT. AND QUE. AND TORONTO	0	
95	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND NFL	0	
96	TORONTO AND MONTREAL AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
97	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
98	ONT. AND N.B. AND EASTERN	0	
1001	QUE. AND ALTA.	17	1.6%
1002	QUE. AND B.C.	19	1.8%
1003	QUE. AND SASK. AND NFLD.	0	
1004	QUE. AND MAN. AND P.E.I.	0	
1005	QUE. AND N.S. AND P.E.I.	1	0.1%
1006	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.B. AND N.S.	0	
1007	QUE. AND WESTERN PROVINCES	1	0.1%
1008	QUE. AND PRAIRIES	0	
1009	QUE. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
1010	QUE. AND ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
1011	QUE. AND ATLANTIC PROVINCES	0	
1012	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	0	
1013	QUE. AND MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC AND N.W.T.	0	
1014	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
1015	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
1016	QUE. AND NFLD.	0	
1017	QUE. AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
1018	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
1019	QUE. AND NFLD. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
1020	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.B.	0	
1021	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA.	0	
1022	QUE. AND NFLD. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1023	QUE. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
1024	QUE. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1025	QUE. AND P.E.I.	0	
1026	QUE. AND N.S.	0	
1027	QUE. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
1028	QUE. AND N.S. AND WEST	1	0.1%
1029	QUE. AND N.S. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1030	QUE. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
1031	QUE. AND N.B. AND EAST	0	
1032	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND ALTA.	0	
1033	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND SASK.	0	
1034	QUE. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
1035	QUE. AND MAN.	0	

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1036	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1037	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
1038	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1039	QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1040	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
1041	QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1042	QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
1043	QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	5	0.5%
1044	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	2	0.2%
1045	QUE. AND WEST	0	
1046	QUE. AND N.W.T.	0	
1047	QUE. AND OTTAWA	0	
1048	QUE. AND WESTERN PROVINCES (ALL WEST OF OTTAWA)	0	
1049	GASPE	0	
1050	GASPE AND P.E.I.	0	
1051	GASPE AND ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT MONTREAL)	0	
1052	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT GASPE OR MONTREAL)	0	
1053	MONTREAL	0	
1054	EAST OF ONT.	0	
1055	BOURASSA, BOURASSA AND SITIRUOX	2	0.2%
1056	BOURASSA AND BARRETT	1	0.1%
1057	QUE. AND UPPER CANADA AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1058	QUE. AND N.S. AND MAN.	0	
1059	QUE. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
1060	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1061	QUE. AND OIL PROVINCES	1	0.1%
1062	QUE. AND SASK.	1	0.1%
1063	QUE. AND TORONTO	1	0.1%
1064	BOURASSA AND STANFIELD	1	0.1%
1065	QUE. AND N.S. AND MARITIMES	0	
1066	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I.	0	
2001	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
2002	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
2003	MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	3	0.3%
2004	MAN. AND SASK. AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
2005	MAN. AND SASK. AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2006	MAN. AND SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
2007	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2008	MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
2009	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2010	MAN. AND N.S.	0	
2011	MAN. AND MARITIMES	0	
2012	MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2013	MAN. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2014	MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2015	SASK. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
2016	SASK. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2017	SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2018	SASK. AND N.B.	0	
2019	SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.B.	0	
2020	ALTA. AND B.C.	6	0.6%
2021	ALTA. AND B.C. AND YUKON AND N.W.T.	0	
2022	ALTA. AND NFLD.	0	
2023	ALTA. AND P.E.I. AND NFLD.	0	
2024	ALTA. AND B.C. AND NFLD. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
2025	THE WEST	7	0.7%
2026	WEST AND N.B.	0	
2027	WEST AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2028	WEST AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
2029	WEST AND B.C.	0	
2030	WEST AND MARITIMES	0	
2031	WEST AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2032	WEST AND SASK.	0	
2033	MAN. AND SASK.	0	
2034	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2035	MAN. AND ALTA. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
2036	SASK. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2037	SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2038	SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
2039	SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
2040	ALTA. AND REGINA	0	
2041	ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2042	ALTA. AND PRAIRIES	0	
2043	B.C. AND MARITIMES	0	
2044	B.C. AND NFLD.	0	
2045	B.C. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
2046	B.C. AND PRAIRIES	3	0.3%
2047	PRAIRIES	2	0.2%
2048	PRAIRIES AND MARITIMES	0	
2049	PRAIRIE PROVINCES SUCH AS MAN. AND SASK., AND NFLD. AND OTH	0	
2050	VANCOUVER	0	
2051	ROCKIES TO EAST	0	
2052	N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
2053	THE WEST, ESPECIALLY ALTA.	0	
2054	PRAIRIE PROVINCES AND WESTERN PROVINCES AND B.C.	0	
2055	WESTERN PROVINCES	0	
2056	WESTERN PROVINCES (ALTA. AND B.C.)	0	
2057	ALTA. AND B.C. AND YUKON	0	

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2058	PRAIRIES, MOSTLY SASK. AND MAN., AND NFLD.	0	
2059	MAN. AND SASK. AND P.E.I.	0	
2060	PRAIRIES AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
2061	MAN. AND SASK. AND P.E.I.	0	
2062	WESTERN PROVINCES AND NORTHERN TERRITORIES	0	
2063	CENTRAL AND WESTERN PROVINCES	0	
2064	CENTRAL CANADA	0	
2065	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
2066	SASK. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2067	ALTA. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2068	SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND WEST	0	
2069	MAN. AND N.B.	0	
2070	SASK. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2071	SASK. AND ALTA. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2072	WEST AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
3001	ATLANTIC PROVINCES	1	0.1%
3002	MARITIME PROVINCES	0	
3003	EASTERN PROVINCES	3	0.3%
3004	MARITIMES AND NFLD.	0	
3005	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
3006	P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
3007	P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
3008	P.E.I. AND YUKON	0	
3009	P.E.I. AND MARITIMES	0	
3010	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
3011	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
3012	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND N.W.T.	0	
3013	NFLD. AND P.E.I.	2	0.2%
3014	NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
3015	NFLD. AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
3016	NFLD. AND N.W.T.	0	
3017	N.S. AND N.B.	0	
3018	N.S. AND EAST	0	
3019	N.S. AND NORTH	0	
3020	N.B. AND EAST COAST	1	0.1%
3021	MARITIMES (N.B.)	0	
3022	MARITIMES AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
3023	CAPE BRETON IN N.S.	0	
3024	P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
3025	EAST COAST	0	
3026	NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
4001	LIBERAL	21	2.0%
4002	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	4	0.4%
4003	N.D.P.	5	0.5%
4004	SOCIAL CREDIT	1	0.1%

v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4005	UNION NATIONALE	0	
4006	LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	2	0.2%
4007	LIBERAL AND N.D.P.	0	
4008	LIBERAL AND N.D.P. IN QUE.	0	
4009	SOCIALIST GOVERNMENTS	1	0.1%
4010	ONES WITH VAST MAJORITY, ON SIDE OF POLITICS	1	0.1%
4011	DEPENDS ON THE POLITICIANS OR THE REPRESENTATIVES	0	
4012	WHERE THE MONEY IS	0	
4013	MAINLAND PROVINCES	0	
4014	ALL EXCEPT THE MARITIMES	2	0.2%
4015	ALL EXCEPT NFLD., N.S., AND N.B.	0	
4016	ALL EXCEPT QUE.	0	
4017	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND QUE.	0	
4018	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND B.C.	0	
4019	ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
4020	THEY GET IT ALL, WE GET NONE	0	
4021	NO ONE PAYS MORE, BUT ALTA. PAYS LESS THAN THEIR SHARE	0	
4022	QUE. AND EASTERN PROVINCES NOT BEARING THEIR FAIR SHARE	0	
4023	N.S. NOT GETTING THEIR SHARE, ONT. AND QUE. TOO MUCH	0	
4024	WEST NOT GETTING THEIR SHARE	0	
4025	FREE ENTERPRISE GOVERNMENTS	1	0.1%
4026	ANY THAT ARE DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DEBTED TO OTHER PROVINCE	0	
4027	N.D.P. IN MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
4028	ENGLAND	0	
4029	FRANCE	0	
4030	ALL EXCEPT NFLD.	0	
4031	UNDERDEVELOPED REGION	0	
4032	IF THE PREMIER WAS A TORY HERE, COULD HAVE MORE PULL IN OTT	1	0.1%
4033	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES	0	
4034	UNITED STATES	0	
4035	LARGER PROVINCES	1	0.1%
4036	GREAT SHAPE WE ARE IN	1	0.1%
4037	TRUDEAU MUCH MORE FOR MONTREAL, ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL	0	
4038	ALL EXCEPT NFLD.	0	
4039	FARMERS OUT WEST	0	
4040	ALL EXCEPT ATLANTIC	0	
4041	EVERYBODY IS BETTER OFF THAN WE ARE	0	
4042	SOCIAL CREDIT AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	1	0.1%
4043	EAST HAS BEEN SCREWING THE WEST FOR YEARS, BUT IT IS CHANGIN	0	
8888	D.K., NO OPINION	1680	

# v60: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MORE POWERFUL			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9999	D.K. WHICH PROVINCES	23	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v61: FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q18A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1483	53.7%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	8	0.3%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	2	0.1%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	3	0.1%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	1	0.0%
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	8	0.3%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	12	0.4%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	1	0.0%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	18	0.7%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	

v61: FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	17	0.6%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	121	4.4%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	0	
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	64	2.3%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	8	0.3%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	1	0.0%
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	149	5.4%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	34	1.2%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	

# v61: FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	248	<div></div> 9.0%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	23	<div></div> 0.8%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	255	<div></div> 9.2%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	11	<div></div> 0.4%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	1	<div></div> 0.0%
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	289	<div></div> 10.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v62: PROVINCE AS PLACE TO LIVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) NOW, AS A PLACE TO LIVE, COULD YOU TELL ME, AGAIN USING THE THERMOMETER, HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q18B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1480	<div></div> 53.6%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	2	<div></div> 0.1%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	<div></div> 0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	2	<div></div> 0.1%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	<div></div> 0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	<div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	<div></div> 0.0%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	4	<div></div> 0.1%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	

v62: PROVINCE AS PLACE TO LIVE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	3	0.1%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	1	0.0%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	10	0.4%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	19	0.7%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	0	
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	55	2.0%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	2	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	

# v62: PROVINCE AS PLACE TO LIVE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	60	2.2%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	4	0.1%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	117	4.2%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	31	1.1%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	237	8.6%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	1	0.0%
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	20	0.7%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	268	9.7%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	14	0.5%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	425	15.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v63: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

v63: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE

Universe	All respondents
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?
Notes	Q18C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1513	54.8%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	68	2.5%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	2	0.1%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	2	0.1%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	1	0.0%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	45	1.6%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	46	1.7%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	2	0.1%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	64	2.3%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	3	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	86	3.1%

v63: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	5	0.2%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	303	11.0%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	3	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	146	5.3%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	14	0.5%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	151	5.5%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	33	1.2%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	139	5.0%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	10	0.4%

v63: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	72	2.6%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	2	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	51	1.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v64: FEEL ABOUT REGION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who did not mention the same region as their province in Q15B.
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT THIS REGION OF (NAME REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B., IF SAME AS PROVINCE, GO TO Q18F.)?
Notes	Q18D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	2167	78.5%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	1	0.0%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	0	
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	3	0.1%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	4	0.1%

v64: FEEL ABOUT REGION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	0	
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	6	0.2%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	0	
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	7	0.3%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	0	
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	72	2.6%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	0	
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	40	1.4%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	3	0.1%

# v64: FEEL ABOUT REGION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	99	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	29	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	140	<div><div></div></div> 5.1%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	86	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	87	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v65: REGION AS PLACE TO LIVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who did not mention the same region as their province in Q15B.		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) NOW SPECIFICALLY, AS A PLACE TO LIVE IN, HOW WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS REGION OF (NAME REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B.)?		
Notes	Q18E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	2168	<div><div></div></div> 78.5%

v65: REGION AS PLACE TO LIVE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	0	
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	0	
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	4	0.1%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	0	
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	0	
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	9	0.3%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	0	
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	7	0.3%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%

v65: REGION AS PLACE TO LIVE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	28	1.0%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	1	0.0%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	42	1.5%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	5	0.2%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	72	2.6%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	16	0.6%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	1	0.0%
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	135	4.9%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	10	0.4%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	1	0.0%
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	119	4.3%

# v65: REGION AS PLACE TO LIVE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	6	0.2%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	134	4.9%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v66: FEEL ABOUT CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?		
Notes	Q18F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1480	53.6%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	3	0.1%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	0	
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	0.0%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	7	0.3%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	3	0.1%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	0	
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	

v66: FEEL ABOUT CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	3	0.1%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	14	0.5%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	0	
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	76	2.8%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	0	
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	67	2.4%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	1	0.0%
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	4	0.1%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	128	4.6%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	

# v66: FEEL ABOUT CANADA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	21	0.8%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	188	6.8%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	17	0.6%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	1	0.0%
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	271	9.8%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	18	0.7%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	99 OR 100	455	16.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v67: CANADA AS A PLACE TO LIVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) NOW SPECIFICALLY, AS A COUNTRY TO LIVE IN, HOW WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL ABOUT CANADA?		
Notes	Q18G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1488	53.9%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	1	0.0%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	0	
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	0.0%

v67: CANADA AS A PLACE TO LIVE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	1	0.0%
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	3	0.1%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	1	0.0%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	0	
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	3	0.1%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	0	
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	10	0.4%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	0	
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	36	1.3%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	

v67: CANADA AS A PLACE TO LIVE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	0	
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	44	1.6%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	3	0.1%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	90	3.3%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	17	0.6%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	188	6.8%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	18	0.7%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	270	9.8%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	19	0.7%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	

# v67: CANADA AS A PLACE TO LIVE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	99 OR 100	566	<div></div> 20.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v68: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?		
Notes	Q18H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1500	<div></div> 54.3%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	28	<div></div> 1.0%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	<div></div> 0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	<div></div> 0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	<div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	20	<div></div> 0.7%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	34	<div></div> 1.2%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	0	
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	52	<div></div> 1.9%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	

v68: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	70	2.5%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	3	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	252	9.1%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	7	0.3%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	161	5.8%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	14	0.5%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	210	7.6%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	36	1.3%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	

v68: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	175	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	101	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	99 OR 100	82	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v69: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE UNITED STATES?
Notes	Q18I in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1570	<div><div></div></div> 56.9%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	69	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	45	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	

v69: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	65	2.4%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	7	0.3%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	81	2.9%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	7	0.3%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	126	4.6%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	3	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	375	13.6%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	6	0.2%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	

# v69: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	128	<div></div> 4.6%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	10	<div></div> 0.4%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	107	<div></div> 3.9%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	15	<div></div> 0.5%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	73	<div></div> 2.6%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	4	<div></div> 0.1%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	40	<div></div> 1.4%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	2	<div></div> 0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	99 OR 100	22	<div></div> 0.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v70: FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

# v70: FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND			
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND?	
Notes		Q18J in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1647	59.7%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	61	2.2%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	3	0.1%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	1	0.0%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	1	0.0%
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	32	1.2%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	44	1.6%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	7	0.3%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	74	2.7%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	2	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	97	3.5%

v70: FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	2	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	393	14.2%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	3	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	123	4.5%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	11	0.4%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	88	3.2%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	24	0.9%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	69	2.5%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	5	0.2%

# v70: FEEL ABOUT ENGLAND			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	36	1.3%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	4	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	1	0.0%
99	99 OR 100	33	1.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v71: FEEL ABOUT FRANCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(THERMOMETER) HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT FRANCE?		
Notes	Q18K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1698	61.5%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	78	2.8%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	3	0.1%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	1	0.0%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	52	1.9%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	1	0.0%
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	2	0.1%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	76	2.8%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	

v71: FEEL ABOUT FRANCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	5	0.2%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	102	3.7%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	4	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	91	3.3%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	5	0.2%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	418	15.1%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	4	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	93	3.4%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	7	0.3%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	

# v71: FEEL ABOUT FRANCE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	57	2.1%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	7	0.3%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	31	1.1%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	2	0.1%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	12	0.4%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	2	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	99 OR 100	8	0.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9999] [Missing=*/8888/9999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=953 -/] [Invalid=1808 -/]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA?		
Post-question	(IF YES) WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Notes	Q19A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO	356	37.4%

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NEWFOUNDLAND	4	0.4%
2	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	3	0.3%
3	NOVA SCOTIA	3	0.3%
4	NEW BRUNSWICK	9	0.9%
5	QUEBEC	54	5.7%
6	ONTARIO	94	9.9%
7	MANITOBA	8	0.8%
8	SASKATCHEWAN	4	0.4%
9	ALBERTA	24	2.5%
10	BRITISH COLUMBIA	17	1.8%
11	ONT. AND QUE.	62	6.5%
12	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN.	1	0.1%
13	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK.	1	0.1%
14	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	7	0.7%
15	ONT. AND QUE. AND B.C.	17	1.8%
16	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	7	0.7%
17	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
18	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
19	ONT. AND QUE. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
20	ONT. AND QUE. AND EAST	0	
21	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES AND B.C.	0	
22	ONT. AND QUE. AND WEST	0	
23	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
24	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
25	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
26	ONT. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
27	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
28	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
29	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
30	ONT. AND MAN.	2	0.2%
31	ONT. AND B.C.	40	4.2%
32	ONT. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
33	ONT. AND ALTA.	28	2.9%
34	ONT. AND P.E.I.	0	
35	ONT. AND THE WEST	4	0.4%
36	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
37	ONT. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	33	3.5%
38	ONT. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
39	ONT. AND NFLD. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
40	ONT. AND NFLD. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
41	ONT. AND NFLD.	1	0.1%
42	ONT. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
43	ONT. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
44	ONT. AND N.S. AND B.C.	0	
45	ONT. AND N.B.	0	

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	ONT. AND N.B. AND MAN.	0	
47	ONT. AND EAST	0	
48	ONT. AND QUE. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA.	0	
49	ONT. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
50	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
51	ONT. AND QUE. AND SOME OF PRAIRIE PROVINCES	0	
52	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
53	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
54	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE.	0	
55	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE. AND ALONG THE ST. LAWRENCE AND REGIO	0	
56	ONT. AND QUE. AND CENTRAL	0	
57	ONT. AND MARITIMES	0	
58	ONT. AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
59	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
60	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
61	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
62	ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
63	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK.	1	0.1%
64	ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
65	ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA.	0	
66	ONT. AND SASK.	0	
67	ONT. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
68	ONT. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
69	ONT. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
70	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	0	
71	CENTRAL	0	
72	CENTRAL AND WEST	0	
73	ONT. AND VANCOUVER	0	
74	ONT. AND OIL PROVINCE	0	
75	ONT. AND NORTH EAST	1	0.1%
76	NORTHERN ONT.	2	0.2%
77	OTTAWA	0	
78	TORONTO	0	
79	ONT. , ALL HIGHLY INDUSTRIALIZED AREAS	0	
80	ONT. AND ALTA. AND WEST	0	
81	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
82	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	0	
83	ONT. AND NFLD. AND N.B.	0	
84	ONT. AND ATLANTICS	0	
85	ONT. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
86	ONT. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
87	ONT. AND N.B. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
88	ONT. AND WHEAT PROVINCES AND OUT WEST	2	0.2%
89	CENTRAL AND WESTERN PROVINCES	0	

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	TORONTO AREA AND B.C.	0	
91	ONT. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
92	ONT. AND ALL EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
93	ONT. AND MAN. AND N.B.	0	
94	ONT. AND QUE. AND TORONTO	0	
95	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND NFL	0	
96	TORONTO AND MONTREAL AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
97	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
98	ONT. AND N.B. AND EASTERN	1	0.1%
1001	QUE. AND ALTA.	3	0.3%
1002	QUE. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1003	QUE. AND SASK. AND NFLD.	0	
1004	QUE. AND MAN. AND P.E.I.	0	
1005	QUE. AND N.S. AND P.E.I.	0	
1006	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.B. AND N.S.	0	
1007	QUE. AND WESTERN PROVINCES	0	
1008	QUE. AND PRAIRIES	0	
1009	QUE. AND MARITIMES	7	0.7%
1010	QUE. AND ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
1011	QUE. AND ATLANTIC PROVINCES	0	
1012	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	0	
1013	QUE. AND MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC AND N.W.T.	0	
1014	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
1015	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
1016	QUE. AND NFLD.	0	
1017	QUE. AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
1018	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
1019	QUE. AND NFLD. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
1020	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.B.	0	
1021	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA.	0	
1022	QUE. AND NFLD. AND B.C.	0	
1023	QUE. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
1024	QUE. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1025	QUE. AND P.E.I.	0	
1026	QUE. AND N.S.	0	
1027	QUE. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
1028	QUE. AND N.S. AND WEST	0	
1029	QUE. AND N.S. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1030	QUE. AND N.B.	4	0.4%
1031	QUE. AND N.B. AND EAST	1	0.1%
1032	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND ALTA.	0	
1033	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND SASK.	0	
1034	QUE. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	1	0.1%
1035	QUE. AND MAN.	0	

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1036	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1037	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
1038	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1039	QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1040	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
1041	QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
1042	QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
1043	QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
1044	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
1045	QUE. AND WEST	1	0.1%
1046	QUE. AND N.W.T.	0	
1047	QUE. AND OTTAWA	0	
1048	QUE. AND WESTERN PROVINCES (ALL WEST OF OTTAWA)	0	
1049	GASPE	0	
1050	GASPE AND P.E.I.	0	
1051	GASPE AND ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT MONTREAL)	0	
1052	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT GASPE OR MONTREAL)	1	0.1%
1053	MONTREAL	0	
1054	EAST OF ONT.	0	
1055	BOURASSA, BOURASSA AND SITIRUOX	0	
1056	BOURASSA AND BARRETT	0	
1057	QUE. AND UPPER CANADA AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1058	QUE. AND N.S. AND MAN.	0	
1059	QUE. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
1060	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1061	QUE. AND OIL PROVINCES	0	
1062	QUE. AND SASK.	0	
1063	QUE. AND TORONTO	0	
1064	BOURASSA AND STANFIELD	0	
1065	QUE. AND N.S. AND MARITIMES	0	
1066	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I.	0	
2001	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	9	0.9%
2002	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	12	1.3%
2003	MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
2004	MAN. AND SASK. AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
2005	MAN. AND SASK. AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2006	MAN. AND SASK. AND MARITIMES	2	0.2%
2007	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2008	MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
2009	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2010	MAN. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
2011	MAN. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2012	MAN. AND B.C.	0	
2013	MAN. AND ALTA.	0	

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2014	MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2015	SASK. AND ALTA.	5	0.5%
2016	SASK. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2017	SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2018	SASK. AND N.B.	0	
2019	SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.B.	0	
2020	ALTA. AND B.C.	19	2.0%
2021	ALTA. AND B.C. AND YUKON AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
2022	ALTA. AND NFLD.	0	
2023	ALTA. AND P.E.I. AND NFLD.	1	0.1%
2024	ALTA. AND B.C. AND NFLD. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
2025	THE WEST	6	0.6%
2026	WEST AND N.B.	0	
2027	WEST AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2028	WEST AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
2029	WEST AND B.C.	0	
2030	WEST AND MARITIMES	2	0.2%
2031	WEST AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2032	WEST AND SASK.	1	0.1%
2033	MAN. AND SASK.	2	0.2%
2034	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2035	MAN. AND ALTA. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
2036	SASK. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2037	SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	4	0.4%
2038	SASK. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2039	SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
2040	ALTA. AND REGINA	0	
2041	ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2042	ALTA. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
2043	B.C. AND MARITIMES	0	
2044	B.C. AND NFLD.	1	0.1%
2045	B.C. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
2046	B.C. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
2047	PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
2048	PRAIRIES AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2049	PRAIRIE PROVINCES SUCH AS MAN. AND SASK., AND NFLD. AND OTH	1	0.1%
2050	VANCOUVER	0	
2051	ROCKIES TO EAST	0	
2052	N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
2053	THE WEST, ESPECIALLY ALTA.	0	
2054	PRAIRIE PROVINCES AND WESTERN PROVINCES AND B.C.	0	
2055	WESTERN PROVINCES	2	0.2%
2056	WESTERN PROVINCES (ALTA. AND B.C.)	0	
2057	ALTA. AND B.C. AND YUKON	1	0.1%

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2058	PRAIRIES, MOSTLY SASK. AND MAN., AND NFLD.	0	
2059	MAN. AND SASK. AND P.E.I.	0	
2060	PRAIRIES AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
2061	MAN. AND SASK. AND P.E.I.	0	
2062	WESTERN PROVINCES AND NORTHERN TERRITORIES	0	
2063	CENTRAL AND WESTERN PROVINCES	0	
2064	CENTRAL CANADA	0	
2065	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
2066	SASK. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2067	ALTA. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2068	SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND WEST	1	0.1%
2069	MAN. AND N.B.	0	
2070	SASK. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2071	SASK. AND ALTA. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2072	WEST AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
3001	ATLANTIC PROVINCES	3	0.3%
3002	MARITIME PROVINCES	9	0.9%
3003	EASTERN PROVINCES	2	0.2%
3004	MARITIMES AND NFLD.	1	0.1%
3005	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	4	0.4%
3006	P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
3007	P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	2	0.2%
3008	P.E.I. AND YUKON	0	
3009	P.E.I. AND MARITIMES	0	
3010	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
3011	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
3012	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND N.W.T.	0	
3013	NFLD. AND P.E.I.	0	
3014	NFLD. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
3015	NFLD. AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
3016	NFLD. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
3017	N.S. AND N.B.	3	0.3%
3018	N.S. AND EAST	0	
3019	N.S. AND NORTH	0	
3020	N.B. AND EAST COAST	0	
3021	MARITIMES (N.B.)	0	
3022	MARITIMES AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	1	0.1%
3023	CAPE BRETON IN N.S.	0	
3024	P.E.I. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
3025	EAST COAST	0	
3026	NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
4001	LIBERAL	0	
4002	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	0	
4003	N.D.P.	0	
4004	SOCIAL CREDIT	0	

v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4005	UNION NATIONALE	0	
4006	LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	0	
4007	LIBERAL AND N.D.P.	0	
4008	LIBERAL AND N.D.P. IN QUE.	0	
4009	SOCIALIST GOVERNMENTS	0	
4010	ONES WITH VAST MAJORITY, ON SIDE OF POLITICS	0	
4011	DEPENDS ON THE POLITICIANS OR THE REPRESENTATIVES	0	
4012	WHERE THE MONEY IS	0	
4013	MAINLAND PROVINCES	0	
4014	ALL EXCEPT THE MARITIMES	1	0.1%
4015	ALL EXCEPT NFLD., N.S., AND N.B.	0	
4016	ALL EXCEPT QUE.	3	0.3%
4017	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND QUE.	1	0.1%
4018	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND B.C.	0	
4019	ALL THE PROVINCES	5	0.5%
4020	THEY GET IT ALL, WE GET NONE	0	
4021	NO ONE PAYS MORE, BUT ALTA. PAYS LESS THAN THEIR SHARE	1	0.1%
4022	QUE. AND EASTERN PROVINCES NOT BEARING THEIR FAIR SHARE	0	
4023	N.S. NOT GETTING THEIR SHARE, ONT. AND QUE. TOO MUCH	0	
4024	WEST NOT GETTING THEIR SHARE	0	
4025	FREE ENTERPRISE GOVERNMENTS	0	
4026	ANY THAT ARE DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DEBTED TO OTHER PROVINCE	1	0.1%
4027	N.D.P. IN MAN. AND B.C.	0	
4028	ENGLAND	0	
4029	FRANCE	0	
4030	ALL EXCEPT NFLD.	0	
4031	UNDERDEVELOPED REGION	0	
4032	IF THE PREMIER WAS A TORY HERE, COULD HAVE MORE PULL IN OTT	0	
4033	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES	0	
4034	UNITED STATES	1	0.1%
4035	LARGER PROVINCES	0	
4036	GREAT SHAPE WE ARE IN	0	
4037	TRUDEAU MUCH MORE FOR MONTREAL, ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL	0	
4038	ALL EXCEPT NFLD.	0	
4039	FARMERS OUT WEST	0	
4040	ALL EXCEPT ATLANTIC	1	0.1%
4041	EVERYBODY IS BETTER OFF THAN WE ARE	0	
4042	SOCIAL CREDIT AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	0	
4043	EAST HAS BEEN SCREWING THE WEST FOR YEARS, BUT IT IS CHANGIN	0	
8888	D.K., NO OPINION	1787	

# v72: PROVINCE BEARS MORE THAN SHARE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9999	D.K. WHICH PROVINCES	21	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9999] [Missing=*/8888/9999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=964 /-] [Invalid=1797 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?		
Post-question	(IF YES) WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Notes	Q20A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO	350	<div></div> 36.3%
1	NEWFOUNDLAND	5	<div></div> 0.5%
2	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	2	<div></div> 0.2%
3	NOVA SCOTIA	1	<div></div> 0.1%
4	NEW BRUNSWICK	3	<div></div> 0.3%
5	QUEBEC	178	<div></div> 18.5%
6	ONTARIO	80	<div></div> 8.3%
7	MANITOBA	0	
8	SASKATCHEWAN	1	<div></div> 0.1%
9	ALBERTA	11	<div></div> 1.1%
10	BRITISH COLUMBIA	7	<div></div> 0.7%
11	ONT. AND QUE.	102	<div></div> 10.6%
12	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN.	0	
13	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK.	1	<div></div> 0.1%
14	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	6	<div></div> 0.6%
15	ONT. AND QUE. AND B.C.	9	<div></div> 0.9%
16	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	5	<div></div> 0.5%
17	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
18	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
19	ONT. AND QUE. AND N.B.	3	<div></div> 0.3%
20	ONT. AND QUE. AND EAST	3	<div></div> 0.3%
21	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES AND B.C.	0	
22	ONT. AND QUE. AND WEST	1	<div></div> 0.1%
23	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
24	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
25	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
26	ONT. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES	0	
27	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES	2	<div></div> 0.2%
28	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA.	0	
29	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
30	ONT. AND MAN.	2	<div></div> 0.2%
31	ONT. AND B.C.	12	<div></div> 1.2%
32	ONT. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	

v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	ONT. AND ALTA.	7	0.7%
34	ONT. AND P.E.I.	0	
35	ONT. AND THE WEST	9	0.9%
36	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
37	ONT. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
38	ONT. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
39	ONT. AND NFLD. AND PRAIRIES	0	
40	ONT. AND NFLD. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
41	ONT. AND NFLD.	0	
42	ONT. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
43	ONT. AND N.S.	0	
44	ONT. AND N.S. AND B.C.	0	
45	ONT. AND N.B.	0	
46	ONT. AND N.B. AND MAN.	0	
47	ONT. AND EAST	0	
48	ONT. AND QUE. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA.	0	
49	ONT. AND QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
50	ONT. AND QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
51	ONT. AND QUE. AND SOME OF PRAIRIE PROVINCES	0	
52	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
53	ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES AND ALTA.	0	
54	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE.	1	0.1%
55	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE. AND ALONG THE ST. LAWRENCE AND REGIO	0	
56	ONT. AND QUE. AND CENTRAL	0	
57	ONT. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
58	ONT. AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
59	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	3	0.3%
60	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
61	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
62	ONT. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
63	ONT. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
64	ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
65	ONT. AND MAN. AND ALTA.	0	
66	ONT. AND SASK.	0	
67	ONT. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
68	ONT. AND SASK. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
69	ONT. AND PRAIRIES	0	
70	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND WEST	1	0.1%
71	CENTRAL	1	0.1%
72	CENTRAL AND WEST	0	
73	ONT. AND VANCOUVER	0	
74	ONT. AND OIL PROVINCE	0	
75	ONT. AND NORTH EAST	0	
76	NORTHERN ONT.	0	

v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	OTTAWA	0	
78	TORONTO	1	0.1%
79	ONT. , ALL HIGHLY INDUSTRIALIZED AREAS	0	
80	ONT. AND ALTA. AND WEST	0	
81	ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
82	SOUTHERN ONT. AND QUE. AND ALTA.	0	
83	ONT. AND NFLD. AND N.B.	2	0.2%
84	ONT. AND ATLANTICS	1	0.1%
85	ONT. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
86	ONT. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
87	ONT. AND N.B. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
88	ONT. AND WHEAT PROVINCES AND OUT WEST	4	0.4%
89	CENTRAL AND WESTERN PROVINCES	0	
90	TORONTO AREA AND B.C.	0	
91	ONT. AND MARITIMES	0	
92	ONT. AND ALL EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
93	ONT. AND MAN. AND N.B.	0	
94	ONT. AND QUE. AND TORONTO	0	
95	ONT. AND QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND NFL	0	
96	TORONTO AND MONTREAL AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
97	ONT. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	0	
98	ONT. AND N.B. AND EASTERN	0	
1001	QUE. AND ALTA.	2	0.2%
1002	QUE. AND B.C.	3	0.3%
1003	QUE. AND SASK. AND NFLD.	0	
1004	QUE. AND MAN. AND P.E.I.	0	
1005	QUE. AND N.S. AND P.E.I.	0	
1006	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.B. AND N.S.	0	
1007	QUE. AND WESTERN PROVINCES	1	0.1%
1008	QUE. AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
1009	QUE. AND MARITIMES	13	1.3%
1010	QUE. AND ALL THE PROVINCES	0	
1011	QUE. AND ATLANTIC PROVINCES	2	0.2%
1012	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
1013	QUE. AND MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC AND N.W.T.	0	
1014	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
1015	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	2	0.2%
1016	QUE. AND NFLD.	5	0.5%
1017	QUE. AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
1018	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
1019	QUE. AND NFLD. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	1	0.1%
1020	QUE. AND NFLD. AND N.B.	0	
1021	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA.	0	
1022	QUE. AND NFLD. AND B.C.	0	

v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1023	QUE. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
1024	QUE. AND P.E.I. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1025	QUE. AND P.E.I.	1	0.1%
1026	QUE. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
1027	QUE. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
1028	QUE. AND N.S. AND WEST	0	
1029	QUE. AND N.S. AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1030	QUE. AND N.B.	0	
1031	QUE. AND N.B. AND EAST	0	
1032	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
1033	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND SASK.	1	0.1%
1034	QUE. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	5	0.5%
1035	QUE. AND MAN.	1	0.1%
1036	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK.	2	0.2%
1037	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
1038	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1039	QUE. AND MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1040	QUE. AND MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
1041	QUE. AND MAN. AND B.C.	0	
1042	QUE. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
1043	QUE. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
1044	QUE. AND PRAIRIES AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1045	QUE. AND WEST	0	
1046	QUE. AND N.W.T.	0	
1047	QUE. AND OTTAWA	0	
1048	QUE. AND WESTERN PROVINCES (ALL WEST OF OTTAWA)	0	
1049	GASPE	0	
1050	GASPE AND P.E.I.	0	
1051	GASPE AND ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT MONTREAL)	0	
1052	ONE OR MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUE. (NOT GASPE OR MONTREAL)	1	0.1%
1053	MONTREAL	0	
1054	EAST OF ONT.	0	
1055	BOURASSA, BOURASSA AND SITIRUOX	0	
1056	BOURASSA AND BARRETT	0	
1057	QUE. AND UPPER CANADA AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
1058	QUE. AND N.S. AND MAN.	1	0.1%
1059	QUE. AND SASK. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
1060	QUE. AND MARITIMES AND MAN. AND SASK.	0	
1061	QUE. AND OIL PROVINCES	0	
1062	QUE. AND SASK.	0	
1063	QUE. AND TORONTO	0	
1064	BOURASSA AND STANFIELD	0	
1065	QUE. AND N.S. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
1066	QUE. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I.	1	0.1%

v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2001	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	2	0.2%
2002	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2003	MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
2004	MAN. AND SASK. AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
2005	MAN. AND SASK. AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2006	MAN. AND SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
2007	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	0	
2008	MAN. AND SASK. AND B.C.	0	
2009	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2010	MAN. AND N.S.	0	
2011	MAN. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2012	MAN. AND B.C.	0	
2013	MAN. AND ALTA.	2	0.2%
2014	MAN. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	1	0.1%
2015	SASK. AND ALTA.	3	0.3%
2016	SASK. AND B.C.	0	
2017	SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2018	SASK. AND N.B.	0	
2019	SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.B.	0	
2020	ALTA. AND B.C.	3	0.3%
2021	ALTA. AND B.C. AND YUKON AND N.W.T.	0	
2022	ALTA. AND NFLD.	1	0.1%
2023	ALTA. AND P.E.I. AND NFLD.	0	
2024	ALTA. AND B.C. AND NFLD. AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
2025	THE WEST	14	1.5%
2026	WEST AND N.B.	0	
2027	WEST AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2028	WEST AND NFLD. AND MARITIMES	0	
2029	WEST AND B.C.	2	0.2%
2030	WEST AND MARITIMES	0	
2031	WEST AND MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA.	1	0.1%
2032	WEST AND SASK.	0	
2033	MAN. AND SASK.	0	
2034	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2035	MAN. AND ALTA. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	1	0.1%
2036	SASK. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
2037	SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C.	0	
2038	SASK. AND MARITIMES	0	
2039	SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
2040	ALTA. AND REGINA	0	
2041	ALTA. AND MARITIMES	0	
2042	ALTA. AND PRAIRIES	0	
2043	B.C. AND MARITIMES	1	0.1%
2044	B.C. AND NFLD.	0	
2045	B.C. AND NFLD. AND N.S.	0	

v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2046	B.C. AND PRAIRIES	0	
2047	PRAIRIES	2	0.2%
2048	PRAIRIES AND MARITIMES	2	0.2%
2049	PRAIRIE PROVINCES SUCH AS MAN. AND SASK., AND NFLD. AND OTH	0	
2050	VANCOUVER	1	0.1%
2051	ROCKIES TO EAST	0	
2052	N.W.T. AND YUKON	1	0.1%
2053	THE WEST, ESPECIALLY ALTA.	1	0.1%
2054	PRAIRIE PROVINCES AND WESTERN PROVINCES AND B.C.	0	
2055	WESTERN PROVINCES	0	
2056	WESTERN PROVINCES (ALTA. AND B.C.)	0	
2057	ALTA. AND B.C. AND YUKON	0	
2058	PRAIRIES, MOSTLY SASK. AND MAN., AND NFLD.	0	
2059	MAN. AND SASK. AND P.E.I.	0	
2060	PRAIRIES AND EASTERN PROVINCES	0	
2061	MAN. AND SASK. AND P.E.I.	0	
2062	WESTERN PROVINCES AND NORTHERN TERRITORIES	0	
2063	CENTRAL AND WESTERN PROVINCES	1	0.1%
2064	CENTRAL CANADA	1	0.1%
2065	MAN. AND SASK. AND ALTA. AND N.S.	0	
2066	SASK. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
2067	ALTA. AND NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
2068	SASK. AND ALTA. AND B.C. AND WEST	0	
2069	MAN. AND N.B.	0	
2070	SASK. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
2071	SASK. AND ALTA. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
2072	WEST AND NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
3001	ATLANTIC PROVINCES	1	0.1%
3002	MARITIME PROVINCES	14	1.5%
3003	EASTERN PROVINCES	6	0.6%
3004	MARITIMES AND NFLD.	1	0.1%
3005	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	1	0.1%
3006	P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
3007	P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B.	0	
3008	P.E.I. AND YUKON	0	
3009	P.E.I. AND MARITIMES	0	
3010	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
3011	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.B.	0	
3012	NFLD. AND P.E.I. AND N.S. AND N.B. AND N.W.T.	1	0.1%
3013	NFLD. AND P.E.I.	1	0.1%
3014	NFLD. AND N.S.	0	
3015	NFLD. AND MARITIMES AND N.W.T.	0	
3016	NFLD. AND N.W.T.	0	
3017	N.S. AND N.B.	0	

v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3018	N.S. AND EAST	1	0.1%
3019	N.S. AND NORTH	1	0.1%
3020	N.B. AND EAST COAST	0	
3021	MARITIMES (N.B.)	0	
3022	MARITIMES AND N.W.T. AND YUKON	0	
3023	CAPE BRETON IN N.S.	1	0.1%
3024	P.E.I. AND N.S.	0	
3025	EAST COAST	1	0.1%
3026	NFLD. AND N.S. AND N.B.	2	0.2%
4001	LIBERAL	0	
4002	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	0	
4003	N.D.P.	0	
4004	SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
4005	UNION NATIONALE	0	
4006	LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	0	
4007	LIBERAL AND N.D.P.	0	
4008	LIBERAL AND N.D.P. IN QUE.	0	
4009	SOCIALIST GOVERNMENTS	0	
4010	ONES WITH VAST MAJORITY, ON SIDE OF POLITICS	0	
4011	DEPENDS ON THE POLITICIANS OR THE REPRESENTATIVES	0	
4012	WHERE THE MONEY IS	0	
4013	MAINLAND PROVINCES	0	
4014	ALL EXCEPT THE MARITIMES	0	
4015	ALL EXCEPT NFLD., N.S., AND N.B.	0	
4016	ALL EXCEPT QUE.	0	
4017	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND QUE.	1	0.1%
4018	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND B.C.	0	
4019	ALL THE PROVINCES	3	0.3%
4020	THEY GET IT ALL, WE GET NONE	1	0.1%
4021	NO ONE PAYS MORE, BUT ALTA. PAYS LESS THAN THEIR SHARE	0	
4022	QUE. AND EASTERN PROVINCES NOT BEARING THEIR FAIR SHARE	0	
4023	N.S. NOT GETTING THEIR SHARE, ONT. AND QUE. TOO MUCH	0	
4024	WEST NOT GETTING THEIR SHARE	1	0.1%
4025	FREE ENTERPRISE GOVERNMENTS	0	
4026	ANY THAT ARE DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DEBTED TO OTHER PROVINCE	0	
4027	N.D.P. IN MAN. AND B.C.	0	
4028	ENGLAND	0	
4029	FRANCE	0	
4030	ALL EXCEPT NFLD.	0	
4031	UNDERDEVELOPED REGION	0	
4032	IF THE PREMIER WAS A TORY HERE, COULD HAVE MORE PULL IN OTT	0	

# v73: PROVINCE BENEFITS MORE THAN SHARE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4033	ALL EXCEPT ONT. AND QUE. AND MARITIMES	0	
4034	UNITED STATES	0	
4035	LARGER PROVINCES	0	
4036	GREAT SHAPE WE ARE IN	0	
4037	TRUDEAU MUCH MORE FOR MONTREAL, ALWAYS HAS BEEN, ALWAYS WILL	1	0.1%
4038	ALL EXCEPT NFLD.	1	0.1%
4039	FARMERS OUT WEST	0	
4040	ALL EXCEPT ATLANTIC	0	
4041	EVERYBODY IS BETTER OFF THAN WE ARE	0	
4042	SOCIAL CREDIT AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	0	
4043	EAST HAS BEEN SCREWING THE WEST FOR YEARS, BUT IT IS CHANGIN	0	
8888	D.K., NO OPINION	1773	
9999	D.K. WHICH PROVINCES	24	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v74: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2695 /-] [Invalid=66 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THIS IS A LIST OF SOME THINGS FOR WHICH GOVERNMENTS IN CANADA ARE RESPONSIBLE. FOR EACH ONE, I WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA OR THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) IS MORE IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.		
Literal question	EDUCATION		
Notes	Q21A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1477	54.8%
1	FEDERAL	176	6.5%
2	PROVINCIAL	844	31.3%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	198	7.3%
8	DON'T KNOW	66	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v75: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2659 /-] [Invalid=102 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THIS IS A LIST OF SOME THINGS FOR WHICH GOVERNMENTS IN CANADA ARE RESPONSIBLE. FOR EACH ONE, I WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA OR THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) IS MORE IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.		
Literal question	FOREIGN AFFAIRS		
Notes	Q21B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1479	55.6%

# v75: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FEDERAL	1050	<div><div></div></div> 39.5%
2	PROVINCIAL	38	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	92	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
8	DON'T KNOW	102	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v76: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2664 /-] [Invalid=97 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THIS IS A LIST OF SOME THINGS FOR WHICH GOVERNMENTS IN CANADA ARE RESPONSIBLE. FOR EACH ONE, I WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA OR THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) IS MORE IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.		
Literal question	LOCAL GOVERNMENT		
Notes	Q21C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1489	<div><div></div></div> 55.9%
1	FEDERAL	84	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
2	PROVINCIAL	950	<div><div></div></div> 35.7%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	141	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
8	DON'T KNOW	97	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v77: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2707 /-] [Invalid=54 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THIS IS A LIST OF SOME THINGS FOR WHICH GOVERNMENTS IN CANADA ARE RESPONSIBLE. FOR EACH ONE, I WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA OR THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) IS MORE IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.		
Literal question	HOSPITAL INSURANCE		
Notes	Q21D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1470	<div><div></div></div> 54.3%
1	FEDERAL	313	<div><div></div></div> 11.6%
2	PROVINCIAL	773	<div><div></div></div> 28.6%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	151	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
8	DON'T KNOW	54	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v78: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2695 /-] [Invalid=66 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v78: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE			
Pre-question	THIS IS A LIST OF SOME THINGS FOR WHICH GOVERNMENTS IN CANADA ARE RESPONSIBLE. FOR EACH ONE, I WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA OR THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) IS MORE IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.		
Literal question	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE		
Notes	Q21E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1478	<div></div> 54.8%
1	FEDERAL	733	<div></div> 27.2%
2	PROVINCIAL	339	<div></div> 12.6%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	145	<div></div> 5.4%
8	DON'T KNOW	66	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v79: GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR ECONOMY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2688 /-] [Invalid=73 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THIS IS A LIST OF SOME THINGS FOR WHICH GOVERNMENTS IN CANADA ARE RESPONSIBLE. FOR EACH ONE, I WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA OR THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE) IS MORE IMPORTANT IN DEALING WITH THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.		
Literal question	THE ECONOMY		
Notes	Q21F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1480	<div></div> 55.1%
1	FEDERAL	847	<div></div> 31.5%
2	PROVINCIAL	85	<div></div> 3.2%
3	BOTH EQUALLY	276	<div></div> 10.3%
8	DON'T KNOW	73	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v80: SAME PARTY RUN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2688 /-] [Invalid=73 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT THE SAME POLITICAL PARTY SHOULD NOT CONTROL BOTH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA AND THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE?) AT THE SAME TIME, BUT OTHERS SAY THAT IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?		
Notes	Q22A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1512	<div></div> 56.2%
1	SAME PARTY SHOULD NOT CONTROL BOTH LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT	316	<div></div> 11.8%
2	MAKES NO DIFFERENCE	842	<div></div> 31.3%
3	SAME PARTY SHOULD CONTROL BOTH	18	<div></div> 0.7%
8	D.K.	73	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v81: SAME PARTY RUN-INTENSITY			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=311 /-] [Invalid=2450 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT THE SAME POLITICAL PARTY SHOULD NOT CONTROL BOTH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA AND THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (PROVINCE?) AT THE SAME TIME, BUT OTHERS SAY THAT IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?	
Literal question		HOW STRONGLY DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT?	
Notes		Q22B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	124	<div></div> 39.9%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	151	<div></div> 48.6%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	36	<div></div> 11.6%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	N.A.	982	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v82: MAP- 1ST RESPONSE PLACEMENT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.	
Literal question		TYPE OF RESPONSE (FIRST MENTION)	
Notes		Q14 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO RESPONSE	1684	<div></div> 61.0%
1	PLACED, AND WRITTEN ON PLACE	321	<div></div> 11.6%
2	PLACED REGIONAL OR PROVINCIAL REFERENCE BUT NOT WRITTEN ON P	76	<div></div> 2.8%
3	GENERAL, NON-PLACED	680	<div></div> 24.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v83: MAP- 1ST RESPONSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2230] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.	
Notes		Q14 in the documentation.	
Frequency table not shown (1513 Modalities)			
# v84: MAP- 2ND RESPONSE PLACEMENT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	

# v84: MAP- 2ND RESPONSE PLACEMENT				
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.		
Literal question		TYPE OF RESPONSE (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes		Q14 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO RESPONSE	1903	<div><div></div></div> 68.9%	
1	PLACED, AND WRITTEN ON PLACE	295	<div><div></div></div> 10.7%	
2	PLACED REGIONAL OR PROVINCIAL REFERENCE BUT NOT WRITTEN ON P	63	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%	
3	GENERAL, NON-PLACED	500	<div><div></div></div> 18.1%	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v85: MAP- 2ND RESPONSE				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2230] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.		
Literal question		CONTENT (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes		Q10D in the documentation.		
Frequency table not shown (1512 Modalities)				
# v86: MAP- 3RD RESPONSE PLACEMENT				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.		
Literal question		TYPE OF RESPONSE (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes		Q14 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO RESPONSE	2052	<div><div></div></div> 74.3%	
1	PLACED, AND WRITTEN ON PLACE	260	<div><div></div></div> 9.4%	
2	PLACED REGIONAL OR PROVINCIAL REFERENCE BUT NOT WRITTEN ON P	46	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%	
3	GENERAL, NON-PLACED	403	<div><div></div></div> 14.6%	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v87: MAP - 3RD RESPONSE				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2230] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		

# v87: MAP - 3RD RESPONSE			
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.	
Literal question		CONTENT (THIRD MENTION)	
Notes		Q10D in the documentation.	
Frequency table not shown (1512 Modalities)			
# v88: MAP- 4TH RESPONSE PLACEMENT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.	
Literal question		TYPE OF RESPONSE (FOURTH MENTION)	
Notes		Q14 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO RESPONSE	2182	<div><div></div></div> 79.0%
1	PLACED, AND WRITTEN ON PLACE	219	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
2	PLACED REGIONAL OR PROVINCIAL REFERENCE BUT NOT WRITTEN ON P	45	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
3	GENERAL, NON-PLACED	315	<div><div></div></div> 11.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v89: MAP- 4TH RESPONSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2230] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.	
Literal question		CONTENT (FOURTH MENTION)	
Notes		Q10D in the documentation.	
Frequency table not shown (1512 Modalities)			
# v90: MAP- 5TH RESPONSE PLACEMENT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.	
Literal question		TYPE OF RESPONSE (FIFTH MENTION)	
Notes		Q14 in the documentation.	

# v90: MAP- 5TH RESPONSE PLACEMENT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO RESPONSE	2320	<div><div></div></div> 84.0%
1	PLACED, AND WRITTEN ON PLACE	179	<div><div></div></div> 6.5%
2	PLACED REGIONAL OR PROVINCIAL REFERENCE BUT NOT WRITTEN ON P	26	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
3	GENERAL, NON-PLACED	236	<div><div></div></div> 8.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v91: MAP- 5TH RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2230] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	HERE IS A BLANK MAP OF CANADA. IT HAS NO WRITING ON IT AT ALL. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO WRITE IN FIVE WORDS OR PHRASES THAT YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBE POLITICS IN CANADA. YOU CAN PUT DOWN ANYTHING YOU WANT AND WRITE ANYWHERE ON THE MAP, BUT YOU CAN ONLY PUT DOWN FIVE THINGS.		
Literal question	CONTENT (FIFTH MENTION)		
Notes	Q14 in the documentation.		
Frequency table not shown (1512 Modalities)			
# v92: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2634 /-] [Invalid=127 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO YOU, PERSONALLY, IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q23A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO IMPORTANT ISSUES.	1692	<div><div></div></div> 64.2%
1	INFLATION.	355	<div><div></div></div> 13.5%
2	COST OF LIVING	68	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
3	WAGE & PRICE CONTROLLING/FREEZING	43	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
4	WAGE CONTROLLING/FREEZING	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
5	PRICE CONTROLLING/FREEZING	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
6	MORTGAGE/INTEREST RATES, COST OF HOUSING	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
7	HOUSING/LACK OF HOUSING	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
8	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIANS, METIS)	0	
9	EDUCATION - EXPENSIVE; UNNECESSARY EXPENSE/ CONTROL OF EDUCA	0	
10	TAXES (GENERAL OR SPECIFICALLY INCOME)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
11	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (I.E. SALES, BUILDING, UTILITY)	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
12	CORPORATE TAXES/ING/ PROFITEERING/BIG CORP. CONTROL; RIP-OF	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
13	NATURAL RESOURCES/RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS/ HANDLING	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
14	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	FARM/AGRICULTURE ISSUES	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%

v92: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL)/FINANCIAL SITUATION	43	1.6%
17	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	0	
18	OIL/ENERGY	12	0.5%
19	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS/EMPLOYMENT	15	0.6%
20	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT/STABLE GOVERNMENT	74	2.8%
21	LEADERSHIP	18	0.7%
22	THE LEADER	28	1.1%
23	THE CANDIDATE	9	0.3%
24	THE PARTY	14	0.5%
25	THE PARTY (PLATFORM)	4	0.2%
26	TO CHANGE THE GOVERNMENT/GENERAL DISLIKE; DISCOURAGED WITH	8	0.3%
27	OLD AGE PENSION	42	1.6%
28	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	8	0.3%
29	SOCIAL WELFARE	3	0.1%
30	CARE/HELP FOR AGED/OLD	1	0.0%
31	IMMIGRATION/IMMIGRATION LAWS	0	
32	EDUCATION	4	0.2%
33	HEALTH PROGRAMS/HOSPITALIZATION	2	0.1%
34	SEPARATISM	4	0.2%
35	BILINGUALISM/FRENCH	17	0.6%
36	REGIONAL DISPARITIES (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	6	0.2%
37	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/ FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRA	4	0.2%
38	UNITY	3	0.1%
39	STATE OF THE COUNTRY (I.E. DEMOCRACY, GENERAL SITUATION). S	11	0.4%
40	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	4	0.2%
41	GOVERNMENT/RUNNING OF GOV'T/CIVIL SERVICE/GOV'T SPENDING	4	0.2%
42	WORLD FOOTBALL LEAGUE	0	
43	SPECIFIC LOCAL/REGIONAL ISSUES	3	0.1%
44	BUDGET/TURNER'S BUDGET	14	0.5%
45	PRICES (IN GENERAL)	4	0.2%
46	PRICES (OF SPECIFIC ITEMS)	6	0.2%
47	WAGES	8	0.3%
48	PRICES (IN GENERAL) AND WAGES	2	0.1%
49	PRICES (OF SPECIFIC ITEMS) AND WAGES	0	
50	OTHER ALLOWANCES/PENSIONS/WELFARE PROGRAMS/ GRANTS	5	0.2%
51	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, DISABLED)	2	0.1%
52	SEAL HUNT	0	
53	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
54	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES/LABOUR PROBLEMS	2	0.1%
55	GENERAL DECADENCE -- MORAL LEADERSHIP, IRRESPONSIBILITY OF	0	
56	WOMEN IN POLITICS	1	0.0%

# v92: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCES:ONTARIO	1	0.0%
58	STATUS OF WOMEN	0	
59	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGNING/ELECTION PROMISES/ CAMPAIGN STYLE/T	2	0.1%
60	ARMED FORCES/NATIONAL DEFENCE	0	
61	TRANSPORTATION	1	0.0%
62	SAME PARTY CONTROLLING FEDERAL & PROVINCIAL	0	
63	POLITICAL APATHY	0	
64	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
65	TO EXERCISE VOTE	1	0.0%
88	D.K.	127	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-999] [Missing=*/888/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=929 /-] [Invalid=1832 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO YOU, PERSONALLY, IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q23B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY CONCERNED	20	2.2%
2	SOMEWHAT, MODERATELY CONCERNED	12	1.3%
3	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES TOO HIGH/RISING PRICES	3	0.3%
4	STRONGLY CONCERNED - WAGES/INCOME TOO LOW	0	
5	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH/WAGES, INCOME TOO LOW, COS	2	0.2%
6	STRONGLY CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/ NOTHING	7	0.8%
7	STRONGLY CONCERNED - GOVERNMENT INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTIO	3	0.3%
8	STRONGLY CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
9	STRONGLY CONCERNED - WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.2%
10	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
11	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
12	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
13	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
14	STRONGLY CONCERNED - IF NOTHING DONE (NOT CONTROLLED) WILL	1	0.1%
15	STRONGLY CONCERNED - SOB STORY (WHERE IS IT GOING TO STOP,	1	0.1%

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	STRONGLY CONCERNED - OUT OF HAND/TOO HIGH/ UNCONTROLLABLE/N	3	0.3%
17	STRONGLY CONCERNED - GOV'T INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV	2	0.2%
18	STRONGLY CONCERNED - DON'T KNOW WHAT CAN BE DONE	1	0.1%
20	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES TOO HIGH/RISING PRICE	3	0.3%
21	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - WAGES/ INCOME TOO LOW	0	
22	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH/ WAGES, INCOME T	2	0.2%
23	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/ SHOULD BE D	1	0.1%
24	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - GOV'T INACTION/ INCORRECT A	2	0.2%
25	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
26	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS	0	
27	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/ OR WAGES T	1	0.1%
28	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/ OR WAGES T	0	
29	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/ OR WAGES T	0	
30	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TO	0	
31	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - OUT OF HAND/ TOO HIGH/UNCONT	4	0.4%
37	PRICES TOO HIGH/RISING PRICES	18	1.9%
38	WAGES/INCOME TOO LOW	1	0.1%
39	PRICES HIGH/WAGES, INCOME TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING	9	1.0%
40	SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEING DONE	67	7.2%
41	GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING	56	6.0%
42	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	7	0.8%
43	WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS (CONTROLLING)	14	1.5%
44	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, SOMETHING	5	0.5%
45	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, GOV'T INA	13	1.4%
46	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, NOTHING C	1	0.1%
47	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, WAGE AND/	2	0.2%
48	WORLD WIDE/GOV'T COULD, SHOULD DO SOMETHING/ MORE	3	0.3%
49	SOB STORY (WHERE IS IT GOING, EXPECTING ANOTHER BABY, WHEN	2	0.2%
50	TRUDEAU, LIBERALS SHOULD DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT NOT DOING ENO	4	0.4%

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
51	DON'T KNOW WHAT CAN BE DONE	4	0.4%
52	GOV'T DOING AS MUCH AS THEY CAN	7	0.8%
53	WORLD WIDE BUT NOT AS BAD IN CANADA AS ELSEWHERE	3	0.3%
54	IF NOTHING DONE (NOT CONTROLLED) WILL BE/COULD BE A DEPRESSI	6	0.6%
55	WORLD WIDE, DON'T KNOW WHAT CAN BE DONE: ONE NATION CANNOT	16	1.7%
56	OUT OF HAND/TOO HIGH;UNCONTROLLABLE, NOT GOOD SITUATION	31	3.3%
57	SHOULD CONTROL BIG COMPANIES/STOP EXCESSIVE PROFITS OF BIG	5	0.5%
58	GOV'T INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHIN	23	2.5%
59	WORLD WIDE; GOV'T DOING AS MUCH AS CAN	1	0.1%
60	WORLD WIDE; NO END IN SIGHT	2	0.2%
61	HARDER ON POOR, LOWER CLASSES; FIXED INCOMES	2	0.2%
62	CAUSED BY LACK OF CONTROL OVER UNIONS/STRIKES; UNIONS SHOUL	6	0.6%
63	MUST CONTROL SPENDING; TIGHTER BELTS	2	0.2%
64	I CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT; NOT IN A POSITION TO DO ANYTHI	1	0.1%
65	EVERYONE AVOIDED IT; WASN'T MADE AN ISSUE	4	0.4%
66	WILL CORRECT ITSELF. BUYER CAN'T BUY SO SELLER CAN'T SELL --	1	0.1%
67	HARDER ON SPECIFIC GROUPS - I.E. FARMERS	1	0.1%
68	WAGES GO UP, PRICES GO UP -- A VICIOUS CIRCLE	3	0.3%
69	NEED A STABLE GOV'T TO HANDLE IT/CONTROL THE SITUATION	0	
70	MIDDLEMEN INCREASE PRICES/CAUSE HIGHER PRICES	2	0.2%
71	WE'RE HAVING INFLATION AND RECESSION AT SAME TIME	0	
72	TOO MUCH CONTROL OVER COMPANIES BY GOV'T	0	
73	IT REFLECTS EVERYTHING THAT IS GOING ON	0	
100	STRONGLY CONCERNED	2	0.2%
101	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED	0	
102	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH	3	0.3%
103	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES OF SPECIFIC THINGS	0	
104	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES (HIGH) AND/OR WAGES (LOW) AND/O	0	
105	STRONGLY CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING	2	0.2%
106	STRONGLY CONCERNED - GOVERNMENT INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTIO	0	
107	STRONGLY CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
108	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; SOMETHING MUST/ SHOULD BE DO	1	0.1%
109	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT	0	

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
110	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
111	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCES TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIF	0	
112	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFI	0	
113	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFI	0	
114	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC THINGS	1	0.1%
120	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH	1	0.1%
121	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES OF SPEC	0	
122	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES (HIGH) AND/OR WAGES	0	
123	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/ SHOULD BE D	1	0.1%
124	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT	0	
125	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
126	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH, SOMETHING MUST/SH	0	
127	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH, GOV'T INACTION OR	0	
128	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH, NOTHING CAN BE DO	0	
129	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCES TO PRICES (INCLU	0	
130	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUD	0	
131	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUD	0	
138	TOO HIGH	15	1.6%
139	REFERENCE TO PRICES OF SPECIFIC THINGS	3	0.3%
140	PRICES (RISING) AND/OR WAGES AND/OR INFLATION	8	0.9%
141	SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEING DONE	3	0.3%
142	GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING	3	0.3%
143	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	1	0.1%
144	TOO HIGH; SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/ NOTHING BEING DONE	3	0.3%
145	TOO HIGH; GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT ACTION/ GOV'T SHOULD	4	0.4%
146	TOO HIGH; NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
147	REFERENCES TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFIC ITEMS) AND/OR WAGES	3	0.3%
148	REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFIC ITEMS) AND/OR WAGES	1	0.1%
149	REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPEDIFIC ITEMS) AND/OR WAGES	0	

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
150	IF NOT DECREASED (CONTROLLED); WILL BE A DEPRESSION	1	0.1%
151	TOO HIGH; REFERENCES TO PRICES OF SPECIFIC THINGS	2	0.2%
152	MORE UNFAIR TO POOR/LOWER CLASSES/WORKERS	1	0.1%
153	SHOULD BE CONTROLS ON WAGE AND/OR PRICE	4	0.4%
154	SALARIES/WAGE INCREASES (TOO HIGH) - RAISES COST OF LIVING	1	0.1%
155	OUT OF HAND; UNCONTROLLABLE	2	0.2%
156	SHOULD CONTROL BIG COMPANIES; BIG COMPANIES RIPPING US OFF	2	0.2%
157	RECOMMEND SPECIFIC ACTION/SOLUTION	0	
158	WORLD WIDE	0	
200	STRONGLY	2	0.2%
201	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT	0	
202	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS(ING) -	0	
203	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS - NO REAL REASON GIVEN	0	
204	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS - NO REAL REASON GIVEN	0	
205	STRONGLY - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - WIL	0	
206	STRONGLY - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS (NO R	3	0.3%
207	STRONGLY - IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESPONSES	0	
208	STRONGLY - GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING TO CONTROL WAGES AND/O	0	
209	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - MENTION	0	
210	STRONGLY - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS -- ME	0	
211	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS (SPECIFIC	1	0.1%
216	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE AND P	0	
217	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS (0	
218	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.1%
219	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR	0	
220	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR	1	0.1%
221	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESP	0	
222	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING TO	0	
223	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRI	0	
224	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR	1	0.1%

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
230	SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS(ING) (NO REAL REAS	3	0.3%
231	SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS (NO REAL REASON GIVEN)	2	0.2%
232	SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS (NO REAL REASON GIVEN)	3	0.3%
233	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - WILL NOT WORK	7	0.8%
234	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - (NO REASON GIV	11	1.2%
235	IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESPONSE (NO MENTION OF STANFIELD,	4	0.4%
236	GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING TO CONTROL WAGES AND/OR PRICES --	1	0.1%
237	SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS -- MENTION STANFIELD	2	0.2%
238	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS -- MENTION STANF	8	0.9%
239	MORE UNFAIR TO POOR/LOWER CLASSES/WORKERS	1	0.1%
240	SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS; SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN	4	0.4%
241	SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS; SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN	0	
242	SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE/PRICE CONTROLS; SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN	1	0.1%
243	SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS; MENTION SPECIFIC ITEM(S)	2	0.2%
244	IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESPONSE (MENTION STANFIELD, P.C.'S)	2	0.2%
245	CONTROLS MAY BE NECESSARY; MAY NEED SOME KIND OF CONTROL	2	0.2%
246	WRONG PLATFORM; NOT PRESENTED PROPERLY; DIDN'T MAKE PEOPLE	2	0.2%
247	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS; (OTHER REASONS)	7	0.8%
248	"I" CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT CONTROLLING	0	
249	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE ANSWERS	0	
300	STRONGLY	2	0.2%
301	MODERATELY STRONGLY	0	
302	STRONGLY - SHOULD INCREASE	0	
303	STRONGLY - SHOULD INCREASE BECAUSE OF HIGH COSTS	0	
304	STRONGLY - SHOULD LOWER PENSIONABLE AGE	0	
305	STRONGLY - LOWER AGE, INCREASE PENSION	0	
308	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY - SHOULD INCREASE	0	
309	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY - SHOULD INCREASE BECAUSE OF HIGH COSTS	0	
310	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY - SHOULD LOWER PENSIONABLE AGE	0	
311	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.1%
312	HUSBAND AND WIFE SHOULD GET AT SAME TIME AND/ OR OTHER THING	4	0.4%

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
313	GOOD; BUT CERTAIN ASPECTS COULD BE IMPROVED/ BETTER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
314	SHOULD INCREASE	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
315	SHOULD INCREASE BECAUSE OF HIGH COSTS	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
316	SHOULD LOWER PENSIONABLE AGE	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
317	A GOOD PLAN, IDEA; NO COMPLAINTS; NECESSARY PROGRAM	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
400	STRONGLY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
401	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT	0	
402	STRONGLY - A MORE STABLE SYSTEM OF GOV'T	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
403	STRONGLY - IS NECESSARY TO GET THINGS DONE/ EFFICIENT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
404	STRONGLY - IS NECESSARY (NO SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
410	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT - A MORE STABLE SYSTEM OF GOV'T	0	
411	MOD./SOMEWHAT/IS NEC. TO GET THINGS DONE/ EFFICIENT	0	
412	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT - IS NECESSARY (NO SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN)	0	
418	A MORE STABLE BETTER SYSTEM OF GOV'T	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
419	IS NECESSARY, NEEDED, GOOD TO GET THINGS DONE/ EFFICIENT	29	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
420	IS NECESSARY/GOOD, WANTED (NO SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN)	19	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
421	CONDITIONAL AGREEMENT	0	
422	WITHOUT MAJORITY LIBERALS HAD TO DO WHAT NDP WANTED; HAVE P	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
423	GOOD BUT ALSO NEED STRONG OPPOSITION; DON'T WANT TOO BIG A	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
424	DO NOT WANT A MAJORITY/WANT A MINORITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
425	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
500	STRONGLY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
501	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT	0	
502	STRONGLY; PRO-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
503	STRONGLY; PRO-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/IS	0	
504	STRONGLY; ANTI-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
505	STRONGLY; ANTI-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/I	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
506	STRONGLY; PRO-CONSERVATIVE; (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
507	STRONGLY; PRO-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMI	0	
508	STRONGLY; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
509	STRONGLY; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROM	0	
510	STRONGLY; PRO-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
511	STRONGLY; PRO-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUES	0	

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
512	STRONGLY; ANTI-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.1%
513	STRONGLY; ANTI-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUE	0	
514	STRONGLY; VOTE FOR BEST PERSON; ONE WHO CAN DO MOST FOR ME;	0	
515	STRONGLY; OTHER PERSON NO GOOD; VOTED AGAINST OTHER PERSON;	0	
516	STRONGLY; PERSONAL FACTORS, REASONS	0	
518	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.3%
519	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES	2	0.2%
520	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.2%
521	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIE	0	
522	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
523	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POL	0	
524	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
525	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC PO	0	
526	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
527	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PRO	0	
528	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
529	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PR	0	
530	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; VOTE FOR BEST PERSON; ONE WHO CAN DO M	0	
531	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; OTHER PERSON NO GOOD; VOTED AGAINST OT	0	
536	PRO-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	18	1.9%
537	PRO-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ ISSUES	5	0.5%
538	ANTI-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.3%
539	ANTI-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ ISSUES	2	0.2%
540	PRO-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.4%
541	PRO-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUES	1	0.1%
542	ANTI-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.2%
543	ANTI-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUES	1	0.1%
544	PRO-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.2%
545	PRO-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ISSUES	0	
546	ANTI-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	ANTI-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ISSUES	1	0.1%
548	VOTE FOR BEST PERSON/PARTY; ONE WHO CAN DO MOST FOR FOR ME,	4	0.4%
549	OTHER PERSON NO GOOD; VOTED AGAINST OTHER PERSON; NEEDED CHA	0	
550	QUALIFIED PRO-CONSERVATIVE	1	0.1%
551	PERSONAL FACTORS	0	
552	DISILLUSIONED WITH ALL/MORE THAN ONE LEADER	3	0.3%
553	QUALIFIED PRO-LIBERAL	1	0.1%
554	HOPE LIBERALS KEEP PROMISES/NOT JUST EMPTY PROMISES NOW THA	0	
555	NDP CAUSED ELECTION	3	0.3%
556	ISSUES AVOIDED, A PERSONALITY CONTEST	1	0.1%
557	IT'S IMPORTANT/NEED GOOD, STRONG LEADERSHIP	3	0.3%
600	STRONGLY	4	0.4%
601	SOMEWHAT/MODERATE	0	
602	DESCRIBE ISSUE ONLY -- NO ATTITUDE	1	0.1%
603	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEI	0	
604	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECIFIC SOLUTION/ACTION	0	
605	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHI	1	0.1%
606	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR - ONLY	4	0.4%
607	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE FOR -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE	0	
608	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECI	1	0.1%
609	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T	0	
610	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NAGATIVE, AGAINST - ONLY	5	0.5%
611	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOUL	0	
612	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/RECOMMEND S	7	0.8%
613	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV	0	
614	UNFAIR TO CERTAIN REGIONS; REGIONAL INEQUALITY (ECONOMIC, PO	1	0.1%
619	DESCRIBE ISSUE ONLY -- NO ATTITUDE	1	0.1%
620	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEI	0	
621	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECIFIC SOLUTION/ACTION	0	
622	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHIN	0	
623	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR - ONLY	2	0.2%
624	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD B	0	

v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
625	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND SPECI	0	
626	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND GOV'T	0	
627	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST - ONLY	1	0.1%
628	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOUL	0	
629	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND SP	3	0.3%
630	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND G	2	0.2%
636	DESCRIBE ISSUE ONLY -- NO ATTITUDE	10	1.1%
637	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/ NOTHING BEI	2	0.2%
638	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECIFIC SOLUTION/ACTIO	11	1.2%
639	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHI	6	0.6%
640	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR - ONLY	20	2.2%
641	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- SOMETHING MUST/ BE DONE/	1	0.1%
642	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND SPECI	8	0.9%
643	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND GOV'T	1	0.1%
644	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST - ONLY 645 DESCRIBE ISS	25	2.7%
645		8	0.9%
646	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND S	29	3.1%
647	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST --JMENTION/ RECOMMEND G	8	0.9%
648	UNFAIR TO CERTAIN REGIONS; REGIONAL INEQUALITY (ECONOMIC, P	3	0.3%
649	CONDITIONAL RESPONSE; IT DEPENDS; "IF", "BUT"	2	0.2%
650	PERSONAL FACTORS; REASONS	1	0.1%
651	IT'S IMPORTANT/VERY IMPORTANT/EVERYONE SHOULD BE CONCERNED	3	0.3%
652	ONLY AN ELECIION PROMISE; NOTHING WILL HAPPEN; PROMISES WON'	3	0.3%
653	EVERYONE AVOIDED IT; WASN'T MADE AN ISSUE, SHOULD HAVE BEEN	1	0.1%
654	SHOULDN'T HAVE CAUSED AN ELECTION/PARTIES SHOULD HAVE GOTTE	2	0.2%
700	AGREE/FEEL THAT ALBERTA OIL SHOULD BE SHARED WITH REST OF CO	1	0.1%
701	DISAGREE THAT ALBERTA OIL SHOULD BE SHARED WITH REST OF COU	3	0.3%
702	WAS NO CRISIS/CRISIS, SHORTAGE A FARCE, PUT-ON	1	0.1%
703	PRICE/COST OF OIL/GAS	2	0.2%
704	MAY EFFECT/HAS EFFECTED ECONOMY, LEAD TO OIL SHORTAGES, SHO	3	0.3%

# v93: FEEL ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
705	CANADIAN OIL BELONGS TO CANADIANS/FIRST	0	
706	GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING/ DISAGREE WITH SPECIFIC ACTION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
707	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
708	MORE HELP SHOULD BE GIVEN TO FARMERS -- SUBSIDIES, GRANTS,	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
709	CONCERN ABOUT PRICES RECEIVED FOR FARM PRODUCE/FARMERS' INCO	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
710	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
888	D.K./NOT STATED	1476	
999	NOT APPLICABLE	356	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v94: ARTICULATENESS-1ST ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=929 /-] [Invalid=1832 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO YOU, PERSONALLY, IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS		
Notes	Q23B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	59	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%
2	MEDIUM	393	<div><div></div></div> 42.3%
3	LOW	477	<div><div></div></div> 51.3%
8	D.K.	1476	
9	N.A.	356	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v95: PARTY CLOSEST ON ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=853 /-] [Invalid=1908 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO YOU, PERSONALLY, IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q23C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	98	<div><div></div></div> 11.5%
1	LIBERALS	412	<div><div></div></div> 48.3%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	218	<div><div></div></div> 25.6%
3	N.D.P.	82	<div><div></div></div> 9.6%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	26	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
5	OTHER	17	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
8	D.K.	1552	

# v95: PARTY CLOSEST ON ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	N.A.	356	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v96: ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=909 /-] [Invalid=1852 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE TO YOU, PERSONALLY, IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q23D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	514	<div></div> 56.5%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	276	<div></div> 30.4%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	119	<div></div> 13.1%
8	D.K.	1496	
9	N.A.	356	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v97: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2349 /-] [Invalid=412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q24A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OTHER ISSUE	1909	<div></div> 81.3%
1	INFLATION.	49	<div></div> 2.1%
2	COST OF LIVING	21	<div></div> 0.9%
3	WAGE & PRICE CONTROLLING/FREEZING	17	<div></div> 0.7%
4	WAGE CONTROLLING/FREEZING	2	<div></div> 0.1%
5	PRICE CONTROLLING/FREEZING	9	<div></div> 0.4%
6	MORTGAGE/INTEREST RATES, COST OF HOUSING	16	<div></div> 0.7%
7	HOUSING/LACK OF HOUSING	8	<div></div> 0.3%
8	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIANS, METIS)	2	<div></div> 0.1%
9	EDUCATION - EXPENSIVE; UNNECESSARY EXPENSE/ CONTROL	1	<div></div> 0.0%
10	TAXES (GENERAL OR SPECIFICALLY INCOME)	10	<div></div> 0.4%
11	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (I.E. SALES, BUILDING, UTILITY)	3	<div></div> 0.1%
12	CORPORATE TAXES/ING/ PROFITEERING/BIG CORP. CONTROL; RIP-OFF	7	<div></div> 0.3%
13	NATURAL RESOURCES/RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS/ HANDLING	3	<div></div> 0.1%
14	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	9	<div></div> 0.4%
15	FARM/AGRICULTURE ISSUES	9	<div></div> 0.4%

v97: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL)/FINANCIAL SITUATION	16	0.7%
17	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	0	
18	OIL/ENERGY	15	0.6%
19	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS/EMPLOYMENT	20	0.9%
20	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT/STABLE GOVERNMENT	16	0.7%
21	LEADERSHIP	12	0.5%
22	THE LEADER	20	0.9%
23	THE CANDIDATE	9	0.4%
24	THE PARTY	6	0.3%
25	THE PARTY (PLATFORM)	4	0.2%
26	TO CHANGE THE GOVERNMENT/GENERAL DISLIKE; DISCOURAGED WITH	4	0.2%
27	OLD AGE PENSION	15	0.6%
28	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	8	0.3%
29	SOCIAL WELFARE	1	0.0%
30	CARE/HELP FOR AGED/OLD	5	0.2%
31	IMMIGRATION/IMMIGRATION LAWS	7	0.3%
32	EDUCATION	4	0.2%
33	HEALTH PROGRAMS/HOSPITALIZATION	3	0.1%
34	SEPARATISM	5	0.2%
35	BILINGUALISM/FRENCH	26	1.1%
36	REGIONAL DISPARITIES (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	8	0.3%
37	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	10	0.4%
38	UNITY	5	0.2%
39	STATE OF THE COUNTRY (I.E. DEMOCRACY, GENERAL SITUATION). S	5	0.2%
40	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	5	0.2%
41	GOVERNMENT/RUNNING OF GOV'T/CIVIL SERVICE/GOV'T SPENDING	4	0.2%
42	WORLD FOOTBALL LEAGUE	0	
43	SPECIFIC LOCAL/REGIONAL ISSUES	5	0.2%
44	BUDGET/TURNER'S BUDGET	9	0.4%
45	PRICES (IN GENERAL)	1	0.0%
46	PRICES (OF SPECIFIC ITEMS)	3	0.1%
47	WAGES	5	0.2%
48	PRICES (IN GENERAL) AND WAGES	1	0.0%
49	PRICES (OF SPECIFIC ITEMS) AND WAGES	0	
50	OTHER ALLOWANCES/PENSIONS/WELFARE PROGRAMS/ GRANTS	3	0.1%
51	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, DISABLED)	2	0.1%
52	SEAL HUNT	1	0.0%
53	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
54	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES/LABOUR PROBLEMS	1	0.0%
55	GENERAL DECADENCE -- MORAL LEADERSHIP, IRRESPONSIBILITY OF	2	0.1%
56	WOMEN IN POLITICS	0	

# v97: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCES:ONTARIO	2	0.1%
58	STATUS OF WOMEN	1	0.0%
59	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGNING/ELECTION PROMISES/ CAMPAIGN STYLE/T	1	0.0%
60	ARMED FORCES/NATIONAL DEFENCE	1	0.0%
61	TRANSPORTATION	2	0.1%
62	SAME PARTY CONTROLLING FEDERAL & PROVINCIAL	0	
63	POLITICAL APATHY	1	0.0%
64	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	0	
65	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
88	D.K.	56	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	356	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=428 /-] [Invalid=2333 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q24B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY CONCERNED	3	0.7%
2	SOMEWHAT, MODERATELY CONCERNED	4	0.9%
3	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES TOO HIGH/RISEING PRICES	0	
4	STRONGLY CONCERNED - WAGES/INCOME TOO LOW	0	
5	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH/WAGES, INCOME TOO LOW, COS	0	
6	STRONGLY CONERNED - SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/ NOTHING	2	0.5%
7	STRONGLY CONCERNED - GOVERNMENT INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTIO	0	
8	STRONGLY CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
9	STRONGLY CONCERNED - WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS	0	
10	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
11	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
12	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
13	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST	0	
14	STRONGLY CONCERNED - IF NOTHING DONE (NOT CONTROLLED) WILL	0	
15	STRONGLY CONCERNED - SOB STORY (WHERE IS IT GOING TO STOP,	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	STRONGLY CONCERNED - OUT OF HAND/TOO HIGH/ UNCONTROLLABLE/N	0	
17	STRONGLY CONCERNED - GOV'T INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV	0	
18	STRONGLY CONCERNED - DON'T KNOW WHAT CAN BE DONE	0	
20	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES TOO HIGH/RISING PRICE	0	
21	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - WAGES/ INCOME TOO LOW	0	
22	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH/ WAGES, INCOME T	0	
23	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/ SHOULD BE D	0	
24	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - GOV'T INACTION/ INCORRECT A	0	
25	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
26	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY/CONCERNED - WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS	0	
27	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/ OR WAGES T	0	
28	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/ OR WAGES T	0	
29	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/ OR WAGES T	0	
30	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TO	0	
31	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - OUT OF HAND/ TOO HIGH/UNCONT	0	
37	PRICES TOO HIGH/RISING PRICES	1	0.2%
38	WAGES/INCOME TOO LOW	1	0.2%
39	PRICES HIGH/WAGES, INCOME TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING	4	0.9%
40	SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEING DONE	8	1.9%
41	GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING	9	2.1%
42	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
43	WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS (CONTROLLING)	0	
44	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, SOMETHING	1	0.2%
45	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, GOV'T INA	0	
46	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, NOTHING C	0	
47	PRICES HIGH AND/OR WAGES TOO LOW, COST OF LIVING, WAGE AND/	0	
48	WORLD WIDE/GOV'T COULD, SHOULD DO SOMETHING/ MORE	1	0.2%
49	SOB STORY (WHERE IS IT GOING, EXPECTING ANOTHER BABY, WHEN	3	0.7%
50	TRUDEAU, LIBERALS SHOULD DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT/ NOT DOING E	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
51	DON'T KNOW WHAT CAN BE DONE	0	
52	GOV'T DOING AS MUCH AS THEY CAN	1	0.2%
53	WORLD WIDE BUT NOT AS BAD IN CANADA AS ELSEWHERE	2	0.5%
54	IF NOTHING DONE (NOT CONTROLLED) WILL BE/COULD BE A DEPRESSI	1	0.2%
55	WORLD WIDE, DON'T KNOW WHAT CAN BE DONE: ONE NATION CANNOT	5	1.2%
56	OUT OF HAND/TOO HIGH;UNCONTROLLABLE, NOT GOOD SITUATION	4	0.9%
57	SHOULD CONTROL BIG COMPANIES/STOP EXCESSIVE PROFITS OF BIG	1	0.2%
58	GOV'T INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHIN	4	0.9%
59	WORLD WIDE; GOV'T DOING AS MUCH AS CAN	0	
60	WORLD WIDE; NO END IN SIGHT	1	0.2%
61	HARDER ON POOR, LOWER CLASSES; FIXED INCOMES	1	0.2%
62	CAUSED BY LACK OF CONTROL OVER UNIONS/STRIKES; UNIONS SHOUL	1	0.2%
63	MUST CONTROL SPENDING; TIGHTER BELTS	1	0.2%
64	I CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT; NOT IN A POSITION TO DO ANYTHI	1	0.2%
65	EVERYONE AVOIDED IT; WASN'T MADE AN ISSUE	0	
66	WILL CORRECT ITSELF. BUYER CAN'T BUY SO SELLER CAN'T SELL -	0	
67	HARDER ON SPECIFIC GROUPS - I.E. FARMERS	0	
68	WAGES GO UP, PRICES GO UP -- A VICIOUS CIRCLE	0	
69	NEED A STABLE GOV'T TO HANDLE IT/CONTROL THE SITUATION	1	0.2%
70	MIDDLEMEN INCREASE PRICES/CAUSE HIGHER PRICES	1	0.2%
71	WE'RE HAVING INFLATION AND RECESSION AT SAME TIME	0	
72	TOO MUCH CONTROL OVER COMPANIES BY GOV'T	0	
73	IT REFLECTS EVERYTHING THAT IS GOING ON	0	
100	STRONGLY CONCERNED	0	
101	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED	0	
102	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH	1	0.2%
103	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES OF SPECIFIC THINGS	0	
104	STRONGLY CONCERNED - PRICES (HIGH) AND/OR WAGES (LOW) AND/O	1	0.2%
105	STRONGLY CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING	0	
106	STRONGLY CONCERNED - GOVERNMENT INACTION/OR INCORRECT ACTIO	0	
107	STRONGLY CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
108	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; SOMETHING MUST/ SHOULD BE DO	0	
109	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
110	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
111	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCES TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIF	0	
112	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFI	0	
113	STRONGLY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFI	0	
114	STRONGLY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH; REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC THINGS	0	
120	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH	1	0.2%
121	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES OF SPEC	0	
122	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - PRICES (HIGH) AND/OR WAGES	0	
123	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - SOMETHING MUST/ SHOULD BE D	0	
124	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT	0	
125	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
126	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH, SOMETHING MUST/SH	0	
127	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH, GOV'T INACTION OR	0	
128	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - TOO HIGH, NOTHING CAN BE DO	0	
129	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCES TO PRICES (INCLU	0	
130	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUD	0	
131	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY CONCERNED - REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUD	0	
138	TOO HIGH	2	0.5%
139	REFERENCE TO PRICES OF SPECIFIC THINGS	0	
140	PRICES (RISING) AND/OR WAGES AND/OR INFLATION	3	0.7%
141	SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEING DONE	3	0.7%
142	GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT ACTION/GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING	3	0.7%
143	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	0	
144	TOO HIGH; SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/ NOTHING BEING DONE	0	
145	TOO HIGH; GOV'T INACTION OR INCORRECT ACTION/ GOV'T SHOULD	0	
146	TOO HIGH; NOTHING CAN BE DONE	1	0.2%
147	REFERENCES TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFIC ITEMS) AND/ OR WAG	0	
148	REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPECIFIC ITEMS) AND/OR WAGES	0	
149	REFERENCE TO PRICES (INCLUDING SPEDIFIC ITEMS) AND/OR WAGES	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
150	IF NOT DECREASED (CONTROLLED); WILL BE A DEPRESSION	0	
151	TOO HIGH; REFERENCES TO PRICES OF SPECIFIC THINGS	2	0.5%
152	MORE UNFAIR TO POOR/LOWER CLASSES/WORKERS	1	0.2%
153	SHOULD BE CONTROLS ON WAGE AND/OR PRICE	2	0.5%
154	SALARIES/WAGE INCREASES (TOO HIGH) - RAISES COST OF LIVING	0	
155	OUT OF HAND; UNCONTROLLABLE	0	
156	SHOULD CONTROL BIG COMPANIES; BIG COMPANIES RIPPING US OFF	0	
157	RECOMMEND SPECIFIC ACTION/SOLUTION	0	
158	WORLD WIDE	1	0.2%
200	STRONGLY	2	0.5%
201	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT	0	
202	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS(ING) -	0	
203	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS - NO REAL REASON GIVEN	0	
204	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS - NO REAL REASON GIVEN	0	
205	STRONGLY - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - WIL	0	
206	STRONGLY - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS (NO R	3	0.7%
207	STRONGLY - IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESPONSES	0	
208	STRONGLY - GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING TO CONTROL WAGES AND/O	0	
209	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - MENTION	0	
210	STRONGLY - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS -- ME	1	0.2%
211	STRONGLY - SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS (SPECIFIC	0	
216	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE AND P	0	
217	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS (0	
218	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS	0	
219	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR	0	
220	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR	0	
221	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESP	0	
222	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING TO	0	
223	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRI	0	
224	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED - SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
230	SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS(ING) (NO REAL REAS	1	0.2%
231	SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS (NO REAL REASON GIVEN)	0	
232	SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS (NO REAL REASON GIVEN)	1	0.2%
233	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - WILL NOT WORK	3	0.7%
234	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS - (NO REASON GIV	4	0.9%
235	IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESPONSE (NO MENTION OF STANFIELD,	1	0.2%
236	GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING TO CONTROL WAGES AND/OR PRICES --	1	0.2%
237	SHOULD HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS -- MENTION STANFIELD	0	
238	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS -- MENTION STANF	2	0.5%
239	MORE UNFAIR TO POOR/LOWER CLASSES/WORKERS	0	
240	SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS; SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN	0	
241	SHOULD HAVE WAGE CONTROLS; SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN	0	
242	SHOULD HAVE BOTH WAGE/PRICE CONTROLS; SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN	1	0.2%
243	SHOULD HAVE PRICE CONTROLS; MENTION SPECIFIC ITEM(S)	0	
244	IT DEPENDS, CONDITIONAL RESPONSE (MENTION STANFIELD, P.C.'S)	0	
245	CONTROLS MAY BE NECESSARY; MAY NEED SOME KIND OF CONTROL	2	0.5%
246	WRONG PLATFORM; NOT PRESENTED PROPERLY; DIDN'T MAKE PEOPLE	1	0.2%
247	SHOULD NOT HAVE WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS; (OTHER REASONS)	3	0.7%
248	"I" CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT CONTROLLING	1	0.2%
249	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE ANSWERS	0	
300	STRONGLY	0	
301	MODERATELY STRONGLY	0	
302	STRONGLY - SHOULD INCREASE	3	0.7%
303	STRONGLY - SHOULD INCREASE BECAUSE OF HIGH COSTS	0	
304	STRONGLY - SHOULD LOWER PENSIONABLE AGE	0	
305	STRONGLY - LOWER AGE, INCREASE PENSION	0	
308	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY - SHOULD INCREASE	0	
309	SOMEWHAT/MODERATELY - SHOULD INCREASE BECAUSE OF HIGH COSTS	0	
310	SOMEWHAT MODERATELY - SHOULD LOWER PENSIONABLE AGE	0	
311	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
312	HUSBAND AND WIFE SHOULD GET AT SAME TIME AND/ OR OTHER THING	2	0.5%

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
313	GOOD; BUT CERTAIN ASPECTS COULD BE IMPROVED/ BETTER	2	 0.5%
314	SHOULD INCREASE	6	 1.4%
315	SHOULD INCREASE BECAUSE OF HIGH COSTS	2	 0.5%
316	SHOULD LOWER PENSIONABLE AGE	3	 0.7%
317	A GOOD PLAN, IDEA; NO COMPLAINTS; NECESSARY PROGRAM	5	 1.2%
400	STRONGLY	2	 0.5%
401	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT	0	
402	STRONGLY - A MORE STABLE SYSTEM OF GOV'T	0	
403	STRONGLY - IS NECESSARY TO GET THINGS DONE/ EFFICIENT	0	
404	STRONGLY - IS NECESSARY (NO SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN)	1	 0.2%
410	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT - A MORE STABLE SYSTEM OF GOV'T	0	
411	MOD./SOMEWHAT/IS NEC. TO GET THINGS DONE/ EFFICIENT	0	
412	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT - IS NECESSARY (NO SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN)	0	
418	A MORE STABLE BETTER SYSTEM OF GOV'T	1	 0.2%
419	IS NECESSARY, NEEDED, GOOD TO GET THINGS DONE/ EFFICIENT	5	 1.2%
420	IS NECESSARY/GOOD, WANTED (NO SPECIFIC REASON GIVEN)	4	 0.9%
421	CONDITIONAL AGREEMENT	0	
422	WITHOUT MAJORITY LIBERALS HAD TO DO WHAT NDP WANTED; HAVE P	0	
423	GOOD BUT ALSO NEED STRONG OPPOSITION; DON'T WANT TOO BIG A	2	 0.5%
424	DO NOT WANT A MAJORITY/WANT A MINORITY	0	
425	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
500	STRONGLY	0	
501	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT	1	 0.2%
502	STRONGLY; PRO-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	1	 0.2%
503	STRONGLY; PRO-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/IS	0	
504	STRONGLY; ANTI-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	2	 0.5%
505	STRONGLY; ANTI-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/I	0	
506	STRONGLY; PRO-CONSERVATIVE; (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
507	STRONGLY; PRO-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMI	0	
508	STRONGLY; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	1	 0.2%
509	STRONGLY; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROM	0	
510	STRONGLY; PRO-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
511	STRONGLY; PRO-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUES	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
512	STRONGLY; ANTI-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
513	STRONGLY; ANTI-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUE	0	
514	STRONGLY; VOTE FOR BEST PERSON; ONE WHO CAN DO MOST FOR ME;	1	0.2%
515	STRONGLY; OTHER PERSON NO GOOD; VOTED AGAINST OTHER PERSON;	0	
516	STRONGLY; PERSONAL FACTORS, REASONS	0	
518	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-LIBERAL (GENERAL,UNSPECIFIED)	0	
519	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES	0	
520	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-LIBERAL (GENERAL,UNSPECIFIED)	0	
521	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIE	0	
522	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL,UNSPECIFIED)	0	
523	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POL	0	
524	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL,UNSPECIFIED)	0	
525	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC PO	0	
526	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
527	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; PRO-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PRO	0	
528	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	
529	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; ANTI-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PR	0	
530	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; VOTE FOR BEST PERSON; ONE WHO CAN DO M	0	
531	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT; OTHER PERSON NO GOOD; VOTED AGAINST OT	0	
536	PRO-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	11	2.6%
537	PRO-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ ISSUES	0	
538	ANTI-LIBERAL (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.9%
539	ANTI-LIBERAL; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ ISSUES	2	0.5%
540	PRO-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.2%
541	PRO-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUES	1	0.2%
542	ANTI-CONSERVATIVE (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	6	1.4%
543	ANTI-CONSERVATIVE; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/ PROMISES/ISSUES	2	0.5%
544	PRO-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.2%
545	PRO-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ISSUES	1	0.2%
546	ANTI-NDP (GENERAL, UNSPECIFIED)	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	ANTI-NDP; MENTION SPECIFIC POLICIES/PROMISES/ISSUES	0	
548	VOTE FOR BEST PERSON/PARTY; ONE WHO CAN DO MOST FOR FOR ME,	2	0.5%
549	OTHER PERSON NO GOOD; VOTED AGAINST OTHER PERSON; NEEDED CHA	1	0.2%
550	QUALIFIED PRO-CONSERVATIVE	1	0.2%
551	PERSONAL FACTORS	2	0.5%
552	DISILLUSIONED WITH ALL/MORE THAN ONE LEADER	2	0.5%
553	QUALIFIED PRO-LIBERAL	0	
554	HOPE LIBERALS KEEP PROMISES/NOT JUST EMPTY PROMISES NOW THA	0	
555	NDP CAUSED ELECTION	1	0.2%
556	ISSUES AVOIDED, A PERSONALITY CONTEST	1	0.2%
557	IT'S IMPORTANT/NEED GOOD, STRONG LEADERSHIP	5	1.2%
600	STRONGLY	14	3.3%
601	SOMEWHAT/MODERATE	3	0.7%
602	DESCRIBE ISSUE ONLY -- NO ATTITUDE	0	
603	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEI	0	
604	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECIFIC SOLUTION/ACTION	0	
605	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHI	1	0.2%
606	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR - ONLY	0	
607	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE FOR -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE	0	
608	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECI	0	
609	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T	1	0.2%
610	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NAGATIVE, AGAINST - ONLY	8	1.9%
611	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOUL	1	0.2%
612	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/RECOMMEND S	3	0.7%
613	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/RECOMMEND G	1	0.2%
614	UNFAIR TO CERTAIN REGIONS; REGIONAL INEQUALITY (ECONOMIC, PO	1	0.2%
619	DESCRIBE ISSUE ONLY -- NO ATTITUDE	1	0.2%
620	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/NOTHING BEI	0	
621	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECIFIC SOLUTION/ACTION	0	
622	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHI	0	
623	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR - ONLY	1	0.2%
624	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD B	0	

v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
625	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND SPECI	0	
626	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND GOV'T	0	
627	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST - ONLY	4	0.9%
628	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOUL	1	0.2%
629	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND SP	2	0.5%
630	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND G	0	
636	DESCRIBE ISSUE ONLY -- NO ATTITUDE	8	1.9%
637	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOULD BE DONE/ NOTHING BEI	5	1.2%
638	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND SPECIFIC SOLUTION/ACTIO	14	3.3%
639	DESCRIBE ISSUE -- MENTION/RECOMMEND GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHI	0	
640	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR - ONLY	13	3.0%
641	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- SOMETHING MUST/ BE DONE/	2	0.5%
642	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND SPECI	10	2.3%
643	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS POSITIVE, FOR -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND GOV'T	6	1.4%
644	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST - ONLY	31	7.2%
645	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- SOMETHING MUST/SHOUL	12	2.8%
646	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND S	37	8.6%
647	DESCRIBE ISSUE AS NEGATIVE, AGAINST -- MENTION/ RECOMMEND G	13	3.0%
648	UNFAIR TO CERTAIN REGIONS; REGIONAL INEQUALITY (ECONOMIC, P	2	0.5%
649	CONDITIONAL RESPONSE; IT DEPENDS; "IF", "BUT"	2	0.5%
650	PERSONAL FACTORS; REASONS	1	0.2%
651	IT'S IMPORTANT/VERY IMPORTANT/EVERYONE SHOULD BE CONCERNED	3	0.7%
652	ONLY AN ELECION PROMISE; NOTHING WILL HAPPEN; PROMISES WON'	2	0.5%
653	EVERYONE AVOIDED IT; WASN'T MADE AN ISSUE, SHOULD HAVE BEEN	2	0.5%
654	SHOULDN'T HAVE CAUSED AN ELECTION/PARTIES SHOULD HAVE GOTTE	1	0.2%
700	AGREE/FEEL THAT ALBERTA OIL SHOULD BE SHARED WITH REST OF CO	1	0.2%
701	DISAGREE THAT ALBERTA OIL SHOULD BE SHARED WITH REST OF COU	3	0.7%
702	WAS NO CRISIS/CRISIS, SHORTAGE A FARCE, PUT-ON	2	0.5%
703	PRICE/COST OF OIL/GAS	2	0.5%
704	MAY EFFECT/HAS EFFECTED ECONOMY, LEAD TO OIL SHORTAGES, SHO	1	0.2%

# v98: FEEL ABOUT 2ND ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
705	CANADIAN OIL BELONGS TO CANADIANS/FIRST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
706	GOV'T SHOULD DO SOMETHING/ DISAGREE WITH SPECIFIC ACTION	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
707	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
708	MORE HELP SHOULD BE GIVEN TO FARMERS -- SUBSIDIES, GRANTS, M	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
709	CONCERN ABOUT PRICES RECEIVED FOR FARM PRODUCE/FARMERS' INCO	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
710	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
888	D.K./NOT STATED	1475	
999	NOT APPLICABLE	858	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v99: ARTICULATENESS-2ND ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=428 /-] [Invalid=2333 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS		
Notes	Q24B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	32	<div><div></div></div> 7.5%
2	MEDIUM	188	<div><div></div></div> 43.9%
3	LOW	208	<div><div></div></div> 48.6%
8	D.K.	1475	
9	N.A.	858	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v100: PARTY CLOSEST ON 2ND ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=407 /-] [Invalid=2354 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q24C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	54	<div><div></div></div> 13.3%
1	LIBERALS	196	<div><div></div></div> 48.2%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	99	<div><div></div></div> 24.3%
3	N.D.P.	45	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
5	OTHER	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
8	D.K.	1496	
9	N.A.	858	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v101: 2ND ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=432 /-] [Invalid=2329 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q24D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	225	<div><div></div></div> 52.1%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	139	<div><div></div></div> 32.2%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	68	<div><div></div></div> 15.7%
8	D.K.	1471	
9	N.A.	858	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v102: BILINGUALISM-LANGUAGE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2694 /-] [Invalid=67 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE)		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	<div><div></div></div> 79.4%
1	MENTION OF LANGUAGE GENERALLY, MENTION OF BILINGUALISM (NOT	90	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
2	FRENCH SOLE MENTION (BILINGUALISM IS 'SPEAKING FRENCH') (AN	73	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
3	ENGLISH SOLE MENTION (BILINGUALISM IS 'SPEAKING ENGLISH') (13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
4	FRENCH AND ENGLISH (LES DEUX LANGUES)	172	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%
5	OTHER LANGUAGE, ENGLISH OR FRENCH AND OTHER LANGUAGE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	FRENCH SOLE MENTION, 'SPEAKING FRENCH' (FRANCOPHONES ONLY)	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	'SPEAKING TWO LANGUAGES' (DEUX LANGUES)	50	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
19	GENERAL REFERENCE TO SCHOOLS	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
20	LEARNING FRENCH IN SCHOOL	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
21	LEARNING ENGLISH IN SCHOOL	0	
22	LEARNING FRENCH FOR JOB	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
23	LEARNING ENGLISH FOR JOB	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
25	GENERAL REFERENCE TO JOBS	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
26	LEARNING ENGLISH FOR JOBS AND TRAVEL	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
27	LEARNING ENGLISH FOR TRAVEL	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
30	LANGUAGE LEGISLATION	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
31	BILL 22, WITH REFERENCE TO LANGUAGE	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%

# v102: BILINGUALISM-LANGUAGE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
32	OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT	1	0.0%
33	SEPARATISM ('INDEPENDENCE'-FRENCH)	19	0.7%
99	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THE DIMENSION	67	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v103: BILINGUALISM-PRESCRIPTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2642 /-] [Invalid=119 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (PRESCRIPTION)		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B, Q25AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	81.0%
1	MANY LANGUAGES , 'ANY LANGUAGE SHOULD BE ALLOWED'	29	1.1%
2	ENGLISH SHOULD BE ONLY LANGUAGE ('IT'S AN ENGLISH COUNTRY')	35	1.3%
3	ENGLISH PRIMARY LANGUAGE, FRENCH OPTIONAL	8	0.3%
4	ENGLISH PRIMARY LANGUAGE, ANY OTHER LANGUAGE OPTIONAL	15	0.6%
5	FRENCH SHOULD BE ONLY LANGUAGE	4	0.2%
6	FRENCH PRIMARY LANGUAGE, ENGLISH OR OTHER LANGUAGE OPTIONAL	21	0.8%
7	FRENCH IN QUEBEC, ENGLISH ELSEWHERE	12	0.5%
8	FRENCH AND ENGLISH IN QUEBEC (BILINGUALISM), ENGLISH ELSEWHE	7	0.3%
9	FRENCH WHERE THERE ARE FRENCH PEOPLE	6	0.2%
10	BILINGUALISM IS A GOOD THING; PEOPLE SHOULD BE BILINGUAL	134	5.1%
11	FRENCH AND ENGLISH EVERYWHERE	38	1.4%
12	NO COMPULSORY SECOND LANGUAGE	81	3.1%
13	PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO SPEAK FRENCH	23	0.9%
14	PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO SPEAK ENGLISH	3	0.1%
15	O.K. FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, NOT NECESSARY FOR OLDER PEOPLE	16	0.6%
16	FRENCH SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS	26	1.0%
17	ENGLISH SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS	1	0.0%
18	OTHER PRESCRIPTIONS	5	0.2%
19	FRENCH NOT COMPULSORY, BUT SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOL	11	0.4%
20	ENGLISH NOT COMPULSORY, BUT SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOL	0	
21		15	0.6%
22		12	0.5%
99	NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	119	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v104: BILINGUALISM-REGIONAL, PROVINCIAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2324 /-] [Invalid=437 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (REGIONAL/PROVINCIAL MENTIONS)		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B, Q25AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	<div></div> 92.1%
1	O.K. FOR QUEBEC, NO FURTHER REFERENCE	2	0.1%
2	O.K. FOR QUEBEC, NOT MARITIMES	0	
3	O.K. FOR QUEBEC, NOT ONTARIO	0	
4	O.K. FOR QUEBEC, NOT WEST	2	0.1%
5	O.K. FOR QUEBEC, BUT NOWHERE ELSE	13	0.6%
6	O.K. FOR QUEBEC, BUT NOT HERE (E.G. 'NOT HERE IN SASKATCHEWA	3	0.1%
7	O.K. FOR QUEBEC AND ONTARIO, BUT NOT ELSEWHERE	0	
8	NOT HERE, NOT IN THIS REGION	8	0.3%
9	O.K. FOR AREAS WITH FRANCOPHONES, BUT NOT ELSEWHERE	4	0.2%
10	O.K. FOR AREAS WITH FRANCOPHONES, BUT NOT HERE	0	
11	O.K. FOR EAST, BUT NOT HERE, ELSEWHERE	4	0.2%
15	QUEBEC, BOURASSA	100	4.3%
19	NEEDED HERE, (REQUIRED, NECESSARY)	3	0.1%
20	NEEDED IN ALL REGIONS/PROVINCES	45	1.9%
99	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THE DIMENSION	437	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v105: BILINGUALISM-COMPULSION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2234 /-] [Invalid=527 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (COMPULSION)		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B, Q25AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	<div></div> 95.8%
1	COMPULSION BY GOVERNMENT (GENERAL)	10	0.4%
2	COMPULSION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	4	0.2%
3	COMPULSION BY QUEBEC	10	0.4%
4	COMPULSION BY THE FRENCH	5	0.2%
5	COMPULSION BY THE LIBERALS	1	0.0%
6	COMPULSION BY TRUDEAU	1	0.0%

# v105: BILINGUALISM-COMPULSION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	COMPULSION IN EDUCATION	9	0.4%
8	COMPULSION IN WORK	11	0.5%
9	COMBINATIONS	2	0.1%
10	GENERAL MENTION OF COMPULSION	41	1.8%
11	COMPULSION, QUEBEC AND LIBERALS	0	
99	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THE DIMENSION	527	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v106: BILINGUALISM-PERSONAL, IMPERSONAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2755 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (PERSONAL - IMPERSONAL)		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B, Q25AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	77.7%
1	IMPERSONAL OR SYSTEMIC	521	18.9%
2	PERSONAL TO INDIVIDUAL (REFERENCE TO PERSONAL FEELINGS, EXP	94	3.4%
9	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THE DIMENSION	6	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v107: BILINGUALISM-POSITIVE, NEGATIVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2696 /-] [Invalid=65 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE)		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B, Q25AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	79.4%
1	COMPLETELY POSITIVE	189	7.0%
2	QUALIFIED POSITIVE	129	4.8%
3	NEUTRAL	29	1.1%
4	QUALIFIED NEGATIVE ('NOT COMPULSORY')	96	3.6%
5	COMPLETELY NEGATIVE	113	4.2%
9	N.A.	65	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v108: BILINGUALISM-ARTICULATENESS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2760 /-] [Invalid=1 /-]		

# v108: BILINGUALISM-ARTICULATENESS				
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question		Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question		Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT BILINGUALISM? (LANGUAGE) / Q25AB. (ARTICULATENESS)		
Notes		Q25A, Q25B, Q25AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2140	<div><div></div></div> 77.5%	
1	HIGH	101	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%	
2	MEDIUM	255	<div><div></div></div> 9.2%	
3	LOW	264	<div><div></div></div> 9.6%	
9	N.A.	1		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v109: BILINGUALISM-PARTY CLOSEST				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1056 /-] [Invalid=1705 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question		Q25A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS BILINGUALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN BILINGUALISM IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question		Q25C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes		Q25C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NONE	735	<div><div></div></div> 69.6%	
1	LIBERAL	230	<div><div></div></div> 21.8%	
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	62	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%	
3	N.D.P.	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%	
4	SOCIAL CREDIT/CREDITISTE	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%	
5	OTHER	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%	
8	D.K.	1629		
9	N.A.	76		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v110: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-INEVITABLE				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2402 /-] [Invalid=359 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question		Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question		HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT FOREIGN INVESTMENT? (INEVITABILITY)		
Notes		Q26A, Q26B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2266	<div><div></div></div> 94.3%	
1	INEVITABLE, 'IT'S INEVITABLE'; 'IT'S NECESSARY'	104	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%	
2	CAUSED BY LACK OF CAPITAL IN CANADA	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%	

# v110: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-INEVITABLE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	CAUSED BY CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS E.G., 'WONT INVEST'	19	0.8%
9	NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	359	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v111: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-CHARACTERISTICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2681 /-] [Invalid=80 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question	CHARACTERISTICS OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT		
Notes	Q26A, Q26AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2266	84.5%
1	GENERAL REFERENCE, ONE COUNTRY IN ANOTHER	24	0.9%
2	REFERENCE TO MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION	1	0.0%
3	GENERAL REFERENCE, TRADE	18	0.7%
4	GENERAL REFERENCE, INVESTMENT OR ECONOMY	50	1.9%
5	U.S. AND LAND (INVESTS IN)	6	0.2%
6	U.S. AND MANUFACTURING	18	0.7%
7	U.S. AND OIL	2	0.1%
8	U.S. AND OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES	7	0.3%
9	U.S. AND OIL AND NATURAL RESOURCES	1	0.0%
10	LAND	2	0.1%
11	MANUFACTURING	13	0.5%
12	OIL	5	0.2%
13	OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES	10	0.4%
14	OIL AND NATURAL RESOURCES	1	0.0%
15	OTHER COMBINATIONS	9	0.3%
16	U.S. AND OTHER COMBINATIONS	7	0.3%
19	FOREIGNERS BUYING IN CANADA (OTHER COUNTRIES, NO SPECIFIC C	69	2.6%
20	U.S. INVESTMENT IN CANADA	62	2.3%
21	COUNTRIES OTHER THAN U.S. INVESTING IN CANADA (SPECIFIC COU	6	0.2%
22	U.S. AND OTHER COUNTRIES INVESTING IN CANADA	19	0.7%
23	MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS INVESTING IN CANADA	5	0.2%
30	CANADA INVESTING ABROAD, FOREIGN TRADE OR AID	80	3.0%
99	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	80	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v112: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-DOMINATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2351 /-] [Invalid=410 /-]		

# v112: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-DOMINATION			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question	DOMINATION		
Notes	Q26A, Q26AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2266	<div><div></div></div> 96.4%
1	DOMINATION (GENERAL)	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
2	DOMINATION BY U.S.	46	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
3	DOMINATION BY U.S. AND OTHER COUNTRIES	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	DOMINATION BY OTHER COUNTRY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	DOMINATION BY MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
9	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	410	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v113: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-ACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2442 /-] [Invalid=319 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question	ACTION		
Notes	Q26A, Q26AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2266	<div><div></div></div> 92.8%
1	GENERAL REFERENCE TO ACTION, E.G. 'SOMETHING MUST BE DONE'	29	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
2	GENERAL REFERENCE, CONTROL NEEDED	93	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
3	GENERAL GOVERNMENT ACTION	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
4	SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENTS REVIEW ACT (SCREE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
5	SPECIFIC REFERENCES TO OTHER GOVERNMENT POLICIES OR PROPOSE	23	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
6	INDIVIDUAL PERSONS ACTION NEEDED	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
9	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	319	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v114: FOREIGN INVESTVESMENT-POSITIVE, NEGATIVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2704 /-] [Invalid=57 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question	POSITIVE/NEGATIVE		
Notes	Q26A, Q26AB in the documentation.		

# v114: FOREIGN INVESTMENT-POSITIVE, NEGATIVE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2266	<div><div></div></div> 83.8%
1	COMPLETELY POSITIVE TOWARDS FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN CANADA	115	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
2	QUALIFIED POSITIVE (THINK ITS GOOD 'BUT')	127	<div><div></div></div> 4.7%
3	NEUTRAL	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
4	QUALIFIED NEGATIVE	69	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
5	COMPLETELY NEGATIVE	115	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
9	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	57	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v115: FOREIGN INVESTMENT-ARTICULATENESS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2759 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS		
Notes	Q26A, Q26AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2266	<div><div></div></div> 82.1%
1	HIGH	76	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
2	MEDIUM	190	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
3	LOW	227	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
9	N.A.	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v116: FOREIGN INVESTMENT-PARTY CLOSEST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=333 /-] [Invalid=2428 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q26A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS FOREIGN INVESTMENT. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q26A, Q26C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	64	<div><div></div></div> 19.2%
1	LIBERAL	152	<div><div></div></div> 45.6%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	46	<div><div></div></div> 13.8%
3	N.D.P.	59	<div><div></div></div> 17.7%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT/CREDITISTE	10	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
8	D.K.	1611	
9	N.A.	817	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			







# v117: INFLATION-CONTENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED QUITE A BIT IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS INFLATION. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN INFLATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	CONTENT		
Notes	Q27A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2116	77.2%
1	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PROBLEM (WHAT A TERRIBLE PROBLEM)	119	4.3%
2	HIGH PRICES, HIGH COST OF LIVING	226	8.2%
3	INCOME, WAGES TOO LOW	14	0.5%
4	PRICES AND WAGES GO TOGETHER TO CREATE A SPIRAL, REFERENCE T	22	0.8%
5	PRICES AND WAGES	47	1.7%
6	WAGES TOO HIGH	2	0.1%
7	IMPOSSIBLE TO SAVE	5	0.2%
10	REFERENCE TO FOOD (AND OTHER)	48	1.8%
11	REFERENCE TO FUEL (AND OTHER)	1	0.0%
12	REFERENCE TO HOUSING (AND OTHER)	5	0.2%
13	REFERENCE TO OTHER SPECIFICS	12	0.4%
14	REFERENCE TO FOOD AND FUEL (AND OTHER)	10	0.4%
15	REFERENCE TO FOOD AND HOUSING (AND OTHER)	20	0.7%
16	REFERENCE TO FUEL AND HOUSING (AND OTHER)	0	
17	REFERENCE TO FOOD, FUEL AND HOUSING (AND OTHER)	3	0.1%
20	MENTION OF DEPRESSION OR RECESSION (HEADING FOR A COLLAPSE)	35	1.3%
21	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH OTHER GENERAL MENTIONS	10	0.4%
22	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH FOOD (AND OTHER)	7	0.3%
23	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH FUEL (AND OTHER)	1	0.0%
24	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH HOUSING (AND OTHER)	1	0.0%
25	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS (AN	2	0.1%
26	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH FOOD AND FUEL (AND OTHER)	1	0.0%
27	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH FOOD AND HOUSING (AND OTHER	1	0.0%
28	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH FUEL AND HOUSING (AND OTHER	0	
29	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH FOOD, FUEL AND HOUSING (AND	0	
30	DEPRESSION MENTION COMBINED WITH WAGES AND PRICES	5	0.2%
40	'IT'S A WORLD-WIDE PHENOMENON'	27	1.0%

# v117: INFLATION-CONTENT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
99	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	21	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v118: INFLATION-CAUSES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2238 /-] [Invalid=523 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED QUITE A BIT IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS INFLATION. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN INFLATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	CAUSES		
Notes	Q27A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2116	94.5%
1	UNIONS, HIGH SETTLEMENTS, WAGES, STRIKES	14	0.6%
2	COMPANIES, BIG BUSINESS	16	0.7%
3	GOVERNMENT ACTION (I.E., SPENDING)	11	0.5%
4	GOVERNMENT INACTION	27	1.2%
5	SHORTAGES	3	0.1%
6	INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR, INDIVIDUAL PEOPLE'S ACTION, E.G., PEO	25	1.1%
7	WORLD SITUATION	5	0.2%
8	SPIRAL	4	0.2%
10	UNIONS AND COMPANIES	5	0.2%
11	UNIONS AND GOVERNMENT ACTION	1	0.0%
12	UNIONS AND GOVERNMENT INACTION	2	0.1%
13	UNIONS AND SHORTAGES	0	
14	UNIONS AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR	0	
15	COMPANIES AND GOVERNMENT ACTION	3	0.1%
16	COMPANIES AND GOVERNMENT INACTION	4	0.2%
17	COMPANIES AND SHORTAGES	1	0.0%
18	COMPANIES AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR	0	
19	GOVERNMENT ACTION AND GOVERNMENT INACTION	1	0.0%
20	GOVERNMENT ACTION AND SHORTAGES	0	
21	GOVERNMENT ACTION AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR	0	
22	GOVERNMENT INACTION AND SHORTAGES	0	
23	GOVERNMENT INACTION AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR	0	
24	SHORTAGES AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR	0	
25	MULTIPLE COMBINATIONS	0	
99	NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	523	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v119: INFLATION-ACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2241 /-] [Invalid=520 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		

# v119: INFLATION-ACTION				
Pre-question		I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED QUITE A BIT IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS INFLATION. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN INFLATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question		ACTION		
Notes		Q27A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2116	<div><div></div></div> 94.4%	
1	GENERAL ACTION, 'ACTION NEEDS TO BE TAKEN'	33	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%	
2	GENERAL GOVERNMENT ACTION	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%	
3	SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROL	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%	
4	SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO OTHER POLICY (GOVERNMENT)	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%	
5	SPECIFIC CONTROL OR POLICY, NO GOVERNMENT REFERENCE	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%	
6	INDIVIDUAL ACTION NEEDED, CHANGE IN BEHAVIOUR	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%	
9	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS DIMENSION	520		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v120: INFLATION-HOW MUCH AFFECTED				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=654 /-] [Invalid=2107 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question		HOW MUCH WERE YOU PERSONALLY AFFECTED BY INFLATION OVER THE PAST YEAR OR SO, A GREAT DEAL, SOME, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?		
Notes		Q27B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	A GREAT DEAL	277	<div><div></div></div> 42.4%	
2	SOME	294	<div><div></div></div> 45.0%	
3	NOT MUCH AT ALL	83	<div><div></div></div> 12.7%	
8	D.K.	1474		
9	N.A.	633		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v121: INFLATION-WAY AFFECTED				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2735 /-] [Invalid=26 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to respondents we were affected by inflation some or a great deal.		
Pre-question		HOW MUCH WERE YOU PERSONALLY AFFECTED BY INFLATION OVER THE PAST YEAR OR SO, A GREAT DEAL, SOME, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?		
Literal question		IN WHAT WAY WERE YOU MOST AFFECTED?		
Notes		Q27C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2172	<div><div></div></div> 79.4%	
1	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PRICES/EVERYTHING	115	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%	
2	LACK OF ABILITY TO SAVE	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%	
3	FOOD	109	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%	
4	CLOTHING	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%	
5	FUEL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%	

# v121: INFLATION-WAY AFFECTED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	HOUSING	13	0.5%
7	MACHINERY	8	0.3%
8	COSTS OF BUSINESS OPERATION	20	0.7%
9	OTHER	12	0.4%
10	FOOD AND CLOTHING	73	2.7%
11	FOOD AND FUEL	46	1.7%
12	FOOD AND HOUSING	15	0.5%
13	FOOD AND OTHER	15	0.5%
14	CLOTHING AND FUEL	4	0.1%
15	CLOTHING AND HOUSING	2	0.1%
16	CLOTHING AND OTHER	6	0.2%
17	FUEL AND HOUSING	0	
18	FUEL AND OTHER	2	0.1%
19	HOUSING AND OTHER	1	0.0%
20	OTHER COMBINATIONS	8	0.3%
40	GENERAL REFERENCE TO INCOME	22	0.8%
41	WAGES	4	0.1%
42	PENSIONS	7	0.3%
43	INVESTMENTS	3	0.1%
44	BUSINESS INCOME	3	0.1%
50	INCOME AND PRICES (GENERAL)	34	1.2%
51	INCOME AND LACK OF ABILITY TO SAVE	4	0.1%
52	INCOME AND FOOD	2	0.1%
53	INCOME AND CLOTHING	1	0.0%
54	INCOME AND FUEL	0	
55	INCOME AND HOUSING	3	0.1%
56	INCOME AND MACHINERY	0	
57	INCOME AND COST OF BUSINESS OPERATION	1	0.0%
58	INCOME AND OTHER	2	0.1%
60	INCOME AND FOOD AND CLOTHING	4	0.1%
61	INCOME AND FOOD AND FUEL	1	0.0%
62	INCOME AND FOOD AND HOUSING	1	0.0%
63	INCOME AND FOOD AND OTHER	1	0.0%
64	INCOME AND CLOTHING AND FUEL	1	0.0%
65	INCOME AND CLOTHING AND HOUSING	0	
66	INCOME AND CLOTHING AND OTHER	0	
67	INCOME AND FUEL AND HOUSING	1	0.0%
68	INCOME AND FUEL AND OTHER	0	
69	INCOME AND HOUSING AND OTHER	0	
70	INCOME AND MULTIPLE COMBINATIONS	0	
99	N.A., NO ANSWER ON THIS IDMENSION	26	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v122: INFLATION-ARTICULATE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

# v122: INFLATION-ARTICULATE				
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question		ARTICULATENESS		
Notes		Q27 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO ANSWER ON THE QUESTION	2107	<div></div>	76.3%
1	HIGH	105	<div></div>	3.8%
2	MEDIUM	236	<div></div>	8.5%
3	LOW	313	<div></div>	11.3%
9	N.A.	0		
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>				
# v123: INFLATION-PARTY CLOSE				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=415 /-] [Invalid=2346 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question		Q27A. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED QUITE A BIT IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS INFLATION. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN INFLATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question		WHICH PARTY IS THE CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes		Q27A, Q27D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NONE	2	<div></div>	0.5%
1	LIBERAL	210	<div></div>	50.6%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	116	<div></div>	28.0%
3	N.D.P.	59	<div></div>	14.2%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT/CREDITISTE	21	<div></div>	5.1%
5	OTHER	7	<div></div>	1.7%
8	D.K.	1705		
9	N.A.	641		
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>				
# v124: FAVOUR SEPARATISM				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2107 /-] [Invalid=654 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question		BEFORE WE LEAVE THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL QUESTION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT.		
Literal question		THERE HAS BEEN QUITE A BIT OF TALK IN RECENT YEARS ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF QUEBEC SEPARATING FROM THE REST OF CANADA AND BECOMING AN INDEPENDENT COUNTRY. ARE YOU IN FAVOUR OF SEPARATISM OR OPPOSED TO IT?		
Notes		Q28A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO OPINION	1507	<div></div>	71.5%
1	IN FAVOUR	69	<div></div>	3.3%
2	OPPOSED	488	<div></div>	23.2%
3	QUALIFIED ANSWERS	43	<div></div>	2.0%

# v124: FAVOUR SEPARATISM			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	29	
9	N.A.	625	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v125: SEPARATISM-INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=554 /-] [Invalid=2207 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	BEFORE WE LEAVE THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL QUESTION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT. THERE HAS BEEN QUITE A BIT OF TALK IN RECENT YEARS ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF QUEBEC SEPARATING FROM THE REST OF CANADA AND BECOMING AN INDEPENDENT COUNTRY. ARE YOU IN FAVOUR OF SEPARATISM OR OPPOSED TO IT?		
Literal question	HOW STRONGLY DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?		
Notes	Q28B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	345	 62.3%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	167	 30.1%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	42	 7.6%
8	D.K.	1466	
9	N.A.	741	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v126: SEPARATISM LIKELY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=618 /-] [Invalid=2143 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW LIKELY DO YOU THINK IT IS THAT QUEBEC ACTUALLY WILL SEPARATE AT SOME TIME IN THE FUTURE, VERY LIKELY, FAIRLY LIKELY, OR NOT VERY LIKELY?		
Notes	Q28C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	38	 6.1%
2	FAIRLY LIKELY	103	 16.7%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	477	 77.2%
8	D.K.	1518	
9	N.A. NOT IN HALF SAMPLE	625	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v127: MAJORITY GOVERNMENT VS MINORITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2075 /-] [Invalid=686 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	BEFORE WE LEAVE THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL QUESTION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT.		
Literal question	IN RECENT YEARS, THE POLITICAL PARTY WHICH HAS FORMED THE GOVERNMENT IN OTTAWA HAS FREQUENTLY NOT HAD A MAJORITY OF THE SEATS IN PARLIAMENT. SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT IT IS BETTER WHEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS A MAJORITY OF SEATS IN PARLIAMENT, WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT MINORITY GOVERNMENTS CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE? WHICH DO YOU FEEL IS BETTER?		

# v127: MAJORITY GOVERNMENT VS MINORITY			
Notes		Q29A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1479	<div></div> 71.3%
1	MAJORITY	356	<div></div> 17.2%
2	MINORITY	166	<div></div> 8.0%
3	IT DEPENDS	74	<div></div> 3.6%
8	D.K.	13	
9	N.A.	673	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v128: MAJORITY GOVERNMENT-SWITCH			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=579 /-] [Invalid=2182 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 2.	
Literal question		IF YOU BELIEVED THAT ONE PARTY WAS MORE LIKELY TO BE ABLE TO FORM A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, BUT YOU DID NOT ORDINARILY VOTE FOR THAT PARTY, HOW LIKELY WOULD YOU BE TO VOTE FOR IT IN ORDER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, VERY LIKELY, SOMEWHAT LIKELY, OR NOT AT ALL LIKELY	
Notes		Q29B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	112	<div></div> 19.3%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	133	<div></div> 23.0%
3	NOT AT ALL LIKELY	334	<div></div> 57.7%
8	D.K.	1509	
9	N.A. NOT IN HALF SAMPLE	673	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v129: MAJORITY GOVERNMENT ISSUE INFLUENCE VOTE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=242 /-] [Invalid=2519 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 2.	
Literal question		DID THIS QUESTION OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT HAVE A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOTHING AT ALL TO DO WITH THE WAY YOU VOTED IN THIS LAST ELECTION?	
Notes		Q29C in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A GREAT DEAL	77	<div></div> 31.8%
2	SOMETHING	78	<div></div> 32.2%
3	NOTHING AT ALL	87	<div></div> 36.0%
8	D.K.	1466	
9	N.A. NOT IN HALF SAMPLE	1053	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v130: FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1221 /-] [Invalid=1540 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	

# v130: FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Literal question	THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		
Notes	Q30A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	INDEPENDENT OR NONE	173	<div><div></div></div> 14.2%
1	LIBERAL	605	<div><div></div></div> 49.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	297	<div><div></div></div> 24.3%
3	N.D.P.	110	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	34	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
7	REFUSED	10	
8	D.K.	1530	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v131: FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2507 /-] [Invalid=254 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q30A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		
Post-question	Q30B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q30A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?		
Notes	Q30A, Q30B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	348	<div><div></div></div> 13.9%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	525	<div><div></div></div> 20.9%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	171	<div><div></div></div> 6.8%
7		1463	<div><div></div></div> 58.4%
8	D.K.	4	
9	N.A.	250	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v132: FEEL CLOSER TO FEDERAL PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=220 /-] [Invalid=2541 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "don't know", "independent or none" in Q30A.		
Literal question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Notes	Q31A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	73	<div><div></div></div> 33.2%
2	NO	147	<div><div></div></div> 66.8%
0	REFUSED	1469	
8	D.K.	24	
9	N.A.	1048	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v133: FEDERAL PARTY CLOSER TO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=63 /-] [Invalid=2698 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "don't know", "independent or none" in Q30A. Q31B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q31A.		
Pre-question	Q31A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q31B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q31A, Q31B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	29	<div><div></div></div> 46.0%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	23	<div><div></div></div> 36.5%
3	N.D.P.	10	<div><div></div></div> 15.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
0	REFUSED	1467	
8	D.K.	6	
9	N.A.	1225	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v134: ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1252 /-] [Invalid=1509 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?		
Notes	Q32A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	409	<div><div></div></div> 32.7%
2	NO	843	<div><div></div></div> 67.3%
0	REFUSED	1464	
8	D.K.	45	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v135: PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=403 /-] [Invalid=2358 /-]		
Universe	Q98B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q32A.		
Pre-question	Q32A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q32A, Q98B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	127	<div><div></div></div> 31.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	166	<div><div></div></div> 41.2%
3	N.D.P.	66	<div><div></div></div> 16.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	44	<div><div></div></div> 10.9%
0	REFUSED	1465	

# v135: PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	4	
9	N.A.	889	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v136: WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1866 /-] [Invalid=895 /-]		
Universe	Q32C asked only to respondents who named a party for Q98B.		
Pre-question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY? (IF YES) WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q32C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY?		
Notes	Q32C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	DON'T KNOW,NO ANSWER,NOT SPECIFIED	1480	<div></div> 79.3%
1	LAST ELECTION,JULY 8,1974,1974	86	<div></div> 4.6%
2	1973, LAST YEAR, 1 YEAR AGO	12	<div></div> 0.6%
3	1971 - 1972 2 OR 3 YEARS AGO	39	<div></div> 2.1%
4	1969 - 1970 4 OR 5 YEARS AGO	12	<div></div> 0.6%
5	1967 - 1968 6 OR 7 YEARS AGO	53	<div></div> 2.8%
6	1966 OR EARLIER 8 OR MORE YEARS AGO	86	<div></div> 4.6%
7	GENERAL - A LONG TIME AGO	12	<div></div> 0.6%
8	OTHER ANSWERS,TIME NOT SPECIFIED,UNABLE TO DETERMINE FROM R	86	<div></div> 4.6%
9	NOT APPLICABLE	895	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v137: WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1872 /-] [Invalid=889 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q32A or "don't know" for Q32B.		
Pre-question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY? (IF YES) WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q32D. WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q32D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 78.2%
1	LEADERSHIP,UNSPECIFIED	16	<div></div> 0.9%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	14	<div></div> 0.7%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	15	<div></div> 0.8%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	4	<div></div> 0.2%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	23	<div></div> 1.2%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	3	<div></div> 0.2%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	3	<div></div> 0.2%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	3	<div></div> 0.2%
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	5	<div></div> 0.3%

v137: WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	26	1.4%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	5	0.3%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	8	0.4%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	1	0.1%
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	14	0.7%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	4	0.2%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	11	0.6%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	4	0.2%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	9	0.5%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	3	0.2%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	3	0.2%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	0.1%
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	2	0.1%
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	17	0.9%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	6	0.3%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	5	0.3%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	1	0.1%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	1	0.1%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	3	0.2%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	8	0.4%
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	0.1%
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	4	0.2%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	14	0.7%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	13	0.7%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	5	0.3%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	7	0.4%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	0	
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	5	0.3%

# v137: WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR,ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	3	0.2%
51	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	16	0.9%
52	"THE MAN"	3	0.2%
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	33	1.8%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	8	0.4%
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH/NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	5	0.3%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH /NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	7	0.4%
58	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	0	
59	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	3	0.2%
60	RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	3	0.2%
61	WANTED MINORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
62	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED/NO ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY/ DEPENDS	12	0.6%
63	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. & LIBERAL	5	0.3%
64	MISCELLANEOUS N.D.P.	3	0.2%
88	NO ANSWER,CAN,T REMEMBER,REFUSED	32	1.7%
99	NOT APPLICABLE	889	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v138: WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1872 /-] [Invalid=889 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q32A or "don't know" for Q32B.		
Pre-question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY? (IF YES) WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q32D. WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q32D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1790	95.6%
1	LEADERSHIP,UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	3	0.2%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	1	0.1%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	1	0.1%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	1	0.1%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	1	0.1%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	2	0.1%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%

v138: WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	2	0.1%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	0	
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	2	0.1%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	0	
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	4	0.2%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	1	0.1%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	0	
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	4	0.2%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	1	0.1%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	0.1%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	0.1%
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	0	
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	0	
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	0	
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	1	0.1%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	0	
50	RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	2	0.1%
51	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	4	0.2%

# v138: WHY CHANGE FEDERAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	"THE MAN"	0	
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH/NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	3	0.2%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH /NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	0	
58	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	1	0.1%
59	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	0	
60	RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
61	WANTED MINORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
62	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED/NO ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY/ DEPENDS	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. & LIBERAL	0	
64	MISCELLANEOUS N.D.P.	0	
88	NO ANSWER,CAN,T REMEMBER,REFUSED	32	1.7%
99	NOT APPLICABLE	889	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v139: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1083 /-] [Invalid=1678 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q33A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	775	71.6%
2	NO	308	28.4%
0	REFUSED	1465	
8	D.K.	213	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v140: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=751 /-] [Invalid=2010 /-]		
Universe	Q33B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" to Q33A.		
Pre-question	Q33A. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Literal question	Q33B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q33A, Q33B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	386	51.4%

# v140: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	300	<div><div></div></div> 39.9%
3	N.D.P.	49	<div><div></div></div> 6.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	14	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
0	REFUSED	1465	
8	D.K.	22	
9	N.A.	523	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v141: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=744 /-] [Invalid=2017 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q33A. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA? Q33B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q33C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q33B) WAS HE THEN?		
Notes	Q33A, Q33B, Q33C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONG	448	<div><div></div></div> 60.2%
2	FAIRLY STRONG	227	<div><div></div></div> 30.5%
3	NOT VERY STRONG	69	<div><div></div></div> 9.3%
8	D.K.	1470	
9	N.A.	547	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v142: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1071 /-] [Invalid=1690 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q34A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	577	<div><div></div></div> 53.9%
2	NO	494	<div><div></div></div> 46.1%
0	REFUSED	1464	
8	D.K.	226	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v143: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1276 /-] [Invalid=1485 /-]		
Universe	Q34B asked only to respondents who answered "yes"		
Pre-question	Q34A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Literal question	Q34B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		

# v143: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Notes		Q34A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	301	<div><div></div></div> 23.6%
2	NO	211	<div><div></div></div> 16.5%
3		24	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
4		18	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
5		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
9		721	<div><div></div></div> 56.5%
0	REFUSED	1465	
8	D.K.	20	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v144: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=547 /-] [Invalid=2214 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q34A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA? Q34B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?	
Literal question		Q34C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q34B) WAS SHE THEN	
Notes		Q34A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONG	254	<div><div></div></div> 46.4%
2	FAIRLY STRONG	226	<div><div></div></div> 41.3%
3	NOT VERY STRONG	67	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
8	D.K.	1471	
9	N.A.	743	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v145: PARENTS FEDERAL POLITICS INTEREST			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1174 /-] [Invalid=1587 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN FEDERAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED,SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?	
Notes		Q35 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	429	<div><div></div></div> 36.5%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	533	<div><div></div></div> 45.4%
3	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	209	<div><div></div></div> 17.8%
4	FATHER INTERESTED MOTHER NOT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
5	MOTHER INTERESTED FATHER NOT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	REFUSED	1464	
8	D.K.	123	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v146: CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	

# v146: CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=622 /-] [Invalid=2139 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		
Notes	Q36A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	234	<div><div></div></div> 37.6%
2	NO	388	<div><div></div></div> 62.4%
8	D.K.	1466	
9	N.A.	673	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v147: PARTY CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=233 /-] [Invalid=2528 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q36A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		
Literal question	Q36B. WHICH ONES? (PROBE) ANY OTHERS?		
Notes	Q36A, Q36B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	YES IN Q36A, Q36B N.A.	13	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
1	LIBERAL ONLY	54	<div><div></div></div> 23.2%
2	P.C. ONLY	41	<div><div></div></div> 17.6%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	23	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	42	<div><div></div></div> 18.0%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	10	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
8	P.C. & N.D.P.	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
9	P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
10	N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P.	36	<div><div></div></div> 15.5%
12	LIB. & P.C. & S.C.	0	
13	LIB. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
14	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
15	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
16	COMMUNIST ONLY	0	
17	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
18	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	0	
19	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
20	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
21	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
22	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	0	
23	LIB.& OTHER	0	
24	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	0	

# v147: PARTY CONTACT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
26	OTHER ONLY	0	
27	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
88	D.K.	1464	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	1064	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v148: CANDIDATE CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=101 -/] [Invalid=2660 -/]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2, and if candidates mentioned in Q36B.		
Pre-question	Q36A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING? Q36B. WHICH ONES? (PROBE) ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q36C. WHICH PARTY WAS HE (WERE THEY)?		
Notes	Q36A, Q36B, Q36C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL ONLY	26	<div></div> 25.7%
2	P.C. ONLY	26	<div></div> 25.7%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	10	<div></div> 9.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	1	<div></div> 1.0%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	17	<div></div> 16.8%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	1	<div></div> 1.0%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
8	P.C. & N.D.P.	1	<div></div> 1.0%
9	P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
10	N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div></div> 1.0%
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P.	15	<div></div> 14.9%
12	LIB. & P.C. & S.C.	0	
13	LIB. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
14	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
15	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	1	<div></div> 1.0%
16	COMMUNIST ONLY	1	<div></div> 1.0%
17	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
18	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	0	
19	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
20	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
21	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
22	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	0	
23	LIB. & OTHER	0	
24	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	1	<div></div> 1.0%
25	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
26	OTHER ONLY	0	
27	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
0	YES TO Q36A, Q36B N.A.	130	
88	D.K.	1466	

# v148: CANDIDATE CONTACT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
99	NOT APPLICABLE	1064	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v149: OTHER CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=617 /-] [Invalid=2144 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Notes	Q37A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	510	<div></div> 82.7%
2	NO	107	<div></div> 17.3%
8	D.K.	1471	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v150: OTHER PARTY CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=496 /-] [Invalid=2265 /-]		
Universe	Q37B asked only to half-sample 2, and respondents who answered "yes" for Q37A.		
Pre-question	Q37A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Literal question	Q37B. WHICH PARTY OR PARTIES?		
Notes	Q37A, Q37B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL ONLY	57	<div></div> 11.5%
2	P.C. ONLY	28	<div></div> 5.6%
3	N.D.P.	6	<div></div> 1.2%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	4	<div></div> 0.8%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	99	<div></div> 20.0%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	10	<div></div> 2.0%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	4	<div></div> 0.8%
8	P.C. & N.D.P.	12	<div></div> 2.4%
9	P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	2	<div></div> 0.4%
10	N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P.	188	<div></div> 37.9%
12	LIB. & P.C. & S.C.	11	<div></div> 2.2%
13	LIB. & N.D.P. & S.C.	2	<div></div> 0.4%
14	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	1	<div></div> 0.2%
15	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	62	<div></div> 12.5%
16	COMMUNIST ONLY	1	<div></div> 0.2%
17	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	2	<div></div> 0.4%
18	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	2	<div></div> 0.4%
19	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	1	<div></div> 0.2%

v150: OTHER PARTY CONTACT

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
20	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
21	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	3	0.6%
22	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	0	
23	LIB.& OTHER	0	
24	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	1	0.2%
25	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
26	OTHER ONLY	0	
27	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
0	YES TO Q36A, Q36B N.A.	0	
88	D.K.	1477	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	788	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v151: HOW CONTACTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=510 /-] [Invalid=2251 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2, and respondents who answered "yes" for Q37B.		
Literal question	HOW DID THEY CONTACT YOU?		
Notes	Q37C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MAIL ONLY (ANY LITERATURE LEFT AT DOOR OR IN MAILBOX = MAIL)	437	<div><div></div></div> 85.7%
2	PHONE ONLY	17	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
3	OTHER ONLY	0	
4	MAIL & PHONE	56	<div><div></div></div> 11.0%
5	MAIL & OTHER	0	
6	PHONE & OTHER	0	
7	MAIL & PHONE & OTHER	0	
8	D.K.	1463	
9	N.A.	788	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v152: CAMPAIGN-NEWSPAPER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=624 /-] [Invalid=2137 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU READ QUITE A BIT, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL ABOUT THE PARTIES, CANDIDATES, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q38 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A BIT	263	<div><div></div></div> 42.1%
2	SOMETHING	209	<div><div></div></div> 33.5%
3	NOT MUCH	152	<div><div></div></div> 24.4%
8	D.K.	1464	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v153: CAMPAIGN-TELEVISION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=621 /-] [Invalid=2140 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT TELEVISION? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAGIGN DID YOU WATCH PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?		
Notes	Q39 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A FEW	277	<div><div></div></div> 44.6%
2	SOME	223	<div><div></div></div> 35.9%
3	ALMOST NONE	121	<div><div></div></div> 19.5%

# v153: CAMPAIGN-TELEVISION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	1467	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v154: CAMPAIGN-RADIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=618 /-] [Invalid=2143 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT RADIO? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN DID YOU HEAR PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HEARD QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?		
Notes	Q40 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A FEW	138	<div></div> 22.3%
2	SOME	204	<div></div> 33.0%
3	ALMOST NONE	276	<div></div> 44.7%
8	D.K.	1470	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v155: MOST IMPORTANT MEDIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=611 /-] [Invalid=2150 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHICH WOULD YOU SAY IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU IN GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT POLITICS, RADIO, TELEVISION, OR THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q41 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	RADIO	31	<div></div> 5.1%
2	TELEVISION	244	<div></div> 39.9%
3	NEWSPAPERS	197	<div></div> 32.2%
4	RADIO & TELEVISION	25	<div></div> 4.1%
5	RADIO & NEWSPAPERS	7	<div></div> 1.1%
6	TELEVISION & NEWSPAPERS	74	<div></div> 12.1%
7	ALL EQUALLY	33	<div></div> 5.4%
8	D.K.	1477	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v156: VOTE FREQUENCY-FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1294 /-] [Invalid=1467 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE IN CANADA, INCLUDING THE ONE HELD THIS JULY, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM, SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?		
Notes	Q42A in the documentation.		

# v156: VOTE FREQUENCY-FEDERAL ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ALL	831	<div><div></div></div> 64.2%
2	MOST	318	<div><div></div></div> 24.6%
3	SOME	89	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
4	NONE	37	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
5	NOT ELIGIBLE BEFORE	19	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
8	D.K.	1467	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v157: ALWAYS VOTE SAME-FEDERAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1210 /-] [Invalid=1551 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Notes	Q42B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME	613	<div><div></div></div> 50.7%
2	DIFFERENT	597	<div><div></div></div> 49.3%
0	REFUSED	1464	
8	D.K.	27	
9	N.A.	60	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v158: FEDERL PARTY ALWAYS VOTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=599 /-] [Invalid=2162 /-]		
Universe	Q42C asked only to respondents who have always voted for the same party.		
Pre-question	Q42B. HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Literal question	Q42C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q42B, Q42C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	374	<div><div></div></div> 62.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	162	<div><div></div></div> 27.0%
3	N.D.P.	48	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
5	OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	SPOILED BALLOT	0	
0	REFUSED	1475	
8	D.K.	2	
9	N.A.	685	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v159: CHOICE OR CONTEST-FEDERAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2050 /-] [Invalid=711 /-]		

# v159: CHOICE OR CONTEST-FEDERAL			
Universe	Q42D asked only to respondents who have voted for different parties.		
Pre-question	Q42B. HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Literal question	Q42D. DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE, OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?		
Notes	Q42B, Q42D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 71.4%
1	CHOICE	575	<div></div> 28.0%
2	DID NOT CONTEST	12	<div></div> 0.6%
8	D.K.	10	
9	N.A.	701	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v160: VOTED IN 1974			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1259 /-] [Invalid=1502 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S JULY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE AWAY, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Notes	Q43A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	1087	<div></div> 86.3%
2	DID NOT VOTE	172	<div></div> 13.7%
8	D.K.	1465	
9	N.A.	37	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v161: VOTE 1974			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1033 /-] [Invalid=1728 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted in 1974.		
Literal question	FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?		
Notes	Q43B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	546	<div></div> 52.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	336	<div></div> 32.5%
3	N.D.P.	106	<div></div> 10.3%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	30	<div></div> 2.9%
5	OTHER	4	<div></div> 0.4%
6	SPOILED BALLOT	11	<div></div> 1.1%
0	REFUSED	1505	
8	D.K.	12	
9	N.A.	211	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v162: WHY NOT VOTE 1974	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1671 /-] [Invalid=1090 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "none" in Q42A or "did not vote" for Q43A.
Pre-question	Q43A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S JULY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE AWAY, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?
Literal question	Q43C. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE IN THE JULY ELECTION?
Notes	Q43A, Q43C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	D.K., NO PARTICULAR REASON	1478	88.5%
1	OUT OF TOWN	27	1.6%
2	ON VACATION, HOLIDAYS	38	2.3%
3	IN HOSPITAL, SICK, BLIND	31	1.9%
4	FORGOT ABOUT IT, DIDN'T KNOW WHEN, WHERE VOTING WAS	4	0.2%
5	BUSY	14	0.8%
6	COULDN'T DECIDE, DIDN'T KNOW CANDIDATES, PARTIES	14	0.8%
7	NOT INTERESTED, JUST DIDN'T BOTHER	22	1.3%
8	RELIGIOUS REASONS	0	
9	DID NOT WANT TO VOTE	5	0.3%
10	FELT OWN PARTY WOULD WIN WITHOUT MY VOTE	0	
11	PROTEST, SPOILED BALLOT	5	0.3%
12	WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE	15	0.9%
13	NEVER VOTE	3	0.2%
14	OUT OF TOWN ON BUSINESS, AT SCHOOL, AND OTHER SPECIFIC REASO	9	0.5%
15	INELIGIBLE, NOT ENUMERATED	5	0.3%
16	REFUSED, WOULDN'T SAY	1	0.1%
88	CAN'T REMEMBER	1	
99	N.A.	1089	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v163: PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED 1974	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=167 /-] [Invalid=2594 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	IF YOU HAD VOTED, WHO WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?
Notes	Q43D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	82	49.1%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	48	28.7%
3	N.D.P.	24	14.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	9	5.4%
5	OTHER	0	
6	SPOILED BALLOT	4	2.4%

# v163: PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED 1974			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	REFUSED	1464	
8	D.K.	41	
9	N.A.	1089	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v164: MOST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1200 /-] [Invalid=1561 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT JULY ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q44A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	399	33.2%
2	CANDIDATES	339	28.2%
3	THE PARTIES	462	38.5%
8	D.K.	1517	
9	N.A.	44	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v165: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1152 /-] [Invalid=1609 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHICH WOULD SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT?		
Notes	Q44B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	443	38.5%
2	CANDIDATES	411	35.7%
3	THE PARTIES	298	25.9%
8	D.K.	1565	
9	N.A.	44	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v166: LEAST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1153 /-] [Invalid=1608 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS LEAST IMPORTANT?		
Notes	Q44C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	320	27.8%
2	CANDIDATES	415	36.0%
3	THE PARTIES	418	36.3%

# v166: LEAST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	1564	
9	N.A.	44	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v167: ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=712 /-] [Invalid=2049 /-]		
Universe	Q44D asked only to respondents who mentioned party or candidate as most important in Q44A.		
Pre-question	Q44A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT JULY ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q44D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES, OR HIS STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q44A, Q44D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STAND ON ISSUES	396	<div></div> 55.6%
2	PERSONAL QUALITIES	316	<div></div> 44.4%
8	D.K.	1489	
9	N.A.	560	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v168: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1857 /-] [Invalid=904 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "stand on certain issues" for Q44D.		
Pre-question	Q44D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES, OR HIS STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q44E. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q44D, Q44E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 78.8%
1	INFLATION	77	<div></div> 4.1%
2	COST OF LIVING	13	<div></div> 0.7%
3	WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	30	<div></div> 1.6%
4	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED, GENERAL), ECONOMIC OR FINANCIAL SITUAT	16	<div></div> 0.9%
5	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING, MORTGAGE OR INTEREST RATES	3	<div></div> 0.2%
6	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	5	<div></div> 0.3%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT	8	<div></div> 0.4%
8	FOREIGN INVESTMENT OR CONTROL	3	<div></div> 0.2%
9	FOREIGN AFFAIRS OR TRADE	4	<div></div> 0.2%
10	FARM OR AGRICULTURAL	7	<div></div> 0.4%
11	OIL OR ENERGY	8	<div></div> 0.4%
12	OLD AGE PENSION OR CARE FOR THE OLD	27	<div></div> 1.5%
13	POLLUTION, ECOLOGICAL, RESOURCES	2	<div></div> 0.1%

v168: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	LEADERSHIP, GOOD LEADER, QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP	12	0.6%
15	BUDGET	6	0.3%
16	BILINGUALISM OR FRENCH ISSUE	11	0.6%
17	REGIONAL DISPARITIES (ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL)	4	0.2%
18	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	3	0.2%
19	EDUCATION	2	0.1%
20	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS OR CORPORATE RIP-OFFS	2	0.1%
21	TAXES (INCOME, TAXES ON SPECIFIC THINGS, I.E. CLOTHING)	4	0.2%
22	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS OR HIS CONSTITUENTS OR KEEPS US	13	0.7%
23	GENERAL ISSUES	12	0.6%
24	GENERAL LIKE OF PLATFORM POLICIES (NO SPECIFIC ISSUE)	14	0.8%
25	MENTION LEADER (ONLY)	9	0.5%
26	MENTION PARTY (ONLY)	3	0.2%
27	MENTION CANDIDATE (ONLY)	4	0.2%
28	ABILITY TO GOVERN OR RUN THE COUNTRY	3	0.2%
29	UNITY	5	0.3%
30	IMMIGRATION	0	
31	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
32	WAGES OR INCOME	1	0.1%
33	LABOUR, LABOUR DISPUTES, UNIONS	1	0.1%
34	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST, PAST PERFORMANCE, WOULD DO WELL	5	0.3%
35	SPECIFIC LOCAL OR REGIONAL ISSUES	11	0.6%
36	MORAL ISSUES (LAWS GOVERNING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT,ABORTION)	5	0.3%
37	WELFARE, SOCIAL WELFARE, OTHER BENEFITS	3	0.2%
38	FOR WORKING MAN, PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, O	8	0.4%
39	KEEP PROMISES, DO WHAT THEY SAY THEY WILL	2	0.1%
40	DON'T OR CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	3	0.2%
41	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.1%
42	GENERAL DISILLUSIONMENT, DISBELIEF IN ANYONE, EVERYONE IS A	2	0.1%
43	MAKE CANADA A BETTER OR GOOD COUNTRY TO LIVE IN, GENERAL SI	1	0.1%
44	ELECTION (BEING CALLED OR COST)	2	0.1%
45	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
46	AGAINST SEPARATISM	2	0.1%
47	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR OR AGAINST)	1	0.1%
48	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	2	0.1%
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER	32	1.7%
98	REFUSED	2	
99	N.A.	902	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v169: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1857 /-] [Invalid=904 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "stand on certain issues" for Q44D.		
Pre-question	Q44D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES, OR HIS STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q44E. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q44D, Q44E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1689	91.0%
1	INFLATION	15	0.8%
2	COST OF LIVING	6	0.3%
3	WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	10	0.5%
4	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED, GENERAL), ECONOMIC OR FINANCIAL SITUA	5	0.3%
5	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING, MORTGAGE OR INTEREST RATES	6	0.3%
6	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	2	0.1%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT	6	0.3%
8	FOREIGN INVESTMENT OR CONTROL	4	0.2%
9	FOREIGN AFFAIRS OR TRADE	4	0.2%
10	FARM OR AGRICULTURAL	4	0.2%
11	OIL OR ENERGY	4	0.2%
12	OLD AGE PENSION OR CARE FOR THE OLD	15	0.8%
13	POLLUTION, ECOLOGICAL, RESOURCES	2	0.1%
14	LEADERSHIP, GOOD LEADER, QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP	3	0.2%
15	BUDGET	3	0.2%
16	BILINGUALISM OR FRENCH ISSUE	6	0.3%
17	REGIONAL DISPARITIES (ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL)	2	0.1%
18	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.1%
19	EDUCATION	3	0.2%
20	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS OR CORPORATE RIP-OFFS	1	0.1%
21	TAXES (INCOME, TAXES ON SPECIFIC THINGS, I.E. CLOTHING)	5	0.3%
22	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS OR HIS CONSTITUENTS OR KEEPS US	0	
23	GENERAL ISSUES	3	0.2%
24	GENERAL LIKE OF PLATFORM POLICIES (NO SPECIFIC ISSUE	2	0.1%
25	MENTION LEADER (ONLY)	0	
26	MENTION PARTY (ONLY)	1	0.1%
27	MENTION CANDIDATE (ONLY)	1	0.1%
28	ABILITY TO GOVERN OR RUN THE COUNTRY	2	0.1%
29	UNITY	1	0.1%
30	IMMIGRATION	0	
31	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
32	WAGES OR INCOME	0	
33	LABOUR, LABOUR DISPUTES, UNIONS	0	

# v169: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST, PAST PERFORMANCE, WOULD DO WELL	0	
35	SPECIFIC LOCAL OR REGIONAL ISSUES	3	0.2%
36	MORAL ISSUES (LAWS GOVERNING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT,ABORTION)	0	
37	WELFARE, SOCIAL WELFARE, OTHER BENEFITS	4	0.2%
38	FOR WORKING MAN, PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, O	5	0.3%
39	KEEP PROMISES, DO WHAT THEY SAY THEY WILL	1	0.1%
40	DON'T OR CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	1	0.1%
41	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
42	GENERAL DISILLUSIONMENT, DISBELIEF IN ANYONE, EVERYONE IS A	1	0.1%
43	MAKE CANADA A BETTER OR GOOD COUNTRY TO LIVE IN, GENERAL SI	1	0.1%
44	ELECTION (BEING CALLED OR COST)	0	
45	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
46	AGAINST SEPARATISM	0	
47	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR OR AGAINST)	1	0.1%
48	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.1%
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER	32	1.7%
98	REFUSED	2	
99	N.A.	902	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v170: PARTY-APPROACH OR ISSUES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=441 /-] [Invalid=2320 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents if party mentioned as most important in Q44A.		
Pre-question	Q44A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT JULY ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q44F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q44A, Q44F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITION ON ISSUES	192	43.5%
2	GENERAL APPROACH	249	56.5%
8	D.K.	1484	
9	N.A.	836	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v171: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1655 /-] [Invalid=1106 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "position on issues" for Q44D.		
Pre-question	Q44D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES, OR HIS STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		

# v171: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Literal question		Q44G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)	
Notes		Q44D, Q44G in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 88.4%
1	INFLATION	55	<div></div> 3.3%
2	COST OF LIVING	7	<div></div> 0.4%
3	WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	26	<div></div> 1.6%
4	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED, GENERAL), ECONOMIC OR FINANCIAL SITUA	13	<div></div> 0.8%
5	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING, MORTGAGE OR INTEREST RATES	1	<div></div> 0.1%
6	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	2	<div></div> 0.1%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT	2	<div></div> 0.1%
8	FOREIGN INVESTMENT OR CONTROL	0	<div></div>
9	FOREIGN AFFAIRS OR TRADE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
10	FARM OR AGRICULTURAL	5	<div></div> 0.3%
11	OIL OR ENERGY	2	<div></div> 0.1%
12	OLD AGE PENSION OR CARE FOR THE OLD	4	<div></div> 0.2%
13	POLLUTION, ECOLOGICAL, RESOURCES	2	<div></div> 0.1%
14	LEADERSHIP, GOOD LEADER, QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP	2	<div></div> 0.1%
15	BUDGET	6	<div></div> 0.4%
16	BILINGUALISM OR FRENCH ISSUE	3	<div></div> 0.2%
17	REGIONAL DISPARITIES (ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL)	1	<div></div> 0.1%
18	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	3	<div></div> 0.2%
19	EDUCATION	1	<div></div> 0.1%
20	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS OR CORPORATE RIP-OFFS	3	<div></div> 0.2%
21	TAXES (INCOME, TAXES ON SPECIFIC THINGS, I.E. CLOTHING)	4	<div></div> 0.2%
22	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS OR HIS CONSTITUENTS OR KEEPS US	0	<div></div>
23	GENERAL ISSUES	9	<div></div> 0.5%
24	GENERAL LIKE OF PLATFORM POLICIES (NO SPECIFIC ISSUE)	4	<div></div> 0.2%
25	MENTION LEADER (ONLY)	0	<div></div>
26	MENTION PARTY (ONLY)	1	<div></div> 0.1%
27	MENTION CANDIDATE (ONLY)	0	<div></div>
28	ABILITY TO GOVERN OR RUN THE COUNTRY	1	<div></div> 0.1%
29	UNITY	0	<div></div>
30	IMMIGRATION	0	<div></div>
31	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	4	<div></div> 0.2%
32	WAGES OR INCOME	2	<div></div> 0.1%
33	LABOUR, LABOUR DISPUTES, UNIONS	1	<div></div> 0.1%
34	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST, PAST PERFORMANCE, WOULD DO WELL	0	<div></div>
35	SPECIFIC LOCAL OR REGIONAL ISSUES	1	<div></div> 0.1%
36	MORAL ISSUES (LAWS GOVERNING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, ABORTION)	1	<div></div> 0.1%
37	WELFARE, SOCIAL WELFARE, OTHER BENEFITS	1	<div></div> 0.1%

# v171: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
38	FOR WORKING MAN, PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, O	2	0.1%
39	KEEP PROMISES, DO WHAT THEY SAY THEY WILL	2	0.1%
40	DON'T OR CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	0	
41	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.1%
42	GENERAL DISILLUSIONMENT, DISBELIEF IN ANYONE, EVERYONE IS A	1	0.1%
43	MAKE CANADA A BETTER OR GOOD COUNTRY TO LIVE IN, GENERAL SI	1	0.1%
44	ELECTION (BEING CALLED OR COST)	0	
45	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
46	AGAINST SEPARATISM	0	
47	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR OR AGAINST)	1	0.1%
48	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER	16	1.0%
98	REFUSED	0	
99	N.A.	1106	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v172: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1655 /-] [Invalid=1106 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "position on issues" for Q44D.		
Pre-question	Q44D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES, OR HIS STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q44G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q44D, Q44G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1554	93.9%
1	INFLATION	20	1.2%
2	COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%
3	WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	5	0.3%
4	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED, GENERAL), ECONOMIC OR FINANCIAL SITUA	2	0.1%
5	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING, MORTGAGE OR INTEREST RATES	5	0.3%
6	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	0	
7	UNEMPLOYMENT	3	0.2%
8	FOREIGN INVESTMENT OR CONTROL	3	0.2%
9	FOREIGN AFFAIRS OR TRADE	5	0.3%
10	FARM OR AGRICULTURAL	1	0.1%
11	OIL OR ENERGY	3	0.2%
12	OLD AGE PENSION OR CARE FOR THE OLD	5	0.3%
13	POLLUTION, ECOLOGICAL, RESOURCES	1	0.1%
14	LEADERSHIP, GOOD LEADER, QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP	0	
15	BUDGET	0	
16	BILINGUALISM OR FRENCH ISSUE	3	0.2%

# v172: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	REGIONAL DISPARITIES (ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL)	4	0.2%
18	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
19	EDUCATION	1	0.1%
20	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS OR CORPORATE RIP-OFFS	3	0.2%
21	TAXES (INCOME, TAXES ON SPECIFIC THINGS, I.E. CLOTHING)	6	0.4%
22	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS OR HIS CONSTITUENTS OR KEEPS US	0	
23	GENERAL ISSUES	2	0.1%
24	GENERAL LIKE OF PLATFORM POLICIES (NO SPECIFIC ISSUE)	0	
25	MENTION LEADER (ONLY)	0	
26	MENTION PARTY (ONLY)	0	
27	MENTION CANDIDATE (ONLY)	0	
28	ABILITY TO GOVERN OR RUN THE COUNTRY	0	
29	UNITY	1	0.1%
30	IMMIGRATION	2	0.1%
31	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
32	WAGES OR INCOME	0	
33	LABOUR, LABOUR DISPUTES, UNIONS	1	0.1%
34	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST, PAST PERFORMANCE, WOULD DO WELL	0	
35	SPECIFIC LOCAL OR REGIONAL ISSUES	1	0.1%
36	MORAL ISSUES (LAWS GOVERNING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, ABORTION)	0	
37	WELFARE, SOCIAL WELFARE, OTHER BENEFITS	3	0.2%
38	FOR WORKING MAN, PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, O	1	0.1%
39	KEEP PROMISES, DO WHAT THEY SAY THEY WILL	0	
40	DON'T OR CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	1	0.1%
41	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
42	GENERAL DISILLUSIONMENT, DISBELIEF IN ANYONE, EVERYONE IS A	0	
43	MAKE CANADA A BETTER OR GOOD COUNTRY TO LIVE IN, GENERAL SI	0	
44	ELECTION (BEING CALLED OR COST)	0	
45	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
46	AGAINST SEPARATISM	0	
47	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR OR AGAINST)	0	
48	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.1%
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER	16	1.0%
98	REFUSED	0	
99	N.A.	1106	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v179: 2ND CHOICE PARTY-1974			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/7]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=982 /-] [Invalid=1779 /-]		

# v179: 2ND CHOICE PARTY-1974				
Universe		All respondents		
Literal question		IF, FOR SOME REASON, YOU HAD BEEN UNABLE TO VOTE FOR THE FEDERAL PARTY THAT YOU MOST PREFERRED IN THE RECENT ELECTION, WHICH OTHER FEDERAL PARTY WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?		
Notes		Q47A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	WOULD NOT VOTE	223	<div></div>	22.7%
1	LIBERAL	230	<div></div>	23.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	260	<div></div>	26.5%
3	N.D.P.	179	<div></div>	18.2%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	81	<div></div>	8.2%
5	OTHER	5	<div></div>	0.5%
6	SPOILED BALLOT	4	<div></div>	0.4%
7	REFUSED	1477		
8	D.K.	302		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v180: PARTY LEAST PREFERENCE-1974				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1068 /-] [Invalid=1693 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Literal question		WHICH OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES WOULD YOU LEAST WANT TO VOTE FOR?		
Notes		Q47B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LIBERAL	127	<div></div>	11.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	155	<div></div>	14.5%
3	N.D.P.	379	<div></div>	35.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	289	<div></div>	27.1%
5	COMMUNIST	82	<div></div>	7.7%
6	OTHER OR MULTIPLE MENTION	36	<div></div>	3.4%
0	REFUSED	1471		
8	D.K.	222		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v181: TIME OF VOTE DECISION				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/88/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=564 /-] [Invalid=2197 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1, and respondents who voted, as indicated in Q43A.		
Literal question		AS YOU KNOW, THE ELECTION WAS HELD ON JULY 8, 1974. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?		
Notes		Q48A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0		25	<div></div>	4.4%
1	KNEW ALL ALONG, ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE SAME PARTY	103	<div></div>	18.3%
2	QUITE AWHILE BEFORE THE ELECTION WAS CALLED	51	<div></div>	9.0%
3	WHEN THE ELECTION WAS CALLED	154	<div></div>	27.3%

# v181: TIME OF VOTE DECISION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	6 WEEKS BEFORE	22	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
5	5 WEEKS BEFORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	4 WEEKS BEFORE	40	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
7	3 WEEKS BEFORE	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
8	2 WEEKS BEFORE	37	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
9	1 WEEK BEFORE	50	<div><div></div></div> 8.9%
10	AT POLL, ELECTION DAY	37	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
11	REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC EVENT (UNDATED)	11	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
12	OTHER	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
13	SEVERAL OR A FEW WEEKS BEFORE	11	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
88	D.K.	1497	
99	N.A. (DID NOT VOTE)	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v182: SURE ALL ALONG			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=555 /-] [Invalid=2206 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1, and respondents who voted, as indicated in Q43A.		
Pre-question	Q48A. AS YOU KNOW, THE ELECTION WAS HELD ON JULY 8, 1974. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?		
Literal question	Q48B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR, OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?		
Notes	Q48A, Q48B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SURE ALL ALONG	445	<div><div></div></div> 80.2%
2	CONSIDERED OTHER	103	<div><div></div></div> 18.6%
3		7	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
8	D.K.	1479	
9	N.A.	727	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v183: OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=127 /-] [Invalid=2634 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1, and to respondents who considered voting for another party.		
Pre-question	Q48A. AS YOU KNOW, THE ELECTION WAS HELD ON JULY 8, 1974. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE? / Q48B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR, OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?		
Literal question	Q48C. (IF OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED) WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q48A, Q48B, Q48C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		25	<div><div></div></div> 19.7%
1	LIBERAL	31	<div><div></div></div> 24.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	37	<div><div></div></div> 29.1%
3	N.D.P.	22	<div><div></div></div> 17.3%

# v183: OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	SOCIAL CREDIT/CREDITISTE	7	<div><div></div></div> 5.5%
5	OTHER	5	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
8	D.K.	1468	
9	N.A.	1166	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v184: REAL REASON VOTED-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=563 /-] [Invalid=2198 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	WE HAVE ASKED A LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT REASONS WHY YOU MIGHT HAVE DECIDED TO VOTE. SOMETIMES, HOWEVER, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO, COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q49 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		25	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE, ETC.	13	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	12	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
10	LIBERALS - PRO	63	<div><div></div></div> 11.2%
11	LIBERALS - CON	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	13	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
15	N.D.P. - CON	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	12	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	18	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	33	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
23	STANFIELD - PRO	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
24	STANFIELD - CON	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
25	LEWIS - PRO	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
26	LEWIS - CON	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
27	CAOINETTE - PRO	0	
28	CAOINETTE - CON	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	46	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	71	<div><div></div></div> 12.6%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - PRO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v184: REAL REASON VOTED-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - NEUTRAL	7	1.2%
45	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - CON	8	1.4%
46	BUDGET - PRO	3	0.5%
47	BUDGET - NEUTRAL	2	0.4%
48	BUDGET - CON	2	0.4%
49	BILINGUALISM - PRO	0	
50	BILINGUALISM - NEUTRAL	4	0.7%
51	BILINGUALISM - CON	0	
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	1	0.2%
58	AGRICULTURE	1	0.2%
59	HEALTH CARE	1	0.2%
60	THE ECONOMY	13	2.3%
61	TAXES	3	0.5%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	3	0.5%
63	WELFARE	2	0.4%
64	HOUSING	4	0.7%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.2%
66	ENERGY POLICY	5	0.9%
67	PENSIONS	19	3.4%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	3	0.5%
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	3	0.5%
70	PROTEST VOTE	8	1.4%
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	29	5.2%
72	MINORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	1	0.2%
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	2	0.4%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	9	1.6%
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	4	0.7%
81	CIVIC DUTY	11	2.0%
85	OTHER	18	3.2%
88	D.K.	1490	
99	N.A.	708	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v185: REAL REASON VOTED-2ND RESPONSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=340 /-] [Invalid=2421 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Literal question	WE HAVE ASKED A LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT REASONS WHY YOU MIGHT HAVE DECIDED TO VOTE. SOMETIMES, HOWEVER, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO, COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU? (SECOND MENTION)
Notes	Q49 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		25	7.4%

v185: REAL REASON VOTED-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE, ETC.	6	1.8%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	2	0.6%
10	LIBERALS - PRO	30	8.8%
11	LIBERALS - CON	7	2.1%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	8	2.4%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	9	2.6%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	4	1.2%
15	N.D.P. - CON	0	
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	1	0.3%
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	6	1.8%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	15	4.4%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	12	3.5%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	3	0.9%
23	STANFIELD - PRO	3	0.9%
24	STANFIELD - CON	7	2.1%
25	LEWIS - PRO	1	0.3%
26	LEWIS - CON	0	
27	CAOINETTE - PRO	3	0.9%
28	CAOINETTE - CON	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	10	2.9%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	4	1.2%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	3	0.9%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	22	6.5%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	41	12.1%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	5	1.5%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - PRO	5	1.5%
44	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - NEUTRAL	1	0.3%
45	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - CON	4	1.2%
46	BUDGET - PRO	3	0.9%
47	BUDGET - NEUTRAL	0	
48	BUDGET - CON	0	
49	BILINGUALISM - PRO	1	0.3%
50	BILINGUALISM - NEUTRAL	7	2.1%
51	BILINGUALISM - CON	1	0.3%
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	3	0.9%
58	AGRICULTURE	4	1.2%
59	HEALTH CARE	2	0.6%
60	THE ECONOMY	4	1.2%
61	TAXES	14	4.1%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	6	1.8%
63	WELFARE	1	0.3%
64	HOUSING	5	1.5%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	2	0.6%

# v185: REAL REASON VOTED-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	ENERGY POLICY	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
67	PENSIONS	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOB	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
70	PROTEST VOTE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
72	MINORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	0	
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
81	CIVIC DUTY	0	
85	OTHER	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
88	D.K.	1465	
99	NO SECOND MENTION	956	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v186: REAL REASON VOTED-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=174 /-] [Invalid=2587 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	WE HAVE ASKED A LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT REASONS WHY YOU MIGHT HAVE DECIDED TO VOTE. SOMETIMES, HOWEVER, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO, COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q49 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		25	<div><div></div></div> 14.4%
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE, ETC.	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
10	LIBERALS - PRO	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
11	LIBERALS - CON	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
15	N.D.P. - CON	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	0	
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
18	PARTY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	7	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
23	STANFIELD - PRO	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
24	STANFIELD - CON	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%

v186: REAL REASON VOTED-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	LEWIS - PRO	1	0.6%
26	LEWIS - CON	0	
27	CAOINETTE - PRO	0	
28	CAOINETTE - CON	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	4	2.3%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	1	0.6%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	0	
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	5	2.9%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	7	4.0%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	3	1.7%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - PRO	3	1.7%
44	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - NEUTRAL	2	1.1%
45	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS - CON	8	4.6%
46	BUDGET - PRO	0	
47	BUDGET - NEUTRAL	0	
48	BUDGET - CON	0	
49	BILINGUALISM - PRO	1	0.6%
50	BILINGUALISM - NEUTRAL	5	2.9%
51	BILINGUALISM - CON	1	0.6%
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	5	2.9%
58	AGRICULTURE	3	1.7%
59	HEALTH CARE	2	1.1%
60	THE ECONOMY	6	3.4%
61	TAXES	4	2.3%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	2	1.1%
63	WELFARE	2	1.1%
64	HOUSING	2	1.1%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	6	3.4%
66	ENERGY POLICY	5	2.9%
67	PENSIONS	4	2.3%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	0	
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	4	2.3%
70	PROTEST VOTE	1	0.6%
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	2	1.1%
72	MINORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	1	0.6%
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	4	2.3%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.6%
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	4	2.3%
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	1	0.6%
81	CIVIC DUTY	0	
85	OTHER	10	5.7%
88	D.K.	1465	
99	NO THIRD MENTION	1122	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v173: VOTED IN 1972			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1269 /-] [Invalid=1492 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THE LAST FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THE ONE IN JULY WAS IN OCTOBER 1972. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER OR NOT YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q50A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	1121	<div><div></div></div> 88.3%
2	DIDN'T VOTE	88	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE	60	<div><div></div></div> 4.7%
8	DON'T REMEMBER	1492	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v174: VOTE IN 1972 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1038 /-] [Invalid=1723 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted in 1972.		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR?		
Notes	Q45B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	559	<div><div></div></div> 53.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	308	<div><div></div></div> 29.7%
3	N.D.P.	122	<div><div></div></div> 11.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	47	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
5	OTHER	0	
6	SPOILED BALLOT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	REFUSED	1495	
8	D.K., DON'T REMEMBER	51	
9	N.A.	177	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v175: WHY SWITCH 72-74,1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1638 /-] [Invalid=1123 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted for a different party in 1972 than in 1974.		
Literal question	I NOTICED THAT YOU CHANGED YOUR VOTE FROM 1972 TO 1974. WAS THERE ANY SPECIAL REASON FOR CHANGING THE PARTY YOU VOTED FOR?		
Notes	Q45C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO, NOT REALLY, NO REAL REASON	1466	<div><div></div></div> 89.5%
1	WANTED A MAJORITY OR STABLE GOVERNMENT, STRONG GOVERNMENT	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
2	DIDN'T WANT A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, WANTED TO KEEP MINORITY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
3	LIKE LIBERALS, WOULD DO A GOOD JOB, HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB, A	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v175: WHY SWITCH 72-74,1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	LIKE LIBERALS PLATFORM, STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEALS OR DEALT	5	0.3%
5	DISLIKED LIBERALS, DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB, GET RID OF GOVERNMENT	10	0.6%
6	DISLIKED LIBERALS STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, WAY DEALT WITH	6	0.4%
7	LIKED TRUDEAU, GOOD LEADER, HAS DONE HIS BEST, A GOOD JOB	5	0.3%
8	LIKED TRUDEAU'S STAND ON ISSUES, HIS PLATFORM	2	0.1%
9	DISLIKED TRUDEAU, INEFFECTIVE, NOT A GOOD LEADER, OUT OF TO	5	0.3%
10	DISLIKED TRUDEAU'S STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEALT OR DIDN'T DEAT	0	
11	LIKED CANDIDATE, POSITIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	13	0.8%
12	DISLIKED CANDIDATE, NEGATIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	7	0.4%
13	TIME FOR A CHANGE, WANTED A CHANGE, GHANGE NEEDED, CHANGE M	7	0.4%
14	LIKED CONSERVATIVES (GENERAL), MORE FAITH IN THEM, GIVE THE	3	0.2%
15	LIKED CONSERVATIVES, STAND ON ISSUES, PLATFORM	8	0.5%
16	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES, GENERAL PERFORMANCE, LOST FAITH IN	0	
17	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES, STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	7	0.4%
18	LIKED STANFIELD, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER, BETTER LEADER	0	
19	LIKED STANFIELD, STAND ON ISSUES	2	0.1%
20	DISLIKED STANFIELD, WOULD NOT BE GOOD LEADER OR EFFECTIVE L	2	0.1%
21	DISLIKED STANFIELD'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	1	0.1%
22	LIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), GIVE THEM A CHANCE	1	0.1%
23	LIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORM	4	0.2%
24	DISLIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), WEREN'T DOING A GOOD JOB	1	0.1%
25	DISLIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORMS	0	
26	DISILLUSIONED WITH ALL PARTIES, DOESN'T MATTER WHO FORMS GO	2	0.1%
27	FORMER PARTY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO FORM GOVERNMENT	6	0.4%
28	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T, WOULDN'T KEEP OR FULFILL PROMISES	1	0.1%
29	SPECIFIC ISSUES, POLICIES	8	0.5%
30	ISSUES, POLICIES UNSPECIFIED	6	0.4%
31	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	1	0.1%
32	CANDIDATE (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	15	0.9%
33	LEADER (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	2	0.1%
34	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD PROVINCIAL FACTOR	1	0.1%
35	LOCAL ISSUES OR LOCAL NEEDS	1	0.1%
36	MADE UP MY OWN MIND, DECIDED TO IGNORE FAMILY TRADITION, OR	0	

# v175: WHY SWITCH 72-74,1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	PARTY LEADER WAS TOO OLD, TIME HE SHOULD RETIRE	1	0.1%
38	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED), THE PEOPLE IN THE PARTY (UNSPECIF	1	0.1%
39	IN 1974 SWITCHED BACK TO FORMER (1968) PARTY, DECIDED TO GI	3	0.2%
40	ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE MAN (BEST CANDIDATE)	3	0.2%
41	DISLIKED LEWIS' STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	3	0.2%
42	NO STRONG ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY, LIKE THINGS ABOUT MORE T	1	0.1%
43	FORMER PARTY DEVIATING FROM THEIR IDEALS, POLICIES	0	
44	N.D.P. CAUSING HAVOC (ELECTION), POLITICAL BLACKMAIL, HAD G	1	0.1%
45	LIKED MRS. TRUDEAU	0	
46	LIKED LEWIS, HIS CONTROL OVER THE PARTY, PROVIDED GOOD PART	2	0.1%
47	FELT SORRY FOR STANFIELD, DIDN'T WANT HIM TO HAVE TO CLEAN	1	0.1%
48	SOCIAL CREDIT DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	1	0.1%
49	PROVINCIAL FACTOR (ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED)	0	
50	WANTED TRUDEAU (LIBERALS) TO HAVE MORE OPPOSITION, SMARTEN	0	
51	LIKED POLICIES, PROGRAMS, IDEAS OF CREDITISTE, SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
52	WANTED SAME PARTY FEDERALLY AND PROVINCIALY	0	
53	NOT SATISFIED WITH SOCIAL CREDIT	1	0.1%
54	THOUGHT SOCIAL CREDIT WOULD DO GOOD JOB, WANTED TO GIVE THE	0	
55	VOTED FOR THE MAN	0	
56	N.D.P. DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	0	
57	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T RUN A CANDIDATE	0	
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, NOT STATED	2	0.1%
99	N.A.	1123	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v176: WHY SWITCH 72-74,2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1638 /-] [Invalid=1123 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted for a different party in 1972 than in 1974.		
Pre-question	I NOTICED THAT YOU CHANGED YOUR VOTE FROM 1972 TO 1974. WAS THERE ANY SPECIAL REASON FOR CHANGING THE PARTY YOU VOTED FOR?		
Literal question	WERE THERE ANY OTHER REASONS?		
Notes	Q45C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTOIN	1579	96.4%
1	WANTED A MAJORITY OR STABLE GOVERNMENT, STRONG GOVERNMENT	5	0.3%
2	DIDN'T WANT A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, WANTED TO KEEP MINORITY	0	

v176: WHY SWITCH 72-74,2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	LIKE LIBERALS, WOULD DO A GOOD JOB, HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB, A	1	0.1%
4	LIKE LIBERALS PLATFORM, STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEALS OR DEALT	2	0.1%
5	DISLIKED LIBERALS, DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB, GET RID OF GOVERNMENT	3	0.2%
6	DISLIKED LIBERALS STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, WAY DEALT WITH	2	0.1%
7	LIKED TRUDEAU, GOOD LEADER, HAS DONE HIS BEST, A GOOD JOB	1	0.1%
8	LIKED TRUDEAU'S STAND ON ISSUES, HIS PLATFORM	0	
9	DISLIKED TRUDEAU, INEFFECTIVE, NOT A GOOD LEADER, OUT OF TO	1	0.1%
10	DISLIKED TRUDEAU'S STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEALT OR DIDN'T DE	1	0.1%
11	LIKED CANDIDATE, POSITIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	2	0.1%
12	DISLIKED CANDIDATE, NEGATIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	0	
13	TIME FOR A CHANGE, WANTED A CHANGE, GHANGE NEEDED, CHANGE M	6	0.4%
14	LIKED CONSERVATIVES (GENERAL), MORE FAITH IN THEM, GIVE THE	2	0.1%
15	LIKED CONSERVATIVES, STAND ON ISSUES, PLATFORM	1	0.1%
16	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES, GENERAL PERFORMANCE, LOST FAITH IN	2	0.1%
17	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES, STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	0	
18	LIKED STANFIELD, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER, BETTER LEADER	0	
19	LIKED STANFIELD, STAND ON ISSUES	0	
20	DISLIKED STANFIELD, WOULD NOT BE GOOD LEADER OR EFFECTIVE L	0	
21	DISLIKED STANFIELD'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	2	0.1%
22	LIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), GIVE THEM A CHANCE	2	0.1%
23	LIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORM	1	0.1%
24	DISLIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), WEREN'T DOING A GOOD JOB	3	0.2%
25	DISLIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORMS	0	
26	DISILLUSIONED WITH ALL PARTIES, DOESN'T MATTER WHO FORMS GO	0	
27	FORMER PARTY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO FORM GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
28	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T, WOULDN'T KEEP OR FULFILL PROMISES	1	0.1%
29	SPECIFIC ISSUES, POLICIES	4	0.2%
30	ISSUES, POLICIES UNSPECIFIED	0	
31	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	1	0.1%
32	CANDIDATE (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	2	0.1%
33	LEADER (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	2	0.1%
34	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD PROVINCIAL FACTOR	0	
35	LOCAL ISSUES OR LOCAL NEEDS	1	0.1%

# v176: WHY SWITCH 72-74,2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	MADE UP MY OWN MIND, DECIDED TO IGNORE FAMILY TRADITION, OR	1	0.1%
37	PARTY LEADER WAS TOO OLD, TIME HE SHOULD RETIRE	0	
38	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED), THE PEOPLE IN THE PARTY (UNSPECIF	2	0.1%
39	IN 1974 SWITCHED BACK TO FORMER (1968) PARTY, DECIDED TO GI	0	
40	ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE MAN (BEST CANDIDATE)	0	
41	DISLIKED LEWIS' STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	0	
42	NO STRONG ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY, LIKE THINGS ABOUT MORE T	0	
43	FORMER PARTY DEVIATING FROM THEIR IDEALS, POLICIES	1	0.1%
44	N.D.P. CAUSING HAVOC (ELECTION), POLITICAL BLACKMAIL, HAD G	1	0.1%
45	LIKED MRS. TRUDEAU	1	0.1%
46	LIKED LEWIS, HIS CONTROL OVER THE PARTY, PROVIDED GOOD PART	0	
47	FELT SORRY FOR STANFIELD, DIDN'T WANT HIM TO HAVE TO CLEAN	0	
48	SOCIAL CREDIT DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	0	
49	PROVINCIAL FACTOR (ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED)	0	
50	WANTED TRUDEAU (LIBERALS) TO HAVE MORE OPPOSITION, SMARTEN	0	
51	LIKED POLICIES, PROGRAMS, IDEAS OF CREDITISTE, SOCIAL CREDI	0	
52	WANTED SAME PARTY FEDERALLY AND PROVINCIALY	0	
53	NOT SATISFIED WITH SOCIAL CREDIT	1	0.1%
54	THOUGHT SOCIAL CREDIT WOULD DO GOOD JOB, WANTED TO GIVE THE	0	
55	VOTED FOR THE MAN	0	
56	N.D.P. DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	1	0.1%
57	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T RUN A CANDIDATE	0	
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, NOT STATED	2	0.1%
99	N.A.	1123	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v177: VOTED IN 1968			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1246 /-] [Invalid=1515 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THE FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN JUNE 1968. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q46A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	934	<div></div> 75.0%
2	DIDN'T VOTE	81	<div></div> 6.5%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE THEN	231	<div></div> 18.5%
8	DON'T REMEMBER	1515	

# v177: VOTED IN 1968			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v178: VOTE IN 1968 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=809 /-] [Invalid=1952 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted in 1968.		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR?		
Notes	Q46B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	467	<div><div></div></div> 57.7%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	232	<div><div></div></div> 28.7%
3	N.D.P.	79	<div><div></div></div> 9.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	29	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	SPOILED BALLOT	0	
0	REFUSED	1495	
8	D.K., DON'T REMEMBER	93	
9	N.A.	364	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v187: LIKE TRUDEAU-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	LET'S START WITH THE LIBERALS, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. TRUDEAU? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q50A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1509	<div><div></div></div> 54.7%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	74	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	37	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	

v187: LIKE TRUDEAU-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	32	1.2%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	3	0.1%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	52	1.9%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	3	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	66	2.4%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	1	0.0%
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	171	6.2%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	2	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	104	3.8%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	

# v187: LIKE TRUDEAU-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	9	0.3%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	1	0.0%
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	186	6.7%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	42	1.5%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	208	7.5%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	8	0.3%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	146	5.3%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	3	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	3	0.1%
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	95	3.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v188: LIKE LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?		
Notes	Q50B in the documentation.		

v188: LIKE LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1657	<div></div> 60.0%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	49	<div></div> 1.8%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	3	0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	0.0%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	34	<div></div> 1.2%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	37	<div></div> 1.3%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	3	0.1%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	51	<div></div> 1.8%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	69	<div></div> 2.5%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	

v188: LIKE LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	256	9.3%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	1	0.0%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	123	4.5%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	5	0.2%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	133	4.8%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	29	1.1%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	137	5.0%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	4	0.1%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	

# v188: LIKE LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	101	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	64	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v189: LIKE LIBERAL PARTY-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE LIBERAL PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q50C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1518	<div><div></div></div> 55.0%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	35	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	42	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v189: LIKE LIBERAL PARTY-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	37	1.3%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	2	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	76	2.8%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	4	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	219	7.9%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	5	0.2%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	1	0.0%
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	127	4.6%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	17	0.6%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	206	7.5%

v189: LIKE LIBERAL PARTY-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	52	1.9%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	193	7.0%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	10	0.4%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	107	3.9%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	0	
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	1	0.0%
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	75	2.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v190: LIKE STANFIELD-THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	NOW, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. STANFIELD? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
Notes	Q50D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1524	55.2%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	82	3.0%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	0.1%

v190: LIKE STANFIELD-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	1	0.0%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	1	0.0%
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	1	0.0%
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	71	2.6%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	1	0.0%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	83	3.0%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	7	0.3%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	107	3.9%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	2	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	135	4.9%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	4	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	1	0.0%
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	276	10.0%

v190: LIKE STANFIELD-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	8	0.3%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	1	0.0%
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	138	5.0%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	11	0.4%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	138	5.0%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	16	0.6%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	83	3.0%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	8	0.3%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	36	1.3%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	1	0.0%

# v190: LIKE STANFIELD-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	22	0.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v191: LIKE LOCAL PC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?		
Notes	Q50E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1658	60.1%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	55	2.0%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	1	0.0%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	1	0.0%
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	46	1.7%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	3	0.1%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	54	2.0%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	2	0.1%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	55	2.0%

v191: LIKE LOCAL PC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	2	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	66	2.4%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	252	9.1%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	5	0.2%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	116	4.2%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	7	0.3%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	139	5.0%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	34	1.2%

# v191: LIKE LOCAL PC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	113	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	76	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	62	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v192: LIKE PC PARTY-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q50F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1543	<div><div></div></div> 55.9%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	42	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	0	
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	39	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%

v192: LIKE PC PARTY-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	0	
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	44	1.6%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	7	0.3%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	76	2.8%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	5	0.2%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	121	4.4%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	0	
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	1	0.0%
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	319	11.6%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	4	0.1%

v192: LIKE PC PARTY-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	173	6.3%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	13	0.5%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	133	4.8%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	35	1.3%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	104	3.8%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	10	0.4%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	44	1.6%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	3	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	39	1.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v193: LIKE LEWIS-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT THE N.D.P.? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. DAVID LEWIS? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q50G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1619	<div></div> 58.6%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	96	<div></div> 3.5%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	3	0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	74	<div></div> 2.7%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	4	0.1%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	65	<div></div> 2.4%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	5	0.2%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	75	<div></div> 2.7%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	3	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	

v193: LIKE LEWIS-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	103	3.7%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	2	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	264	9.6%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	4	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	143	5.2%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	2	0.1%
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	10	0.4%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	127	4.6%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	1	0.0%
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	16	0.6%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	84	3.0%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	

# v193: LIKE LEWIS-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	4	0.1%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	36	1.3%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	2	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	17	0.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v194: LIKE LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE-THEROMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL N.D.P. CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?		
Notes	Q50H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1912	69.3%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	85	3.1%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	4	0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	66	2.4%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	3	0.1%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	

v194: LIKE LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE-THEROMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	63	2.3%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	1	0.0%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	51	1.8%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	56	2.0%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	300	10.9%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	3	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	63	2.3%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	1	0.0%

v194: LIKE LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE-THEROMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	6	0.2%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	56	2.0%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	6	0.2%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	40	1.4%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	1	0.0%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	27	1.0%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	3	0.1%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	10	0.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v195: LIKE NDP-THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE N.D.P. PARTY TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
Notes	Q50I in the documentation.

v195: LIKE NDP-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1639	<div></div> 59.4%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	91	<div></div> 3.3%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	1	0.0%
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	3	0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	1	0.0%
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	77	<div></div> 2.8%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	7	0.3%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	97	<div></div> 3.5%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	14	0.5%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	110	<div></div> 4.0%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	3	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	116	<div></div> 4.2%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	

v195: LIKE NDP-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	3	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	271	9.8%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	7	0.3%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	115	4.2%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	9	0.3%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	80	2.9%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	23	0.8%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	51	1.8%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	1	0.0%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	

# v195: LIKE NDP-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v196: LIKE CAOUETTE-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. CAOUETTE? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q50J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1797	<div><div></div></div> 65.1%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	92	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	88	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	69	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	

v196: LIKE CAOUETTE-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	4	0.1%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	76	2.8%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	4	0.1%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	75	2.7%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	1	0.0%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	242	8.8%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	8	0.3%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	1	0.0%
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	103	3.7%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	4	0.1%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	

# v196: LIKE CAOUETTE-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	78	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	57	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	0	
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v197: LIKE LOCAL SC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION?		
Notes	Q50K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION OR NO CANDIDATE	2342	<div><div></div></div> 84.8%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	58	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	0	

v197: LIKE LOCAL SC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	0	
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	34	1.2%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	1	0.0%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	18	0.7%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	4	0.1%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	22	0.8%
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	0	
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	34	1.2%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	3	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	

v197: LIKE LOCAL SC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	139	5.0%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	0	
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	0	
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	0	
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	31	1.1%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	1	0.0%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	27	1.0%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	5	0.2%
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	13	0.5%
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	2	0.1%
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	12	0.4%
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	

# v197: LIKE LOCAL SC CANDIDATE-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	0	
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	14	0.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v198: LIKE SC PARTY-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q50L in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	1842	66.7%
1	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 1	119	4.3%
2	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 2	2	0.1%
3	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 3	0	
4	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 4	1	0.0%
5	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 5	2	0.1%
6	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 6	0	
7	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 7	0	
8	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 8	0	
9	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 9	0	
10	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 10	90	3.3%
11	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 11	0	
12	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 12	0	
13	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 13	0	
14	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 14	0	
15	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 15	5	0.2%
16	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 16	0	
17	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 17	0	
18	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 18	0	
19	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 19	0	
20	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 20	63	2.3%
21	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 21	0	
22	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 22	0	
23	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 23	0	
24	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 24	0	
25	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 25	13	0.5%
26	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 26	0	
27	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 27	0	
28	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 28	0	
29	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 29	0	
30	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 30	94	3.4%

v198: LIKE SC PARTY-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
31	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 31	0	
32	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 32	0	
33	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 33	0	
34	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 34	0	
35	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 35	1	0.0%
36	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 36	0	
37	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 37	0	
38	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 38	0	
39	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 39	0	
40	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 40	92	3.3%
41	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 41	0	
42	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 42	0	
43	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 43	0	
44	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 44	0	
45	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 45	2	0.1%
46	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 46	0	
47	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 47	0	
48	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 48	0	
49	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 49	0	
50	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 50	242	8.8%
51	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 51	1	0.0%
52	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 52	1	0.0%
53	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 53	0	
54	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 54	0	
55	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 55	2	0.1%
56	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 56	0	
57	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 57	0	
58	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 58	0	
59	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 59	0	
60	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 60	78	2.8%
61	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 61	0	
62	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 62	0	
63	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 63	0	
64	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 64	0	
65	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 65	3	0.1%
66	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 66	0	
67	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 67	0	
68	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 68	0	
69	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 69	0	
70	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 70	42	1.5%
71	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 71	0	
72	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 72	0	
73	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 73	0	
74	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 74	0	
75	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 75	4	0.1%

# v198: LIKE SC PARTY-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 76	0	<div></div>
77	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 77	0	
78	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 78	0	
79	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 79	0	
80	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 80	30	
81	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 81	0	1.1%
82	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 82	0	<div></div>
83	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 83	0	
84	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 84	0	
85	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 85	2	
86	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 86	0	
87	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 87	0	<div></div>
88	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 88	0	
89	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 89	0	
90	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 90	14	
91	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 91	0	
92	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 92	0	<div></div>
93	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 93	0	
94	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 94	0	
95	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 95	1	
96	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 96	0	
97	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 97	0	<div></div>
98	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 98	0	
99	THERMOMETER SCORE OF 99 OR 100	15	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v199: LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=32.877 /-] [StdDev=44.206 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q51A in the documentation.		
# v200: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q51A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1630	<div></div> 78.1%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	21	<div></div> 1.0%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, HAS INTEGRI	15	<div></div> 0.7%

v200: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	17	0.8%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER 05 GOOD MAN, FINE	19	0.9%
5		4	0.2%
6		8	0.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	13	0.6%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	3	0.1%
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HIS WIFE, HAS SETTLED DOWN	8	0.4%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	7	0.3%
12	BILINGUAL	3	0.1%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	1	0.0%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS	4	0.2%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	8	0.4%
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	9	0.4%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	17	0.8%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES MAN	1	0.0%
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESSIVE, MOVES ONWARD, TRYING TO CH	0	
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	4	0.2%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	1	0.0%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	5	0.2%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	3	0.1%
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING	2	0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	1	0.0%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	7	0.3%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	1	0.0%
29	AGGRESIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	7	0.3%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	10	0.5%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q.,LA PORTE AFFAIR	2	0.1%
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING	5	0.2%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE OR FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS	7	0.3%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	1	0.0%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	4	0.2%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	3	0.1%
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION,	0	

v200: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE, EVERYONE	0	
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	2	0.1%
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	2	0.1%
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNET	7	0.3%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND'	1	0.0%
44	NOT PATRONIZING	1	0.0%
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	1	0.0%
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS OR CRISES WELL	4	0.2%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	4	0.2%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	1	0.0%
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING	0	
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	1	0.0%
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	4	0.2%
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT O	0	
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAK COMPROMISES	0	
55	LIKE THE WAY HE IS RUNNING THE COUNTRY	0	
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	0	
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	0	
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVIN	5	0.2%
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR D	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	1	0.0%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT, STATESMAN	3	0.1%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	2	0.1%
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM	3	0.1%
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	0	
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	3	0.1%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT OR WHEN HE HAD A L	0	
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	0	
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	2	0.1%
72	GOOD IMAGE	0	
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	1	0.0%
74	HE TRAVELS	0	

v200: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	1	0.0%
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	1	0.0%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	0	
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS O	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	0	
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	1	0.0%
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS	0	
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	0	
87	HE GIVES HELP TO THE MUNICIPALITIES	0	
88	NO,OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	21	1.0%
89	HE WANTS TO BUILD A SEA PORT	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	136	6.5%
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	21	1.0%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	675	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v201: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q51A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1807	86.6%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	5	0.2%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, HAS INTEGRI	2	0.1%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	6	0.3%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	8	0.4%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	5	0.2%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	3	0.1%
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	3	0.1%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	0	
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HIS WIFE, HAS SETTLED DOWN	3	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	1	0.0%
12	BILINGUAL	4	0.2%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	0	
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS	2	0.1%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	2	0.1%
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	3	0.1%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	3	0.1%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES MAN	2	0.1%
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESSIVE, MOVES ONWARD, TRYING TO CH	1	0.0%
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	1	0.0%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	1	0.0%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	2	0.1%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	0	
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING	1	0.0%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	0	
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	6	0.3%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	1	0.0%
29	AGGRESIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	4	0.2%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	2	0.1%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q.,LA PORTE AFFAIR	0	

v201: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING	1	0.0%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE OR FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS	2	0.1%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	0	
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	0	
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION,	0	
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE, EVERYONE	0	
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	0	
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	0	
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNET	5	0.2%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND'	1	0.0%
44	NOT PATRONIZING	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	0	
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS OR CRISES WELL	0	
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	1	0.0%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	0	
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING	0	
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	0	
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	0	
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT OF	0	
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKES COMPROMISES	0	
55	LIKE THE WAY HE IS RUNNING THE COUNTRY	1	0.0%
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	0	
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	0	
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING	1	0.0%
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR D	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	1	0.0%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT, STATESMAN	0	
63	HE IS REALISTIC	1	0.0%
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM	2	0.1%
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	0	

# v201: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	2	0.1%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT OR WHEN HE HAD A L	0	
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	0	
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	0	
72	GOOD IMAGE	1	0.0%
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	1	0.0%
74	HE TRAVELS	2	0.1%
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	0	
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	0	
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	0	
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	0	
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS O	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	0	
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	1	0.0%
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS	1	0.0%
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	1	0.0%
87	HE GIVES HELP TO THE MUNICIPALITIES	1	0.0%
88	NO,OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	21	1.0%
89	HE WANTS TO BUILD A SEA PORT	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	136	6.5%
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	21	1.0%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v202: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q51B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	70.1%
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	45	2.2%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	14	0.7%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE OR ANTICS	6	0.3%

v202: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO	12	0.6%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN	8	0.4%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN OR DOESN'T UNDERSTAN	2	0.1%
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN OR DOESN'T UNDERSTAN	3	0.1%
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY OR CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED	8	0.4%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT C	3	0.1%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.2%
11	EVERYTHING	11	0.5%
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	1	0.0%
13	GIVES OR LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AI	0	
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUN	1	0.0%
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	1	0.0%
16	SPENDS, WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.1%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC OR FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH C	9	0.4%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FR	3	0.1%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO OR OTTAWA	0	
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	4	0.2%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFOR	1	0.0%
22	HE IS FRENCH	2	0.1%
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	6	0.3%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	2	0.1%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, IS RUDE	9	0.4%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	2	0.1%
27	SARCASTIC	4	0.2%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	8	0.4%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	8	0.4%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPEC	11	0.5%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	7	0.3%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	12	0.6%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	4	0.2%
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIS	5	0.2%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	1	0.0%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	0	

v202: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	13	0.6%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	2	0.1%
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	8	0.4%
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	3	0.1%
41	THE WAY HE RUNS COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	4	0.2%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	3	0.1%
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HI	15	0.7%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	0	
45	HIS MAJORITY	0	
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	2	0.1%
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC	1	0.0%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	2	0.1%
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL	0	
50	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
51	HIS CABINET SHUFFLE	2	0.1%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	4	0.2%
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	3	0.1%
54	HE IS UNFAIR	1	0.0%
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS, PIPELINE	1	0.0%
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	2	0.1%
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	6	0.3%
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	0	
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM	0	
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	1	0.0%
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	1	0.0%
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	2	0.1%
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE OR FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FAR	1	0.0%
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUA	3	0.1%
67	HANDLING OF L.I.P., O.F.Y. PROGRAMMES	1	0.0%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	7	0.3%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	0	
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL, SMART	0	
71	HE HAS CHANGED	3	0.1%
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	2	0.1%
73	POOR SPEAKER	2	0.1%
74	HIS TEMPER	1	0.0%
75	HIS SPEECHES DURING THE ELECTION, THE TRAIN	0	

# v202: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	LACK OF POLICIES, NO SET POLICIES, DON'T HEAR ABOUT HIS POLI	0	
77	TOO MUCH FOR EAST AND PRAIRIES (IGNORES B.C.)	0	
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	0	
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO	1	0.0%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY	1	0.0%
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.0%
82	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, TOO CONSERVATIVE	0	
83	TOO NARROW	3	0.1%
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	3	0.1%
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	30	1.4%
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	1	0.0%
90	NOT A TYPICAL WHOLESOME CANADIAN	0	
91	REALLY NOT A MAN	0	
92	HE CRITICIZES OTHERS TOO OFTEN	0	
93	HE DOESN'T USE HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	253	12.1%
96	NOTHING DISLIKE, LIKE HIM	13	0.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v203: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q51B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1666	79.9%
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	4	0.2%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	3	0.1%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE OR ANTICS	2	0.1%
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO	3	0.1%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN	3	0.1%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN OR DOESN'T UNDERSTAN	2	0.1%
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN OR DOESN'T UNDERSTAN	2	0.1%

v203: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY OR CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED	3	0.1%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT C	2	0.1%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	2	0.1%
13	GIVES OR LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AI	0	
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUN	1	0.0%
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	2	0.1%
16	SPENDS, WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC OR FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH C	7	0.3%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FR	6	0.3%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO OR OTTAWA	1	0.0%
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	3	0.1%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFOR	0	
22	HE IS FRENCH	1	0.0%
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	5	0.2%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	3	0.1%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, IS RUDE	3	0.1%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
27	SARCASTIC	0	
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	2	0.1%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	4	0.2%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPEC	1	0.0%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	1	0.0%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	7	0.3%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	0	
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIS	4	0.2%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	1	0.0%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	2	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	0	
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	2	0.1%
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	0	
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	1	0.0%
41	THE WAY HE RUNS COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%

v203: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	0	
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HI	5	0.2%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	0	
45	HIS MAJORITY	1	0.0%
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	0	
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC	0	
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	2	0.1%
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL	1	0.0%
50	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
51	HIS CABINET SHUFFLE	2	0.1%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	1	0.0%
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	0	
54	HE IS UNFAIR	0	
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS, PIPELINE	1	0.0%
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	1	0.0%
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	1	0.0%
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	0	
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	2	0.1%
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	0	
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	1	0.0%
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	0	
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE OR FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FAR	1	0.0%
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUA	2	0.1%
67	HANDLING OF L.I.P., O.F.Y. PROGRAMMES	2	0.1%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	1	0.0%
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL, SMART	0	
71	HE HAS CHANGED	0	
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	1	0.0%
73	POOR SPEAKER	0	
74	HIS TEMPER	3	0.1%
75	HIS SPEECHES DURING THE ELECTION, THE TRAIN	0	
76	LACK OF POLICIES, NO SET POLICIES, DON'T HEAR ABOUT HIS POLI	2	0.1%
77	TOO MUCH FOR EAST AND PRAIRIES (IGNORES B.C.)	0	
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	0	
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO	1	0.0%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY	0	

# v203: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.0%
82	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, TOO CONSERVATIVE	0	
83	TOO NARROW	0	
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	0	
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	30	1.4%
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	1	0.0%
90	NOT A TYPICAL WHOLESOME CANADIAN	0	
91	REALLY NOT A MAN	1	0.0%
92	HE CRITICIZES OTHERS TOO OFTEN	0	
93	HE DOESN'T USE HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	253	12.1%
96	NOTHING DISLIKE, LIKE HIM	13	0.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v204: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q51B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1753	84.0%
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	0	
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	2	0.1%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE OR ANTICS	0	
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO	0	
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN	1	0.0%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN OR DOESN'T UNDERSTAN	0	
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN OR DOESN'T UNDERSTAN	0	
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY OR CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED	1	0.0%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT C	1	0.0%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	0	

v204: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	GIVES OR LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AI	1	0.0%
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUN	0	
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	1	0.0%
16	SPENDS, WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC OR FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH C	3	0.1%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FR	1	0.0%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO OR OTTAWA	0	
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	1	0.0%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFOR	0	
22	HE IS FRENCH	0	
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	0	
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	0	
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, IS RUDE	1	0.0%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
27	SARCASTIC	1	0.0%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	0	
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	1	0.0%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPEC	1	0.0%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	1	0.0%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	1	0.0%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	1	0.0%
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIS	2	0.1%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	0	
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	1	0.0%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	1	0.0%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	0	
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	0	
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RUNS COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	0	
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	0	
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HI	2	0.1%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	1	0.0%
45	HIS MAJORITY	0	
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	0	
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC	1	0.0%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	0	

v204: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL	0	
50	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
51	HIS CABINET SHUFFLE	1	0.0%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	0	
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	0	
54	HE IS UNFAIR	0	
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS, PIPELINE	1	0.0%
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	0	
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	2	0.1%
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	0	
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM	0	
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	1	0.0%
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	3	0.1%
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	0	
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE OR FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FAR	0	
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUA	0	
67	HANDLING OF L.I.P., O.F.Y. PROGRAMMES	0	
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	0	
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL, SMART	0	
71	HE HAS CHANGED	0	
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	0	
73	POOR SPEAKER	0	
74	HIS TEMPER	0	
75	HIS SPEECHES DURING THE ELECTION, THE TRAIN	0	
76	LACK OF POLICIES, NO SET POLICIES, DON'T HEAR ABOUT HIS POLI	0	
77	TOO MUCH FOR EAST AND PRAIRIES (IGNORES B.C.)	0	
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	0	
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO	1	0.0%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY	0	
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	
82	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, TOO CONSERVATIVE	0	
83	TOO NARROW	0	
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	0	
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0	

# v204: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	0	
90	NOT A TYPICAL WHOLESOME CANADIAN	0	
91	REALLY NOT A MAN	0	
92	HE CRITICIZES OTHERS TOO OFTEN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
93	HE DOESN'T USE HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	253	<div><div></div></div> 12.1%
96	NOTHING DISLIKE, LIKE HIM	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v205: LIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. STANFIELD? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q52A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 70.2%
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, HAS INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIO	101	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	GOOD MAN	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD MAKE A GOOD PRIME MINISTER, HAS LEADERSHI	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	CALM	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
9	HE IS A FAMILY MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	NICE LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
12	HE TRIES VERY HARD TO LEARN FRENCH, HIS FRENCH ISN'T BAD	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
13	NOVA SCOTIAN, TYPICAL OF EASTERN PROVINCES, FROM THE MARITIM	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
14	HE IS A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
15	ANY MENTION OF 'OLD MAN' IN A FAVOURABLE CONTEXT ALSO CODED	0	
16	TRUSTWORTHY	0	
17	HE IS HUMBLE, HOME STYLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF, NAIVE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
20	HE IS A GOOD OR SMART BUSINESSMAN	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

v205: LIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	1	0.0%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, OLD-TIME POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	3	0.1%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	3	0.1%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	1	0.0%
25	NICE FRIENDLY FELLOW, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	3	0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE	0	
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	4	0.2%
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	7	0.3%
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSISTE	4	0.2%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH	5	0.2%
31	HE IS A STATESMAN, LIKE A STATESMAN, DIPLOMAT	1	0.0%
32	IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING A	6	0.3%
33	LIKE HIS POLICY ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS, ANY MENTION OF	3	0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	4	0.2%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WIT	3	0.1%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOP	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, WOULD RAISE PENSIONS	1	0.0%
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	1	0.0%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CH	14	0.7%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, MEANS WELL, WILLING TO TRY	3	0.1%
41	HAS A LOT OF STAMINA	0	
42	HE IS RESPECTED, ADMIRER, I RESPECT OR ADMIRE HIM	0	
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER	1	0.0%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS	3	0.1%
45	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.0%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (UNSPECIFIED)	5	0.2%
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD POLICIES	3	0.1%
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSUE	0	
50	HELPS INDUSTRY	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY	1	0.0%
52	HAS NO STRONG POINTS (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	2	0.1%
53	HAS A GOOD IMAGE	2	0.1%
54	LOYAL TO PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	2	0.1%
55	AWARE OF HIS BAD IMAGE, KNOWS HIS FAULTS	0	
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	0	
57	WOULD MAKE A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR, IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	1	0.0%

# v205: LIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
58	FOR THE WORKING MAN	0	
59	GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION	2	0.1%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY	0	
61	HE IS OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	0	
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST	0	
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN	4	0.2%
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
65	HE IS TRYING HARD IN QUEBEC, WITH FRENCH PEOPLE	0	
66	TOO BAD HE LOST, I FEEL SORRY FOR HIM	0	
67	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.0%
68	HIS LONG UNDERWEAR	2	0.1%
69	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
70	PROUD TO BE A CANADIAN	0	
71	HE LIKES TO GARDEN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	IF HE WAS FRENCH CANADIAN HE WOULD DO BETTER	0	
74	HE HELPS INDIANS	1	0.0%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	28	1.3%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	238	11.4%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	23	1.1%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	8	0.4%
98	N.A.	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v206: LIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q52A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1668	80.0%
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT	9	0.4%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, HAS INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIO	18	0.9%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	6	0.3%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	4	0.2%
5	GOOD MAN	1	0.0%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST	5	0.2%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD MAKE A GOOD PRIME MINISTER, HAS LEADERSHI	4	0.2%
8	CALM	0	
9	HE IS A FAMILY MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY	2	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	

v206: LIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	NICE LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	1	0.0%
12	HE TRIES VERY HARD TO LEARN FRENCH, HIS FRENCH ISN'T BAD	2	0.1%
13	NOVA SCOTIAN, TYPICAL OF EASTERN PROVINCES, FROM THE MARITIM	1	0.0%
14	HE IS A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED	3	0.1%
15	ANY MENTION OF 'OLD MAN' IN A FAVOURABLE CONTEXT ALSO CODED	0	
16	TRUSTWORTHY	1	0.0%
17	HE IS HUMBLE, HOME STYLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF, NAIVE	2	0.1%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	0	
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	1	0.0%
20	HE IS A GOOD OR SMART BUSINESSMAN	1	0.0%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	1	0.0%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, OLD-TIME POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	2	0.1%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	4	0.2%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	0	
25	NICE FRIENDLY FELLOW, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	1	0.0%
26	HIS COURAGE	1	0.0%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	1	0.0%
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	1	0.0%
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSISTE	5	0.2%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH	1	0.0%
31	HE IS A STATESMAN, LIKE A STATESMAN, DIPLOMAT	1	0.0%
32	IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING A	4	0.2%
33	LIKE HIS POLICY ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS, ANY MENTION OF	1	0.0%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	2	0.1%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WIT	8	0.4%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOP	1	0.0%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, WOULD RAISE PENSIONS	1	0.0%
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CH	0	
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, MEANS WELL, WILLING TO TRY	2	0.1%
41	HAS A LOT OF STAMINA	0	
42	HE IS RESPECTED, ADMIRER, I RESPECT OR ADMIRE HIM	1	0.0%
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER	1	0.0%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS	3	0.1%
45	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN NOVA SCOTIA	0	

# v206: LIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD POLICIES	4	0.2%
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSUE	0	
50	HELPS INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
51	PLANS CAREFULLY	0	
52	HAS NO STRONG POINTS (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
53	HAS A GOOD IMAGE	1	0.0%
54	LOYAL TO PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	1	0.0%
55	AWARE OF HIS BAD IMAGE, KNOWS HIS FAULTS	0	
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	2	0.1%
57	WOULD MAKE A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR, IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	0	
58	FOR THE WORKING MAN	0	
59	GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION	0	
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY	0	
61	HE IS OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	2	0.1%
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST	2	0.1%
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN	1	0.0%
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
65	HE IS TRYING HARD IN QUEBEC, WITH FRENCH PEOPLE	1	0.0%
66	TOO BAD HE LOST, I FEEL SORRY FOR HIM	0	
67	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	
68	HIS LONG UNDERWEAR	0	
69	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
70	PROUD TO BE A CANADIAN	0	
71	HE LIKES TO GARDEN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	IF HE WAS FRENCH CANADIAN HE WOULD DO BETTER	0	
74	HE HELPS INDIANS	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	28	1.3%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	238	11.4%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	23	1.1%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	8	0.4%
98	N.A.	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v207: LIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q52A in the documentation.		

v207: LIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1759	84.4%
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT	0	
2	HONEST, SINCERE, HAS INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIO	1	0.0%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	3	0.1%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	0	
5	GOOD MAN	0	
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST	1	0.0%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD MAKE A GOOD PRIME MINISTER, HAS LEADERSHI	1	0.0%
8	CALM	0	
9	HE IS A FAMILY MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	NICE LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	0	
12	HE TRIES VERY HARD TO LEARN FRENCH, HIS FRENCH ISN'T BAD	1	0.0%
13	NOVA SCOTIAN, TYPICAL OF EASTERN PROVINCES, FROM THE MARITIM	0	
14	HE IS A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED	1	0.0%
15	ANY MENTION OF 'OLD MAN' IN A FAVOURABLE CONTEXT ALSO CODED	0	
16	TRUSTWORTHY	1	0.0%
17	HE IS HUMBLE, HOME STYLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF, NAIVE	1	0.0%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	0	
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	0	
20	HE IS A GOOD OR SMART BUSINESSMAN	1	0.0%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, OLD-TIME POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	0	
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	0	
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	0	
25	NICE FRIENDLY FELLOW, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE	0	
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	0	
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	1	0.0%
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSISTE	1	0.0%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH	1	0.0%
31	HE IS A STATESMAN, LIKE A STATESMAN, DIPLOMAT	0	
32	IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING A	3	0.1%
33	LIKE HIS POLICY ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS, ANY MENTION OF	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	2	0.1%

v207: LIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WIT	1	0.0%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOP	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, WOULD RAISE PENSIONS	1	0.0%
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CH	0	
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, MEANS WELL, WILLING TO TRY	2	0.1%
41	HAS A LOT OF STAMINA	0	
42	HE IS RESPECTED, ADMIRER, I RESPECT OR ADMIRE HIM	0	
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER	0	
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS	0	
45	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.0%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD POLICIES	0	
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSUE	0	
50	HELPS INDUSTRY	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY	0	
52	HAS NO STRONG POINTS (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
53	HAS A GOOD IMAGE	0	
54	LOYAL TO PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	0	
55	AWARE OF HIS BAD IMAGE, KNOWS HIS FAULTS	0	
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	1	0.0%
57	WOULD MAKE A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR, IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	0	
58	FOR THE WORKING MAN	0	
59	GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION	0	
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY	0	
61	HE IS OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	0	
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST	0	
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN	0	
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
65	HE IS TRYING HARD IN QUEBEC, WITH FRENCH PEOPLE	0	
66	TOO BAD HE LOST, I FEEL SORRY FOR HIM	1	0.0%
67	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	
68	HIS LONG UNDERWEAR	0	
69	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
70	PROUD TO BE A CANADIAN	0	
71	HE LIKES TO GARDEN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	IF HE WAS FRENCH CANADIAN HE WOULD DO BETTER	0	
74	HE HELPS INDIANS	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	28	1.3%

# v207: LIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	238	<div><div></div></div> 11.4%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
98	N.A.	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v208: DISLIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. STANFIELD? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q52B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 70.2%
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW, LACKS DRIVE	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
4	POOR SPEAKER, CAN'T GET MESSAGE ACROSS, ANY MENTION OF LACK	60	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
5	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY, DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH, DON'T UN	22	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, DOESN'T HAVE OR LACKS LEADERSHIP QUALITI	36	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM, LACK OF FIR	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
10	TOO OLD, HIS AGE, WE NEED A YOUNGER MAN	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
11	EVERYTHING	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
12	HIS WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS OR FREEZE, PRICE FREEZE	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES, COULDN'T SEEM TO STICK TO ONE POINT	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
16	NOT MODERN ENOUGH, OLD FASHIONED IDEAS, NOT UP WITH THE TIME	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
17	HIS APATHY, INDIFFERENCE, VERY COOL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
18	DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB AS PREMIER OF NOVA SCOTIA	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
19	TOO MUCH FOR NOVA SCOTIA	0	
20	MORE FOR THE EAST	0	
21	CAN'T REPRESENT FRENCH CANADA, NOT POPULAR IN QUEBEC AND HE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, LOOKS ENGLISH	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
23	TOO MANY PROMISES	0	

v208: DISLIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE, TOO SUPERFICIAL	5	0.2%
25	HE IS RUDE	1	0.0%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	4	0.2%
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	9	0.4%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL	2	0.1%
29	TOO PETTY, TOO NARROW-MINDED, TOO MUCH OF A GRANNY, TOO PROV	5	0.2%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, JUST HIS WAY, HIS APPROACH, GENERAL DISLI	5	0.2%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE, LACKS CONFIDENCE OF PEOPLE OR P	7	0.3%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER, SMUTTY CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	10	0.5%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	4	0.2%
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL	11	0.5%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, NO APPEAL, LEAVES YOU FLAT	9	0.4%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	5	0.2%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T,V,	5	0.2%
39	TOO SNEERING, DERISIVE	1	0.0%
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	2	0.1%
41	DIDN'T LIKE WHAT HE DID IN MONCTON, WHAT HE DID TO LEONARD J	1	0.0%
42	FORCING THE ELECTION	1	0.0%
43	DOESN'T KNOW WHEN TO GIVE UP	0	
44	NO APPEAL TO YOUNG, JUST FOR THE OLD	0	
45	BIASED	0	
46	BACKED OFF FROM CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, DONE A POOR JOB	3	0.1%
48	NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE	0	
49	NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE	0	
50	NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
51	TOO MUCH FOR THE RICH	1	0.0%
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY OR BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIGH PRICES	4	0.2%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	2	0.1%
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	3	0.1%
56	HE IS TOO RICH	1	0.0%
57	NOT FOR THE OLD, LIBERALS GIVE MORE TO AGED, POLICY ON PENSI	1	0.0%
58	TOO AMBITIOUS, TOO ANXIOUS, OBSESSED WITH MAJORITY	2	0.1%
59	CARRIES A GRUDGE	0	
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WH	5	0.2%
61	DIEFENBAKER (ANY MENTION)	1	0.0%

# v208: DISLIKE STANFIELD-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	0	
63	GOT CREDIT FOR NEW FLAG	1	0.0%
64	TOO HONEST, TOO GOOD A PERSON	0	
65	LOWERED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, WELFARE POLICY	0	
66	NO POLICIES	0	
67	SOCIALIST APPROACH	0	
68	UNORGANIZED	0	
69	HE LEFT NOVA SCOTIA, NOT CONCERNED WITH NOVA SCOTIA	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	17	0.8%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	229	11.0%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	5	0.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	4	0.2%
98	N.A.	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v209: DISLIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q52B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1689	81.0%
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW, LACKS DRIVE	6	0.3%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	4	0.2%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	12	0.6%
4	POOR SPEAKER, CAN'T GET MESSAGE ACROSS, ANY MENTION OF LACK	21	1.0%
5	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY, DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH, DON'T UN	6	0.3%
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	5	0.2%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, DOESN'T HAVE OR LACKS LEADERSHIP QUALITI	13	0.6%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM, LACK OF FIR	4	0.2%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	3	0.1%
10	TOO OLD, HIS AGE, WE NEED A YOUNGER MAN	6	0.3%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	HIS WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS OR FREEZE, PRICE FREEZE	4	0.2%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM	6	0.3%
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	1	0.0%

v209: DISLIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES, COULDN'T SEEM TO STICK TO ONE POINT	2	0.1%
16	NOT MODERN ENOUGH, OLD FASHIONED IDEAS, NOT UP WITH THE TIME	1	0.0%
17	HIS APATHY, INDIFFERENCE, VERY COOL	1	0.0%
18	DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB AS PREMIER OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
19	TOO MUCH FOR NOVA SCOTIA	0	
20	MORE FOR THE EAST	2	0.1%
21	CAN'T REPRESENT FRENCH CANADA, NOT POPULAR IN QUEBEC AND HE	0	
22	HE IS ENGLISH, LOOKS ENGLISH	0	
23	TOO MANY PROMISES	1	0.0%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE, TOO SUPERFICIAL	1	0.0%
25	HE IS RUDE	1	0.0%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.0%
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	5	0.2%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL	1	0.0%
29	TOO PETTY, TOO NARROW-MINDED, TOO MUCH OF A GRANNY, TOO PROV	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, JUST HIS WAY, HIS APPROACH, GENERAL DISLI	6	0.3%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE, LACKS CONFIDENCE OF PEOPLE OR P	2	0.1%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER, SMUTTY CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	0	
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL	5	0.2%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, NO APPEAL, LEAVES YOU FLAT	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	2	0.1%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T,V,	2	0.1%
39	TOO SNEERING, DERISIVE	2	0.1%
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	1	0.0%
41	DIDN'T LIKE WHAT HE DID IN MONCTON, WHAT HE DID TO LEONARD J	3	0.1%
42	FORCING THE ELECTION	0	
43	DOESN'T KNOW WHEN TO GIVE UP	0	
44	NO APPEAL TO YOUNG, JUST FOR THE OLD	1	0.0%
45	BIASED	0	
46	BACKED OFF FROM CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, DONE A POOR JOB	1	0.0%
48	NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE	1	0.0%
49	NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE	2	0.1%
50	NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
51	TOO MUCH FOR THE RICH	1	0.0%
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY OR BIG BUSINESS	0	

# v209: DISLIKE STANFIELD-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIGH PRICES	1	0.0%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	0	
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	1	0.0%
56	HE IS TOO RICH	0	
57	NOT FOR THE OLD, LIBERALS GIVE MORE TO AGED, POLICY ON PENSI	0	
58	TOO AMBITIOUS, TOO ANXIOUS, OBSESSED WITH MAJORITY	0	
59	CARRIES A GRUDGE	1	0.0%
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WH	0	
61	DIEFENBAKER (ANY MENTION)	1	0.0%
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	0	
63	GOT CREDIT FOR NEW FLAG	0	
64	TOO HONEST, TOO GOOD A PERSON	0	
65	LOWERED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, WELFARE POLICY	0	
66	NO POLICIES	0	
67	SOCIALIST APPROACH	0	
68	UNORGANIZED	0	
69	HE LEFT NOVA SCOTIA, NOT CONCERNED WITH NOVA SCOTIA	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	17	0.8%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	229	11.0%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	5	0.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	4	0.2%
98	N.A.	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v210: DISLIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q52B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1789	85.8%
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW, LACKS DRIVE	3	0.1%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	1	0.0%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
4	POOR SPEAKER, CAN'T GET MESSAGE ACROSS, ANY MENTION OF LACK	4	0.2%
5	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY, DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH, DON'T UN	1	0.0%

v210: DISLIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	1	0.0%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, DOESN'T HAVE OR LACKS LEADERSHIP QUALITI	2	0.1%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM, LACK OF FIR	2	0.1%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	1	0.0%
10	TOO OLD, HIS AGE, WE NEED A YOUNGER MAN	1	0.0%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	HIS WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS OR FREEZE, PRICE FREEZE	1	0.0%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM	0	
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	0	
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES, COULDN'T SEEM TO STICK TO ONE POINT	2	0.1%
16	NOT MODERN ENOUGH, OLD FASHIONED IDEAS, NOT UP WITH THE TIME	2	0.1%
17	HIS APATHY, INDIFFERENCE, VERY COOL	1	0.0%
18	DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB AS PREMIER OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
19	TOO MUCH FOR NOVA SCOTIA	0	
20	MORE FOR THE EAST	0	
21	CAN'T REPRESENT FRENCH CANADA, NOT POPULAR IN QUEBEC AND HE	0	
22	HE IS ENGLISH, LOOKS ENGLISH	0	
23	TOO MANY PROMISES	0	
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE, TOO SUPERFICIAL	0	
25	HE IS RUDE	0	
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	1	0.0%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL	0	
29	TOO PETTY, TOO NARROW-MINDED, TOO MUCH OF A GRANNY, TOO PROV	2	0.1%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, JUST HIS WAY, HIS APPROACH, GENERAL DISLI	0	
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE, LACKS CONFIDENCE OF PEOPLE OR P	1	0.0%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER, SMUTTY CAMPAIGN	0	
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	0	
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL	1	0.0%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, NO APPEAL, LEAVES YOU FLAT	2	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	1	0.0%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T,V,	1	0.0%
39	TOO SNEERING, DERISIVE	1	0.0%
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	0	

# v210: DISLIKE STANFIELD-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	DIDN'T LIKE WHAT HE DID IN MONCTON, WHAT HE DID TO LEONARD J	1	0.0%
42	FORCING THE ELECTION	1	0.0%
43	DOESN'T KNOW WHEN TO GIVE UP	0	
44	NO APPEAL TO YOUNG, JUST FOR THE OLD	1	0.0%
45	BIASED	0	
46	BACKED OFF FROM CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, DONE A POOR JOB	2	0.1%
48	NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE	1	0.0%
49	NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE	2	0.1%
50	NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
51	TOO MUCH FOR THE RICH	0	
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY OR BIG BUSINESS	0	
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIGH PRICES	0	
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	0	
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	0	
56	HE IS TOO RICH	0	
57	NOT FOR THE OLD, LIBERALS GIVE MORE TO AGED, POLICY ON PENSI	0	
58	TOO AMBITIOUS, TOO ANXIOUS, OBSESSED WITH MAJORITY	0	
59	CARRIES A GRUDGE	0	
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WH	0	
61	DIEFENBAKER (ANY MENTION)	0	
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	0	
63	GOT CREDIT FOR NEW FLAG	0	
64	TOO HONEST, TOO GOOD A PERSON	0	
65	LOWERED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, WELFARE POLICY	0	
66	NO POLICIES	0	
67	SOCIALIST APPROACH	0	
68	UNORGANIZED	0	
69	HE LEFT NOVA SCOTIA, NOT CONCERNED WITH NOVA SCOTIA	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	17	0.8%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	229	11.0%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	5	0.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	4	0.2%
98	N.A.	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v211: LIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		

# v211: LIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE			
Literal question		IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. LEWIS? (FIRST MENTION)	
Notes		Q53A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 70.2%
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, BRIGHT, CAPABL	18	<div></div> 0.9%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD	39	<div></div> 1.9%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE	22	<div></div> 1.1%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, A VERY FINE SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF S	43	<div></div> 2.1%
5	GOOD MAN	6	<div></div> 0.3%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	10	<div></div> 0.5%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, WOULD MAKE A GOOD PR	6	<div></div> 0.3%
8	CALM, COMES ON QUIETLY	1	<div></div> 0.0%
9	HIS WIFE, HIS SON, GOOD FAMILY MAN	1	<div></div> 0.0%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	<div></div> 0.0%
11	NICE LOOKING, HIS SMILE, FRIENDLY FACE	4	<div></div> 0.2%
12	SPEAKS GOOD FRENCH, HE IS BILINGUAL	1	<div></div> 0.0%
13	HE IS SCOTTISH	0	<div></div>
14	BECAUSE HE IS A FOREIGNER	1	<div></div> 0.0%
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	6	<div></div> 0.3%
16	SELF-EDUCATED MAN, SELF-MADE MAN	1	<div></div> 0.0%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	10	<div></div> 0.5%
18	CHARMING	1	<div></div> 0.0%
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS	7	<div></div> 0.3%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	5	<div></div> 0.2%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	6	<div></div> 0.3%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	2	<div></div> 0.1%
23	INTERESTING, FASCINATING	0	<div></div>
24	DOWN TO EARTH TYPE OF MAN, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SEN	2	<div></div> 0.1%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, CHARISMA, PLEASANT	6	<div></div> 0.3%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	1	<div></div> 0.0%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	1	<div></div> 0.0%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE	0	<div></div>
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS	5	<div></div> 0.2%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, KEPT OTHER PARTIES ON THEIR T	4	<div></div> 0.2%
31	HE IS A GOOD STATESMAN	2	<div></div> 0.1%
32	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION OR HIGH PRICES OR COST OF L	2	<div></div> 0.1%
33	HIS EFFORTS FOR FRENCH CANADIANS	0	<div></div>

v211: LIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	2	0.1%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON OR ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED	5	0.2%
36	HE HELPS PEOPLE	2	0.1%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE OR	0	
38	HE IS FOR WORKING MAN OR WORKING PEOPLE	4	0.2%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	19	0.9%
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR	2	0.1%
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS	0	
42	HE IS FOR THE FARMERS, DOES MORE FOR AGRICULTURE	2	0.1%
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	1	0.0%
44	ADMITS WHEN HE DOES NOT KNOW ANSWER	0	
45	WORKS FOR POOR, UNDERPRIVILEGED	2	0.1%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES, BIG CORPORATIONS (ANY MEN	1	0.0%
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	4	0.2%
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	5	0.2%
49	GOOD AT COMPROMISE	0	
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES AND THE WAY HE PUTS THEM ACROSS	1	0.0%
51	LIKE HIS IDEA ABOUT GETTING PENSIONS AT SIXTY	1	0.0%
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING	6	0.3%
54	TRUE CANADIAN	1	0.0%
55	POLICY ON HOUSING	1	0.0%
56	TRYING TO GET MORE INDUSTRY	0	
57	HIS CAMPAIGN, WENT DOOR TO DOOR	1	0.0%
58	NOT CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
59	HIS POLICY ON EXPOSURE OF WHERE CAMPAIGN FUNDS COME FROM	1	0.0%
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	1	0.0%
62	POLICY ON GUARANTEED WAGE	0	
63	GOOD BUSINESS MAN	0	
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
65	SORRY HE LOST ELECTION, TREATED BADLY IN LAST ELECTION	2	0.1%
66	WOULD BE A GOOD CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
69	DID A LOT FOR HIS CONSTITUENCY	0	
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST OR WEST COAST	1	0.0%
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW IN PANEL DISCUSSIONS	0	

# v211: LIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
72	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUREAUCRACY	1	0.0%
73	HIS PROMISES SOUND GOOD	0	
74	HIS STYLE	2	0.1%
75	HIS ENERGY	1	0.0%
76	EXPERIENCED	0	
77	CAN CONVINCE ME	0	
78	NOT IN POLITICS JUST FOR THE MONEY	0	
79	SERIOUS	0	
80	THIRD PARTY IS NECESSARY TO SPLIT VOTES	0	
81	HE IS RETIRED	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	62	3.0%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	228	10.9%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	17	0.8%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	29	1.4%
98	N.A. ICS JUST FOR THE MONEY	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v212: LIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q53A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1608	77.1%
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, BRIGHT, CAPABL	6	0.3%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD	12	0.6%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE	4	0.2%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, A VERY FINE SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF S	8	0.4%
5	GOOD MAN	3	0.1%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	11	0.5%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, WOULD MAKE A GOOD PR	9	0.4%
8	CALM, COMES ON QUIETLY	0	
9	HIS WIFE, HIS SON, GOOD FAMILY MAN	1	0.0%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	0.0%
11	NICE LOOKING, HIS SMILE, FRIENDLY FACE	4	0.2%
12	SPEAKS GOOD FRENCH, HE IS BILINGUAL	4	0.2%
13	HE IS SCOTTISH	0	
14	BECAUSE HE IS A FOREIGNER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	1	0.0%

v212: LIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	SELF-EDUCATED MAN, SELF-MADE MAN	0	
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	2	0.1%
18	CHARMING	3	0.1%
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS	4	0.2%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	2	0.1%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	3	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	1	0.0%
23	INTERESTING, FASCINATING	0	
24	DOWN TO EARTH TYPE OF MAN, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SEN	4	0.2%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, CHARISMA, PLEASANT	7	0.3%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	1	0.0%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	2	0.1%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE	1	0.0%
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS	5	0.2%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, KEPT OTHER PARTIES ON THEIR T	4	0.2%
31	HE IS A GOOD STATESMAN	0	
32	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION OR HIGH PRICES OR COST OF L	1	0.0%
33	HIS EFFORTS FOR FRENCH CANADIANS	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	2	0.1%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON OR ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED	7	0.3%
36	HE HELPS PEOPLE	3	0.1%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE OR	2	0.1%
38	HE IS FOR WORKING MAN OR WORKING PEOPLE	4	0.2%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR	0	
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS	0	
42	HE IS FOR THE FARMERS, DOES MORE FOR AGRICULTURE	0	
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	1	0.0%
44	ADMITS WHEN HE DOES NOT KNOW ANSWER	1	0.0%
45	WORKS FOR POOR, UNDERPRIVILEGED	1	0.0%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES, BIG CORPORATIONS (ANY MEN	1	0.0%
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	1	0.0%
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	0	
49	GOOD AT COMPROMISE	0	
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES AND THE WAY HE PUTS THEM ACROSS	1	0.0%
51	LIKE HIS IDEA ABOUT GETTING PENSIONS AT SIXTY	1	0.0%

# v212: LIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING	0	
54	TRUE CANADIAN	0	
55	POLICY ON HOUSING	0	
56	TRYING TO GET MORE INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
57	HIS CAMPAIGN, WENT DOOR TO DOOR	0	
58	NOT CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
59	HIS POLICY ON EXPOSURE OF WHERE CAMPAIGN FUNDS COME FROM	0	
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
61	HE IS STRONG	1	0.0%
62	POLICY ON GUARANTEED WAGE	0	
63	GOOD BUSINESS MAN	1	0.0%
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
65	SORRY HE LOST ELECTION, TREATED BADLY IN LAST ELECTION	2	0.1%
66	WOULD BE A GOOD CANDIDATE	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	0	
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
69	DID A LOT FOR HIS CONSTITUENCY	1	0.0%
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST OR WEST COAST	0	
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW IN PANEL DISCUSSIONS	1	0.0%
72	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUREAUCRACY	0	
73	HIS PROMISES SOUND GOOD	0	
74	HIS STYLE	0	
75	HIS ENERGY	0	
76	EXPERIENCED	0	
77	CAN CONVINCE ME	0	
78	NOT IN POLITICS JUST FOR THE MONEY	2	0.1%
79	SERIOUS	0	
80	THIRD PARTY IS NECESSARY TO SPLIT VOTES	1	0.0%
81	HE IS RETIRED	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	62	3.0%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	228	10.9%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	17	0.8%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	29	1.4%
98	N.A. ICS JUST FOR THE MONEY	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v213: LIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q53A in the documentation.		

v213: LIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1711	82.1%
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, BRIGHT, CAPABL	1	0.0%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD	3	0.1%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE	1	0.0%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, A VERY FINE SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF S	2	0.1%
5	GOOD MAN	0	
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	0	
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, WOULD MAKE A GOOD PR	4	0.2%
8	CALM, COMES ON QUIETLY	0	
9	HIS WIFE, HIS SON, GOOD FAMILY MAN	2	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	
11	NICE LOOKING, HIS SMILE, FRIENDLY FACE	0	
12	SPEAKS GOOD FRENCH, HE IS BILINGUAL	0	
13	HE IS SCOTTISH	0	
14	BECAUSE HE IS A FOREIGNER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	1	0.0%
16	SELF-EDUCATED MAN, SELF-MADE MAN	0	
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	0	
18	CHARMING	0	
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS	1	0.0%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	0	
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	3	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
23	INTERESTING, FASCINATING	0	
24	DOWN TO EARTH TYPE OF MAN, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SEN	2	0.1%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, CHARISMA, PLEASANT	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	0	
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	0	
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE	0	
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS	0	
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, KEPT OTHER PARTIES ON THEIR T	1	0.0%
31	HE IS A GOOD STATESMAN	1	0.0%
32	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION OR HIGH PRICES OR COST OF L	0	
33	HIS EFFORTS FOR FRENCH CANADIANS	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON OR ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED	2	0.1%

v213: LIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	HE HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE OR	0	
38	HE IS FOR WORKING MAN OR WORKING PEOPLE	1	0.0%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR	0	
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS	0	
42	HE IS FOR THE FARMERS, DOES MORE FOR AGRICULTURE	1	0.0%
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	1	0.0%
44	ADMITS WHEN HE DOES NOT KNOW ANSWER	0	
45	WORKS FOR POOR, UNDERPRIVILEGED	1	0.0%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES, BIG CORPORATIONS (ANY MEN	2	0.1%
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	0	
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	0	
49	GOOD AT COMPROMISE	1	0.0%
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES AND THE WAY HE PUTS THEM ACROSS	0	
51	LIKE HIS IDEA ABOUT GETTING PENSIONS AT SIXTY	0	
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM (NO LIKES MENTIONED)	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING	0	
54	TRUE CANADIAN	0	
55	POLICY ON HOUSING	0	
56	TRYING TO GET MORE INDUSTRY	0	
57	HIS CAMPAIGN, WENT DOOR TO DOOR	0	
58	NOT CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
59	HIS POLICY ON EXPOSURE OF WHERE CAMPAIGN FUNDS COME FROM	0	
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	0	
62	POLICY ON GUARANTEED WAGE	0	
63	GOOD BUSINESS MAN	0	
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
65	SORRY HE LOST ELECTION, TREATED BADLY IN LAST ELECTION	2	0.1%
66	WOULD BE A GOOD CANDIDATE	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	0	
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
69	DID A LOT FOR HIS CONSTITUENCY	0	
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST OR WEST COAST	1	0.0%
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW IN PANEL DISCUSSIONS	1	0.0%
72	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUREAUCRACY	0	
73	HIS PROMISES SOUND GOOD	0	
74	HIS STYLE	1	0.0%

# v213: LIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	HIS ENERGY	0	
76	EXPERIENCED	0	
77	CAN CONVINCE ME	1	0.0%
78	NOT IN POLITICS JUST FOR THE MONEY	0	
79	SERIOUS	0	
80	THIRD PARTY IS NECESSARY TO SPLIT VOTES	0	
81	HE IS RETIRED	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	62	3.0%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	228	10.9%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	17	0.8%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	29	1.4%
98	N.A. ICS JUST FOR THE MONEY	676	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v214: DISLIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. LEWIS? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q53B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	70.1%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	18	0.9%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES, HIS PROGRAM	23	1.1%
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	6	0.3%
4	HE BROUGHT THE GOVERNMENT DOWN, FORCED THE ELECTION	16	0.8%
5	CORPORATE RIP-OFF, AGAINST CORPORATIONS	6	0.3%
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	4	0.2%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	3	0.1%
10	TOO OLD	5	0.2%
11	EVERYTHING	4	0.2%
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	3	0.1%
13	WELFARE PROGRAM, WELFARE STATE	0	
14	SUPPORTED THE LIBERALS OR TRUDEAU TOO MUCH	4	0.2%
15	DIDN'T SUPPORT THE LIBERALS ENOUGH, FOUND TOO MUCH FAULT WI	1	0.0%
16	LOST IN HIS OWN RIDING, RAN A BAD CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
17	DIDN'T STICK TO WHAT HE SAID, CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	8	0.4%
18	MYSTERIOUS, HEDGES, DOESN'T GIVE DECISIONS	1	0.0%

v214: DISLIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	HE IS TOO PUSHY OR AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS FIGHTING OR ARGUING	8	0.4%
20	MORE FOR THE EAST	1	0.0%
21	VERBAL ATTACKS, NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY CREDIT	4	0.2%
22	OVER CONFIDENT	0	
23	NOT A GOOD IMAGE FOR THE PARTY, DOESN'T BENEFIT THE N.D.P.,	0	
24	INSINCERE	3	0.1%
25	MAKES STATEMENTS WITHOUT FACTS, OR TWISTS FACTS	2	0.1%
26	POOR SPEAKER, TOO REPETITIVE	2	0.1%
27	SENSATIONALISTIC	0	
28	TOO ARROGANT	6	0.3%
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	1	0.0%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (NOT SPECIFIED)	10	0.5%
31	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE, MANIPULATION OF PEOPLE	1	0.0%
32	TOO POLITICAL, WORKED TOO HARD FOR HIS CAUSE, NOT ENOUGH SU	5	0.2%
33	NOT CAPABLE, DOESN'T KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT	2	0.1%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	1	0.0%
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND SO EASY	6	0.3%
36	LACK OF PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	1	0.0%
38	DO AWAY WITH FREE ENTERPRISE, CONTROL OF INDUSTRY, NATIONALI	3	0.1%
39	PEOPLE THINK OF SOCIALISM AS COMMUNISM	2	0.1%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	11	0.5%
41	OLD AGE PENSION AT SIXTY	1	0.0%
42	TOO MEDDLESOME	1	0.0%
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	2	0.1%
44	HE IS A CLOWN	1	0.0%
45	CAN'T REPRESENT FRENCH CANADIANS OR QUEBEC	1	0.0%
46	DON'T TRUST HIM, DON'T BELIEVE HIM	4	0.2%
47	HE IS BORING	0	
48	OVERDOES HIS OPPOSITION, DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO UTILIZE POWER	0	
49	TOO AMBITIOUS	1	0.0%
50	TOO CLOSE TO COMMUNISM	4	0.2%
51	MORE FOR WEST	1	0.0%
52	SEEMS AGAINST ANYONE WITH MONEY	1	0.0%
53	AFRAID OF F.L.Q.	1	0.0%
54	TOO INFLUENTIAL, HIS MANIPULATING WAYS	1	0.0%
55	DOMINEERING, BIT OF A DICTATOR	0	

# v214: DISLIKE LEWIS-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	0	
57	TOO MUCH CONTROL IN THE LAST HOUSE	2	0.1%
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V.	2	0.1%
59	HIS SONS	0	
60	OTHER SPECIFIC POLICIES (WOMEN'S ISSUES, MEDICARE, EDUCATIO	3	0.1%
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	1	0.0%
62	WOULDN'T HELP WORKERS WHEN THEY WERE ON STRIKE	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM	0	
64	CHANGED HIS IMAGE	0	
65	NOT A CONSTRUCTIVE PERSON	0	
66	TOO EASILY LEAD BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	2	0.1%
67	HIS JEWISHNESS THAT COMES OUT	0	
68	HIS QUITTING THE PARTY	1	0.0%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	65	3.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	329	15.8%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	6	0.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	15	0.7%
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v215: DISLIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q53B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1624	77.9%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	2	0.1%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES, HIS PROGRAM	2	0.1%
3		2	0.1%
4	HE BROUGHT THE GOVERNMENT DOWN, FORCED THE ELECTION	1	0.0%
5	CORPORATE RIP-OFF, AGAINST CORPORATIONS	2	0.1%
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	0	
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH	1	0.0%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
10	TOO OLD	2	0.1%
11	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	3	0.1%
13	WELFARE PROGRAM, WELFARE STATE	2	0.1%

v215: DISLIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	SUPPORTED THE LIBERALS OR TRUDEAU TOO MUCH	1	0.0%
15	DIDN'T SUPPORT THE LIBERALS ENOUGH, FOUND TOO MUCH FAULT WI	1	0.0%
16	LOST IN HIS OWN RIDING, RAN A BAD CAMPAIGN	0	
17	DIDN'T STICK TO WHAT HE SAID, CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	2	0.1%
18	MYSTERIOUS, HEDGES, DOESN'T GIVE DECISIONS	0	
19	HE IS TOO PUSHY OR AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS FIGHTING OR ARGUING	1	0.0%
20	MORE FOR THE EAST	0	
21		1	0.0%
22	OVER CONFIDENT	1	0.0%
23	NOT A GOOD IMAGE FOR THE PARTY, DOESN'T BENEFIT THE N.D.P.,	1	0.0%
24	INSINCERE	1	0.0%
25	MAKES STATEMENTS WITHOUT FACTS, OR TWISTS FACTS	0	
26	POOR SPEAKER, TOO REPETITIVE	0	
27	SENSATIONALISTIC	0	
28	TOO ARROGANT	0	
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	1	0.0%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (NOT SPECIFIED)	0	
31	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE, MANIPULATION OF PEOPLE	0	
32	TOO POLITICAL, WORKED TOO HARD FOR HIS CAUSE, NOT ENOUGH SU	2	0.1%
33	NOT CAPABLE, DOESN'T KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT	1	0.0%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND SO EASY	0	
36	LACK OF PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	0	
38	DO AWAY WITH FREE ENTERPRISE, CONTROL OF INDUSTRY, NATIONALI	1	0.0%
39	PEOPLE THINK OF SOCIALISM AS COMMUNISM	1	0.0%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
41	OLD AGE PENSION AT SIXTY	0	
42	TOO MEDDLESOME	1	0.0%
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	0	
44	HE IS A CLOWN	0	
45	CAN'T REPRESENT FRENCH CANADIANS OR QUEBEC	0	
46	DON'T TRUST HIM, DON'T BELIEVE HIM	0	
47	HE IS BORING	0	
48	OVERDOES HIS OPPOSITION, DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO UTILIZE POWER	1	0.0%
49	TOO AMBITIOUS	1	0.0%

# v215: DISLIKE LEWIS-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	TOO CLOSE TO COMMUNISM	0	
51	MORE FOR WEST	1	0.0%
52	SEEMS AGAINST ANYONE WITH MONEY	0	
53	AFRAID OF F.L.Q.	0	
54	TOO INFLUENTIAL, HIS MANIPULATING WAYS	1	0.0%
55	DOMINEERING, BIT OF A DICTATOR	0	
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	2	0.1%
57	TOO MUCH CONTROL IN THE LAST HOUSE	0	
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V.	0	
59	HIS SONS	0	
60	OTHER SPECIFIC POLICIES (WOMEN'S ISSUES, MEDICARE, EDUCATIO	1	0.0%
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	1	0.0%
62	WOULDN'T HELP WORKERS WHEN THEY WERE ON STRIKE	1	0.0%
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM	0	
64	CHANGED HIS IMAGE	0	
65	NOT A CONSTRUCTIVE PERSON	2	0.1%
66	TOO EASILY LEAD BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	0	
67	HIS JEWISHNESS THAT COMES OUT	0	
68	HIS QUITTING THE PARTY	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	65	3.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	329	15.8%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	6	0.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	15	0.7%
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v216: DISLIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2086 /-] [Invalid=675 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q53B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1664	79.8%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	0	
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES, HIS PROGRAM	0	
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	0	
4	HE BROUGHT THE GOVERNMENT DOWN, FORCED THE ELECTION	0	
5	CORPORATE RIP-OFF, AGAINST CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	0	

v216: DISLIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	1	0.0%
10	TOO OLD	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	0	
13	WELFARE PROGRAM, WELFARE STATE	0	
14	SUPPORTED THE LIBERALS OR TRUDEAU TOO MUCH	0	
15	DIDN'T SUPPORT THE LIBERALS ENOUGH, FOUND TOO MUCH FAULT WI	0	
16	LOST IN HIS OWN RIDING, RAN A BAD CAMPAIGN	0	
18	MYSTERIOUS, HEDGES, DOESN'T GIVE DECISIONS	0	
19	HE IS TOO PUSHY OR AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS FIGHTING OR ARGUING	0	
20	MORE FOR THE EAST	0	
21	VERBAL ATTACKS, NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY CREDIT	1	0.0%
22	OVER CONFIDENT	0	
23	NOT A GOOD IMAGE FOR THE PARTY, DOESN'T BENEFIT THE N.D.P.,	0	
24	INSINCERE	0	
25	MAKES STATEMENTS WITHOUT FACTS, OR TWISTS FACTS	0	
26	POOR SPEAKER, TOO REPETITIVE	0	
27	SENSATIONALISTIC	1	0.0%
28	TOO ARROGANT	0	
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (NOT SPECIFIED)	0	
31	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE, MANIPULATION OF PEOPLE	0	
32	TOO POLITICAL, WORKED TOO HARD FOR HIS CAUSE, NOT ENOUGH SU	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, DOESN'T KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT	0	
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND SO EASY	0	
36	LACK OF PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	0	
38	DO AWAY WITH FREE ENTERPRISE, CONTROL OF INDUSTRY, NATIONALI	0	
39	PEOPLE THINK OF SOCIALISM AS COMMUNISM	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
41	OLD AGE PENSION AT SIXTY	0	
42	TOO MEDDLESOME	0	
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	0	
44	HE IS A CLOWN	0	
45	CAN'T REPRESENT FRENCH CANADIANS OR QUEBEC	0	

# v216: DISLIKE LEWIS-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	DON'T TRUST HIM, DON'T BELIEVE HIM	0	
47	HE IS BORING	0	
48	OVERDOES HIS OPPOSITION, DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO UTILIZE POWER	0	
49	TOO AMBITIOUS	0	
50	TOO CLOSE TO COMMUNISM	0	
51	MORE FOR WEST	0	
52	SEEMS AGAINST ANYONE WITH MONEY	0	
53	AFRAID OF F.L.Q.	0	
54	TOO INFLUENTIAL, HIS MANIPULATING WAYS	0	
55	DOMINEERING, BIT OF A DICTATOR	0	
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	0	
57	TOO MUCH CONTROL IN THE LAST HOUSE	0	
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V.	0	
59	HIS SONS	0	
60	OTHER SPECIFIC POLICIES (WOMEN'S ISSUES, MEDICARE, EDUCATIO	0	
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	0	
62	WOULDN'T HELP WORKERS WHEN THEY WERE ON STRIKE	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM	0	
64	CHANGED HIS IMAGE	1	0.0%
65	NOT A CONSTRUCTIVE PERSON	0	
66	TOO EASILY LEAD BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	1	0.0%
67	HIS JEWISHNESS THAT COMES OUT	0	
68	HIS QUITTING THE PARTY	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	65	3.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	329	15.8%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	6	0.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	15	0.7%
98	N.A.	675	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v217: LIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2084 /-] [Invalid=677 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CAOUETTE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q54A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	70.2%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, BRILLIANT	9	0.4%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT, VERY MUCH HIMSELF	25	1.2%
3	VIBRANT PERSONALITY, LIKE HIM, LIKE HIM A LOT, LIKEABLE	9	0.4%

v217: LIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	GOOD SPEAKER, GOOD ORATOR, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	40	1.9%
5	GOOD MAN	7	0.3%
6	HARD WORKER, WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD	9	0.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	5	0.2%
8	NEVER GETS EMBARRASSED	0	
9	FAMILY MAN	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	3	0.1%
11	HIS APPEARANCE	2	0.1%
12	BILINGUAL	1	0.0%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	2	0.1%
14	ANIMATED, PERKINESS, HIS FIRE, ENERGETIC, DYNAMIC, HIS ENTHU	9	0.4%
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY,	5	0.2%
16	HIS DETERMINATION, HE NEVER GIVES UP, PERSISTENT, HIS TENACI	6	0.3%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	8	0.4%
18	HIS CHARM	0	
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	8	0.4%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	4	0.2%
21	GOOD POLICIES, GOOD PROGRAM	6	0.3%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	3	0.1%
23	INTERESTING, DIFFERENT	2	0.1%
24	COMICAL, A CLOWN, LIKE A COMEDIAN, ENTERTAINING	9	0.4%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	3	0.1%
27	GOOD IN OPPOSITION	3	0.1%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	1	0.0%
29	HE IS A FIGHTER	6	0.3%
30	HE IS DOWN TO EARTH, REALISTIC	2	0.1%
31	A SIMPLE MAN	2	0.1%
32	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVIN	3	0.1%
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE DEFENDS FRENCH CANADIANS	1	0.0%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, CANADIANS, ORDINARY PEOPLE	2	0.1%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE	0	
37	HE CARES FOR US, WE NEED HIM	1	0.0%
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V.	1	0.0%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CH	19	0.9%
40	HIS MONEY MACHINE, HIS MONETARY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
41	HE IS A GENTLEMAN, POLITE	1	0.0%
42	DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUES, ANSWERS ALL QUESTIONS	1	0.0%
43	HE IS IN TOUCH, WE SEE HIM OFTEN, CLOSE TO HIS PEOPLE	0	

# v217: LIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
45	HE WORKS FOR THE POOR, WANTS TO HELP THE POOR, HE UNDERSTAN	0	
46	KNOWS WHAT IS NEEDED OR WANTED, AWARE OF PROBLEMS, WELL INFO	4	0.2%
47	HE HAS BROADENED, MAKES MORE SENSE THAN A FEW YEARS AGO	1	0.0%
48	HE IS O.K.	1	0.0%
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	1	0.0%
50	SMALL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE IN HIM	0	
51	HE WANTS TO KEEP QUEBEC IN CANADA	0	
52	SYMPATHETIC	1	0.0%
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES	0	
54	TRUE CANADIAN	1	0.0%
55	HE IS FOR THE PENSIONERS, INCREASED OLD AGE PENSIONS, FOR R	0	
56	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	1	0.0%
57	PROGRESSIVE	0	
58	MORE SOCIALISTIC, POLICIES ON SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
59	HE WORKS FOR MIDDLE CLASS	0	
60	HIS ATTITUDE THAT YOUNG PEOPLE SHOULD WORK HARDER, PEOPLE S	1	0.0%
61	HIS FORTITUDE	0	
62	NO CONNECTION WITH THE WEST	0	
63	POLICY ON GUARANTEED WAGE OR WORKING HOURS	0	
64	IF HE WERE IN WE WOULD SEE IF EVERYTHING HE SAYS IS TRUE, L	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	108	5.2%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	226	10.8%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	12	0.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	45	2.2%
98	N.A.	677	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v218: LIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2084 /-] [Invalid=677 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION		
Notes	Q54A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1594	76.5%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, BRILLIANT	1	0.0%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT, VERY MUCH HIMSELF	15	0.7%
3	VIBRANT PERSONALITY, LIKE HIM, LIKE HIM A LOT, LIKEABLE	1	0.0%

v218: LIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4		12	0.6%
5	GOOD MAN	1	0.0%
6	HARD WORKER, WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD	5	0.2%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	3	0.1%
8	NEVER GETS EMBARRASSED	0	
9	FAMILY MAN	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
12	BILINGUAL	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	0	
14		1	0.0%
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY,	7	0.3%
16	HIS DETERMINATION, HE NEVER GIVES UP, PERSISTENT, HIS TENACI	4	0.2%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	9	0.4%
18	HIS CHARM	0	
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	6	0.3%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	1	0.0%
21	GOOD POLICIES, GOOD PROGRAM	2	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
23	INTERESTING, DIFFERENT	1	0.0%
24	COMICAL, A CLOWN, LIKE A COMEDIAN, ENTERTAINING	2	0.1%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	1	0.0%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	3	0.1%
27	GOOD IN OPPOSITION	1	0.0%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	0	
29	HE IS A FIGHTER	2	0.1%
30	HE IS DOWN TO EARTH, REALISTIC	1	0.0%
31	A SIMPLE MAN	1	0.0%
32	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVIN	1	0.0%
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE DEFENDS FRENCH CANADIANS	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, CANADIANS, ORDINARY PEOPLE	2	0.1%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE	0	
37	HE CARES FOR US, WE NEED HIM	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CH	0	
40	HIS MONEY MACHINE, HIS MONETARY SYSTEM	2	0.1%
41	HE IS A GENTLEMAN, POLITE	0	
42	DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUES, ANSWERS ALL QUESTIONS	1	0.0%
43	HE IS IN TOUCH, WE SEE HIM OFTEN, CLOSE TO HIS PEOPLE	0	

# v218: LIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
45	HE WORKS FOR THE POOR, WANTS TO HELP THE POOR, HE UNDERSTAN	2	0.1%
46	KNOWS WHAT IS NEEDED OR WANTED, AWARE OF PROBLEMS, WELL INFO	2	0.1%
47	HE HAS BROADENED, MAKES MORE SENSE THAN A FEW YEARS AGO	0	
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0	
50	SMALL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE IN HIM	1	0.0%
51	HE WANTS TO KEEP QUEBEC IN CANADA	1	0.0%
52	SYMPATHETIC	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES	1	0.0%
54	TRUE CANADIAN	0	
55	HE IS FOR THE PENSIONERS, INCREASED OLD AGE PENSIONS, FOR R	1	0.0%
56	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	1	0.0%
57	PROGRESSIVE	1	0.0%
58	MORE SOCIALISTIC, POLICIES ON SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
59	HE WORKS FOR MIDDLE CLASS	0	
60	HIS ATTITUDE THAT YOUNG PEOPLE SHOULD WORK HARDER, PEOPLE S	0	
61	HIS FORTITUDE	0	
62	NO CONNECTION WITH THE WEST	0	
63	POLICY ON GUARANTEED WAGE OR WORKING HOURS	0	
64	IF HE WERE IN WE WOULD SEE IF EVERYTHING HE SAYS IS TRUE, L	1	0.0%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	108	5.2%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	226	10.8%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	12	0.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	45	2.2%
98	N.A.	677	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v219: LIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2084 /-] [Invalid=677 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q54A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1655	79.4%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, BRILLIANT	0	
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT, VERY MUCH HIMSELF	3	0.1%
3	VIBRANT PERSONALITY, LIKE HIM, LIKE HIM A LOT, LIKEABLE	1	0.0%

v219: LIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	GOOD SPEAKER, GOOD ORATOR, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	2	0.1%
5	GOOD MAN	0	
6	HARD WORKER, WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD	7	0.3%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	4	0.2%
8	NEVER GETS EMBARRASSED	0	
9	FAMILY MAN	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	0.0%
11	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
12	BILINGUAL	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	0	
14	ANIMATED, PERKINESS, HIS FIRE, ENERGETIC, DYNAMIC, HIS ENTHU	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY,	0	
16	HIS DETERMINATION, HE NEVER GIVES UP, PERSISTENT, HIS TENACI	1	0.0%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	4	0.2%
18	HIS CHARM	1	0.0%
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	0	
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	0	
21	GOOD POLICIES, GOOD PROGRAM	2	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
23	INTERESTING, DIFFERENT	0	
24	COMICAL, A CLOWN, LIKE A COMEDIAN, ENTERTAINING	1	0.0%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	0	
27	GOOD IN OPPOSITION	0	
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	2	0.1%
29	HE IS A FIGHTER	0	
30	HE IS DOWN TO EARTH, REALISTIC	2	0.1%
31	A SIMPLE MAN	0	
32	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVIN	0	
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE DEFENDS FRENCH CANADIANS	1	0.0%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, CANADIANS, ORDINARY PEOPLE	1	0.0%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE	0	
37	HE CARES FOR US, WE NEED HIM	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CH	0	
40	HIS MONEY MACHINE, HIS MONETARY SYSTEM	0	
41	HE IS A GENTLEMAN, POLITE	0	
42	DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUES, ANSWERS ALL QUESTIONS	0	
43	HE IS IN TOUCH, WE SEE HIM OFTEN, CLOSE TO HIS PEOPLE	0	

# v219: LIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
45	HE WORKS FOR THE POOR, WANTS TO HELP THE POOR, HE UNDERSTAN	1	0.0%
46	KNOWS WHAT IS NEEDED OR WANTED, AWARE OF PROBLEMS, WELL INFO	0	
47	HE HAS BROADENED, MAKES MORE SENSE THAN A FEW YEARS AGO	0	
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0	
50	SMALL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE IN HIM	0	
51	HE WANTS TO KEEP QUEBEC IN CANADA	0	
52	SYMPATHETIC	1	0.0%
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES	0	
54	TRUE CANADIAN	0	
55	HE IS FOR THE PENSIONERS, INCREASED OLD AGE PENSIONS, FOR R	1	0.0%
56	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	0	
57	PROGRESSIVE	0	
58	MORE SOCIALISTIC, POLICIES ON SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
59	HE WORKS FOR MIDDLE CLASS	0	
60	HIS ATTITUDE THAT YOUNG PEOPLE SHOULD WORK HARDER, PEOPLE S	0	
61	HIS FORTITUDE	0	
62	NO CONNECTION WITH THE WEST	0	
63	POLICY ON GUARANTEED WAGE OR WORKING HOURS	1	0.0%
64	IF HE WERE IN WE WOULD SEE IF EVERYTHING HE SAYS IS TRUE, L	1	0.0%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	108	5.2%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	226	10.8%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	12	0.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	45	2.2%
98	N.A.	677	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v220: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2084 /-] [Invalid=677 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CAOUETTE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q54B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	70.2%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	13	0.6%
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAM	12	0.6%
3	HIS IDEAS	1	0.0%
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	7	0.3%

v220: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	HE IS ONLY FOR FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	4	0.2%
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS	13	0.6%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	5	0.2%
8	HIS LANGUAGE IS BAD	2	0.1%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	3	0.1%
10	TOO OLD, SHOULD RETIRE	1	0.0%
11	EVERYTHING	4	0.2%
12	HE SCREAMS TOO MUCH, HE RANTS AND RAVES	6	0.3%
13	HE IS TOO RADICAL	1	0.0%
14	HE IS CRAZY, HAS NO BRAINS	2	0.1%
15	'A LITTLE HITLER', TOO DICTATORIAL, A REAL FASCIST	2	0.1%
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	3	0.1%
17	A DEMAGOGUE	0	
18	HE IS TOO OUTSPOKEN	1	0.0%
19	TOO HONEST	0	
20	HIS MONEY MACHINE, HIS MONETARY SYSTEM, ECONOMIC IDEAS	4	0.2%
21	HIS PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP OR PARTY	6	0.3%
23	VERY ARROGANT	2	0.1%
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	1	0.0%
25	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO DYNAMIC	1	0.0%
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER, CAN'T STAND TO LISTEN TO HIM	6	0.3%
27	TRUDEAU'S MAN, A HIDDEN LIBERAL	1	0.0%
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	1	0.0%
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	4	0.2%
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.2%
31	CAMPAIGN STYLE, 'GANGSTER-LIKE WITH BLACK CAR'	0	
32	ACCUSATIONS AGAINST OTHER PARTIES OR PEOPLE, TOO CRITICAL	5	0.2%
33	TOO PARTISAN	0	
34	OLD FASHIONED PROGRAM, SAME THING EVERY ELECTION	3	0.1%
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	3	0.1%
36	TOO PATERNALISTIC	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE	1	0.0%
38	FOR SEPARATISM, SOME OF HIS THOUGHTS ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
39	HE WAS A DRAFT DODGER DURING THE WAR	2	0.1%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	4	0.2%
41	DISAGREEMENT WITH SAMSON	1	0.0%
42	NOT CONCERNED WITH QUEBEC'S NEEDS	0	
43	DOESN'T ALWAYS KNOW WHAT HE IS SAYING	2	0.1%
44	RACISM	0	

# v220: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	TOO SURE OF HIMSELF	0	
46	HAS NO PLATFORM	1	0.0%
47	HE DOESN'T GET THROUGH TO THE PEOPLE	0	
48	HARPING ABOUT FAT CAT BUSINESS	0	
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	1	0.0%
50	SHOULD CAMPAIGN MORE HERE THEN WE WOULD KNOW	0	
51	DOESN'T KEEP PACE WITH OTHER PROVINCES	0	
52	URNS HIS HAT ON ISSUES	0	
53	IS UNEDUCATED TO THE FACT THAT WE'RE NOT ALL DUMMIES	0	
54	WORKING FOR THE WEST	0	
55	OUR SPECIFIC DISLIKES WITH REFERENCE TO HIS INVOLVEMENT IN	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	122	5.9%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	328	15.7%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	6	0.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	30	1.4%
98	N.A.	677	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v221: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2084 /-] [Invalid=677 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	ANYTHING ELSE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q54B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1569	75.3%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	2	0.1%
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAM	1	0.0%
3	HIS IDEAS	0	
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	2	0.1%
5	HE IS ONLY FOR FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	2	0.1%
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS	3	0.1%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	2	0.1%
8	HIS LANGUAGE IS BAD	1	0.0%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
10	TOO OLD, SHOULD RETIRE	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	HE SCREAMS TOO MUCH, HE RANTS AND RAVES	2	0.1%
13	HE IS TOO RADICAL	1	0.0%
14	HE IS CRAZY, HAS NO BRAINS	0	
15	'A LITTLE HITLER', TOO DICTATORIAL, A REAL FASCIST	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	0	
17	A DEMAGOGUE	1	0.0%

v221: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	HE IS TOO OUTSPOKEN	0	
19	TOO HONEST	0	
20	HIS MONEY MACHINE, HIS MONETARY SYSTEM, ECONOMIC IDEAS	2	0.1%
21	HIS PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP OR PARTY	1	0.0%
23	VERY ARROGANT	0	
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	
25	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO DYNAMIC	0	
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER, CAN'T STAND TO LISTEN TO HIM	1	0.0%
27	TRUDEAU'S MAN, A HIDDEN LIBERAL	1	0.0%
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	1	0.0%
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	1	0.0%
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
31	CAMPAIGN STYLE, 'GANGSTER-LIKE WITH BLACK CAR'	0	
32	ACCUSATIONS AGAINST OTHER PARTIES OR PEOPLE, TOO CRITICAL	0	
33	TOO PARTISAN	0	
34	OLD FASHIONED PROGRAM, SAME THING EVERY ELECTION	0	
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
36	TOO PATERNALISTIC	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
38	FOR SEPARATISM, SOME OF HIS THOUGHTS ON SEPARATISM	2	0.1%
39	HE WAS A DRAFT DODGER DURING THE WAR	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	0	
41	DISAGREEMENT WITH SAMSON	0	
42	NOT CONCERNED WITH QUEBEC'S NEEDS	0	
43	DOESN'T ALWAYS KNOW WHAT HE IS SAYING	0	
44	RACISM	0	
45	TOO SURE OF HIMSELF	0	
46	HAS NO PLATFORM	0	
47	HE DOESN'T GET THROUGH TO THE PEOPLE	0	
48	HARPING ABOUT FAT CAT BUSINESS	1	0.0%
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
50	SHOULD CAMPAIGN MORE HERE THEN WE WOULD KNOW	0	
51	DOESN'T KEEP PACE WITH OTHER PROVINCES	0	
52	URNS HIS HAT ON ISSUES	0	
53	IS UNEDUCATED TO THE FACT THAT WE'RE NOT ALL DUMMIES	0	
54	WORKING FOR THE WEST	0	
55	OUR SPECIFIC DISLIKES WITH REFERENCE TO HIS INVOLVEMENT IN	0	

# v221: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	122	<div></div> 5.9%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	328	<div></div> 15.7%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	6	0.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	30	<div></div> 1.4%
98	N.A.	677	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v222: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2084 /-] [Invalid=677 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	(THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q54B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1594	<div></div> 76.5%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	0	
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAM	1	0.0%
3	HIS IDEAS	0	
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	0	
5	HE IS ONLY FOR FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS	1	0.0%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	0	
8	HIS LANGUAGE IS BAD	0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.0%
10	TOO OLD, SHOULD RETIRE	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	HE SCREAMS TOO MUCH, HE RANTS AND RAVES	0	
13	HE IS TOO RADICAL	0	
14	HE IS CRAZY, HAS NO BRAINS	0	
15	'A LITTLE HITLER', TOO DICTATORIAL, A REAL FASCIST	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	0	
17	A DEMAGOGUE	0	
18	HE IS TOO OUTSPOKEN	0	
19	TOO HONEST	0	
20	HIS MONEY MACHINE, HIS MONETARY SYSTEM, ECONOMIC IDEAS	0	
21	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP OR PARTY	0	
23	VERY ARROGANT	0	
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	
25	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO DYNAMIC	0	
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER, CAN'T STAND TO LISTEN TO HIM	0	
27	TRUDEAU'S MAN, A HIDDEN LIBERAL	0	
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	0	
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	0	

# v222: DISLIKE CAOUETTE-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
31	CAMPAIGN STYLE, 'GANGSTER-LIKE WITH BLACK CAR'	0	
32	ACCUSATIONS AGAINST OTHER PARTIES OR PEOPLE, TOO CRITICAL	0	
33	TOO PARTISAN	0	
34	OLD FASHIONED PROGRAM, SAME THING EVERY ELECTION	1	0.0%
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
36	TOO PATERNALISTIC	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
38	FOR SEPARATISM, SOME OF HIS THOUGHTS ON SEPARATISM	0	
39	HE WAS A DRAFT DODGER DURING THE WAR	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	0	
41	DISAGREEMENT WITH SAMSON	0	
42	NOT CONCERNED WITH QUEBEC'S NEEDS	0	
43	DOESN'T ALWAYS KNOW WHAT HE IS SAYING	0	
44	RACISM	0	
45	TOO SURE OF HIMSELF	0	
46	HAS NO PLATFORM	0	
47	HE DOESN'T GET THROUGH TO THE PEOPLE	0	
48	HARPING ABOUT FAT CAT BUSINESS	0	
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
50	SHOULD CAMPAIGN MORE HERE THEN WE WOULD KNOW	0	
51	DOESN'T KEEP PACE WITH OTHER PROVINCES	0	
52	TURNES HIS HAT ON ISSUES	0	
53	IS UNEDUCATED TO THE FACT THAT WE'RE NOT ALL DUMMIES	0	
54	WORKING FOR THE WEST	0	
55	OUR SPECIFIC DISLIKES WITH REFERENCE TO HIS INVOLVEMENT IN	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	122	5.9%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	328	15.7%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	6	0.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	30	1.4%
98	N.A.	677	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v223: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1146 /-] [Invalid=1615 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC,SAY) LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?		

# v223: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Notes		Q60A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	INDEPENDENT	62	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
1	LIBERAL	514	<div><div></div></div> 44.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	297	<div><div></div></div> 25.9%
3	N.D.P.	139	<div><div></div></div> 12.1%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	66	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	UNION NATIONALE	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	55	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
8	D.K.	1595	
9	REFUSED	20	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v224: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1083 /-] [Invalid=1678 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q60A THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC,SAY) LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?	
Literal question		Q60B HOW STRONGLY DO YOU GENERALLY FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?	
Notes		Q60A, Q60B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	407	<div><div></div></div> 37.6%
2	FAIRLY	526	<div><div></div></div> 48.6%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	150	<div><div></div></div> 13.9%
8	D.K.	1464	
9	N.A.	214	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v225: FEEL CLOSER TO PROVINCIAL PARTY			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=167 /-] [Invalid=2594 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to respondents who answered "don't know", or "independents" in Q60A.	
Literal question		WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?	
Notes		Q61A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	59	<div><div></div></div> 35.3%
2	NO	108	<div><div></div></div> 64.7%
0	REFUSED	1476	
8	D.K.	34	
9	N.A.	1084	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v226: PROVINCIAL PARTY CLOSER TO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=47 /-] [Invalid=2714 /-]		
Universe	Q61B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q61A.		
Pre-question	Q61A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q61B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q61A, Q61B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	22	<div><div></div></div> 46.8%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	16	<div><div></div></div> 34.0%
3	N.D.P.	5	<div><div></div></div> 10.6%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	2	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
5	OTHER	0	
6	UNION NATIONALE	2	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	0	
0	REFUSED	1468	
8	D.K.	7	
9	N.A.	1239	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v227: ANY PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1228 /-] [Invalid=1533 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q62A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	332	<div><div></div></div> 27.0%
2	NO	896	<div><div></div></div> 73.0%
0	REFUSED	1471	
8	D.K.	62	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v228: PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1290 /-] [Invalid=1471 /-]		
Universe	Q62B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q62A.		
Pre-question	Q62A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	Q62B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q62A, Q62B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	92	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
2	NO	88	<div><div></div></div> 6.8%
3		47	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%

# v228: PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4		57	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
5		3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6		27	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
7		10	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
9		966	<div><div></div></div> 74.9%
0	REFUSED	1466	
8	D.K.	5	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v229: WHEN CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1787 /-] [Invalid=974 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY, THAT IS, THE (NAME OF PARTY MENTIONED IN Q62B)		
Notes	Q62C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	D.K.,NO ANSWER, NOT SPECIFIED	1503	<div><div></div></div> 84.1%
1	LAST ELECTION	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
2	1973, LAST YEAR, 1 YEAR AGO	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	1972, 2 YEARS AGO	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
4	1971, 3 YEARS AGO	22	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
5	1970, 4 YEARS AGO	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
6	1969, 5 YEARS AGO	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
7	1968, 6 YEARS AGO	20	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
8	1967, 7 YEARS AGO	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
9	1966, 8 YEARS AGO	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
10	1965, 9 YEARS AGO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	1964, 10 YEARS AGO	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
12	1963, 11 OR MORE YEARS AGO	40	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
13	GENERAL, A LONG TIME AGO	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
14	HAVN'T REALLY CHANGED, TEMPORARY CHANGE, DON'T REALLY BELON	29	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
15	SINCE, AFTER LAST ELECTION (UNABLE TO DETERMINE YEAR)	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
16	TIME NOT SPECIFIED, UNABLE TO DETERMINE FROM RESPONSE	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
17	THIS YEAR, 1974	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
99	N.A.	974	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v230: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1787 /-] [Invalid=974 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q62D in the documentation.		

v230: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	81.9%
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	18	1.0%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	6	0.3%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	5	0.3%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	5	0.3%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	12	0.7%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	2	0.1%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	1	0.1%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONALE,	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	24	1.3%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	6	0.3%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	3	0.2%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	11	0.6%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	2	0.1%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	3	0.2%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	1	0.1%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	4	0.2%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	3	0.2%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	8	0.4%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN UN	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	7	0.4%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	4	0.2%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	4	0.2%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	0.1%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	1	0.1%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	2	0.1%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	2	0.1%
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN U	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THA	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	10	0.6%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	3	0.2%

v230: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	17	1.0%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	4	0.2%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	4	0.2%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	9	0.5%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	7	0.4%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHE	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OT	1	0.1%
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	2	0.1%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
50	RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	2	0.1%
51	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	15	0.8%
52	"THE MAN" (D.K. IF LEADER OR CANDIDATE)	5	0.3%
53	VAGUE REASONS,"FOR A CHANGE","EVERYTHING IN GENERAL", DIDN'	31	1.7%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
55	WANTED THE P.C.,S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	3	0.2%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	2	0.1%
58	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
59	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	4	0.2%
60	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	2	0.1%
61	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
62	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
64	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
65	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
66	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
67	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
68	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	9	0.5%
69	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	1	0.1%
70	APPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	1	0.1%
71	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	2	0.1%
72	APPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	4	0.2%
73	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	1	0.1%
74	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE	0	
75	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%

# v230: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	0	
77	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
78	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
79	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	5	0.3%
80	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
81	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
82	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	1	0.1%
83	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
84	APPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	3	0.2%
85	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	2	0.1%
86	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
88	NO ANSWER, CAN,T REMEMBER, REFUSED	23	1.3%
99	N.A.	974	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v231: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1787 /-] [Invalid=974 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q62D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1725	96.5%
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	1	0.1%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	0	
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	0	
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	1	0.1%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONALE,	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	4	0.2%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0	

v231: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	3	0.2%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	2	0.1%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	1	0.1%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	0	
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	0	
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	0	
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	2	0.1%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN UN	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	0	
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	0	
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	0	
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	0	
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN U	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THA	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	0	
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	0	
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	3	0.2%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	3	0.2%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHE	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OT	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
50	RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
51	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	1	0.1%
52	"THE MAN" (D.K. IF LEADER OR CANDIDATE)	0	
53	VAGUE REASONS,"FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL", DIDN'	2	0.1%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.,S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	

# v231: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	0	
58	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
59	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
60	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
61	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
62	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
64	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
65	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
66	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
67	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
68	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	0	
69	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	0	
70	APPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
71	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	1	0.1%
72	APPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	2	0.1%
73	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	0	
74	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE	0	
75	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	0	
76	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
77	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	0	
78	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER PERFORMANCE	0	
79	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	2	0.1%
80	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
81	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
82	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
83	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
84	APPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	0	
85	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	0	
86	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
88	NO ANSWER, CAN,T REMEMBER, REFUSED	23	1.3%
99	N.A.	974	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v232: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1051 /-] [Invalid=1710 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q63A. DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Notes	Q63A in the documentation.		

# v232: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	727	<div><div></div></div> 69.2%
2	NO	324	<div><div></div></div> 30.8%
0	REFUSED	1465	
8	D.K.	245	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v233: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=705 /-] [Invalid=2056 /-]		
Universe	Q63B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q63A.		
Pre-question	Q63A. DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Literal question	Q63B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT		
Notes	Q63A, Q63B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	341	<div><div></div></div> 48.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	237	<div><div></div></div> 33.6%
3	N.D.P. (INCLUDE C.C.F.)	49	<div><div></div></div> 7.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	35	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	UNION NATIONALE	40	<div><div></div></div> 5.7%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	REFUSED	1466	
8	D.K.	19	
9	N.A.	571	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v234: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2160 /-] [Invalid=601 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q63A. DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP? / Q63B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT		
Literal question	Q63C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q63B) WAS HE THEN?		
Notes	Q63A, Q63B, Q63C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 67.7%
1	VERY STRONG	389	<div><div></div></div> 18.0%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	264	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
3	NOT VERY STRONG	44	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
8	D.K.	8	
9	N.A.	593	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v235: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		

# v235: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY?			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1015 /-] [Invalid=1746 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Notes	Q64A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	568	<div><div></div></div> 56.0%
2	NO	447	<div><div></div></div> 44.0%
0	REFUSED	1466	
8	D.K.	280	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v236: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=554 /-] [Invalid=2207 /-]		
Universe	Q64B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q64A.		
Literal question	Q64B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q64A, Q64B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	262	<div><div></div></div> 47.3%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	179	<div><div></div></div> 32.3%
3	N.D.P. (INCLUDE C.C.F.)	38	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	39	<div><div></div></div> 7.0%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
6	UNION NATIONALE	33	<div><div></div></div> 6.0%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	REFUSED	1465	
8	D.K.	12	
9	N.A.	730	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v237: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2014 /-] [Invalid=747 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q64A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP? / Q64B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q64C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q64B) WAS SHE THEN?		
Notes	Q64A, Q64B, Q64C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 72.6%
1	VERY STRONG	244	<div><div></div></div> 12.1%
2	FAIRLY STRONG	244	<div><div></div></div> 12.1%
3	NOT VERY STRONG	63	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
8	D.K.	3	

# v237: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	N.A.	744	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v238: PARENTS PROVINCIAL POLITICAL INTERST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1125 /-] [Invalid=1636 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?		
Notes	Q65 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	415	<div></div> 36.9%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	524	<div></div> 46.6%
3	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	185	<div></div> 16.4%
4	FATHER INTERESTED, MOTHER NOT	1	<div></div> 0.1%
0	REFUSED	1466	
8	D.K.	170	
9	N.A.	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v239: PROVINCIAL VOTER?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1294 /-] [Invalid=1467 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM , SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?		
Notes	Q72A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ALL	770	<div></div> 59.5%
2	MOST	315	<div></div> 24.3%
3	SOME	112	<div></div> 8.7%
4	NONE	97	<div></div> 7.5%
8	D.K.	1467	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v240: ALWAYS VOTE SAME PROVINCIAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2632 /-] [Invalid=129 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Notes	Q72B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 55.6%
1	SAME	636	<div></div> 24.2%
2	DIFFERENT	533	<div></div> 20.3%

# v240: ALWAYS VOTE SAME PROVINCIAL			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	25	
9	N.A.	104	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v241: PROVINCIAL PARTY ALWAYS VOTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2085 /-] [Invalid=676 /-]		
Universe	Q72C asked only to respondents who answered "yes" to Q72B.		
Pre-question	Q72B. IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Literal question	Q72C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q72B, Q72C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 70.2%
1	LIBERAL	322	<div></div> 15.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	173	<div></div> 8.3%
3	N.D.P.	69	<div></div> 3.3%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	35	<div></div> 1.7%
5	OTHER	1	<div></div> 0.0%
6	UNION NATIONALE	3	<div></div> 0.1%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	19	<div></div> 0.9%
8	D.K.	6	
9	N.A.	670	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v242: CHOICE OR CONTEST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=515 /-] [Invalid=2246 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "different party" in Q72B.		
Literal question	DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?		
Notes	Q72D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CHOICE	500	<div></div> 97.1%
2	DID NOT CONTEST	15	<div></div> 2.9%
8	D.K.	1481	
9	N.A.	765	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v243: VOTED LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1183 /-] [Invalid=1578 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?		
Notes	Q73A in the documentation.		

# v243: VOTED LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	1115	<div><div></div></div> 94.3%
2	DID NOT VOTE	65	<div><div></div></div> 5.5%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE THEN	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
8	D.K.	1481	
9	N.A.	97	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v244: VOTE-LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1044 /-] [Invalid=1717 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted, as indicated in Q73A.		
Pre-question	Q73A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q73B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?		
Notes	Q73A, Q73B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	463	<div><div></div></div> 44.3%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	291	<div><div></div></div> 27.9%
3	N.D.P.	148	<div><div></div></div> 14.2%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	72	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
5	OTHER	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
6	UNION NATIONALE	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	53	<div><div></div></div> 5.1%
8	D.K.	1509	
9	N.A.	208	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v245: WHY NOT VOTE-LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1625 /-] [Invalid=1136 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "none" in Q72A or "do not vote" in Q73A.		
Pre-question	Q73A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q73C. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE IN THE LAST ELECTION?		
Notes	Q73A, Q73C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO PARTICULAR REASON, DON'T KNOW	1479	<div><div></div></div> 91.0%
1	OUT OF TOWN	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
2	ON VACATION, HOLIDAYS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
3	IN HOSPITAL, SICK, BLIND	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
4	FORGOT ABOUT IT,DIDN'T KNOW WHEN/WHERE VOTING WAS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
5	BUSY	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	COULDN'T DECIDE, DIDN'T KNOW CANDIDATES/PARTIES	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
7	NOT INTERESTED, JUST DIDN'T BOTHER	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%

# v245: WHY NOT VOTE-LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	RELIGIOUS REASONS	1	0.1%
9	DID NOT WANT TO VOTE	4	0.2%
10	FELT OWN PARTY WOULD WIN WITHOUT MY VOTE	0	
11	PROTEST, SPOILED VOTE	2	0.1%
12	WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE	3	0.2%
13	NEVER VOTE	1	0.1%
14	OUT OF TOWN ON BUSINESS,AT SCHOOL & OTHER SPECIFIC REASONS	10	0.6%
15	NOT ELIGIBLE	57	3.5%
16	DID NOT GET ENUMERATED	9	0.6%
17	LIVED IN ANOTHER PROVINCE AT THAT TIME	6	0.4%
88	CAN'T REMEMBER, NOT STATED	8	0.5%
99	N.A.	1136	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v246: PROVINCIAL PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1563 /-] [Invalid=1198 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "none" for Q72A or "did not note", or "not eligible" in Q73A.		
Pre-question	Q73A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q73D. IF YOU HAD VOTED IN THAT ELECTION, WHICH PARTY WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR.		
Notes	Q73A, Q73D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	93.6%
1	LIBERAL	53	3.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	25	1.6%
3	N.D.P.	14	0.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	3	0.2%
5	OTHER	0	
6	UNION NATIONALE	2	0.1%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	3	0.2%
8	D.K.	60	
9	N.A.	1138	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v247: MOST IMPORTANT- CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1150 /-] [Invalid=1611 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q74A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	352	30.6%

# v247: MOST IMPORTANT- CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	CANDIDATES	318	<div></div> 27.7%
3	THE PARTIES	480	<div></div> 41.7%
8	D.K.	1528	
9	N.A.	83	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v248: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT-CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1108 /-] [Invalid=1653 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q74B. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	439	<div></div> 39.6%
2	CANDIDATES	377	<div></div> 34.0%
3	THE PARTIES	292	<div></div> 26.4%
8	D.K.	1570	
9	N.A.	83	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v249: LEAST IMPORTANT-CANDIDATE, LEADER, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1097 /-] [Invalid=1664 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q74C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE LEAST IMPORTANT?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	324	<div></div> 29.5%
2	CANDIDATES	424	<div></div> 38.7%
3	THE PARTIES	349	<div></div> 31.8%
8	D.K.	1581	
9	N.A.	83	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v250: ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=639 /-] [Invalid=2122 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		

# v250: ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES			
Literal question		Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES OR HIS STAND ON ISSUES?	
Notes		Q74A, Q74D in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STAND ON ISSUES	304	<div></div> 47.6%
2	PERSONAL QUALITIES	335	<div></div> 52.4%
8	D.K.	1494	
9	N.A.	628	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			

# v251: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1763 /-] [Invalid=998 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?/ Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF HIS PERSONAL QUALITIES OR HIS STAND ON ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q74E. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74D, Q74E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	83.0%
1	INFLATION	10	0.6%
2	COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	12	0.7%
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING; MORTGAGE/INTEREST RATES	2	0.1%
5	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	5	0.3%
6	WAGES/INCOMES	4	0.2%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	9	0.5%
8	WAGES AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	0	
9	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.1%
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONABLE AGE	8	0.5%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	10	0.6%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS (INCLUDES DENTAL CA	5	0.3%
13	AUTO INSURANCE	3	0.2%
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	2	0.1%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	7	0.4%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BI	1	0.1%
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	3	0.2%
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	6	0.3%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	1	0.1%
20	OIL/ENERGY	7	0.4%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	6	0.3%
22	BILINGUALISM/FRENCH ISSUE/LANGUAGE	6	0.3%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	5	0.3%
24	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	5	0.3%
26	UNITY	3	0.2%
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	6	0.3%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES	8	0.5%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	3	0.2%
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	1	0.1%

# v251: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL; THOSE THAT NEED HELP; OVERALL WELL B	9	0.5%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	3	0.2%
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	4	0.2%
35	JAMES BAY	3	0.2%
36	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	1	0.1%
37	SOCIALISM	1	0.1%
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING; EVERYTHING IN GENERAL; GENERAL WELFARE O	2	0.1%
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE; GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	1	0.1%
40	GENERAL ISSUES	10	0.6%
41	GENERAL LIKE (INCLUDING OVERALL PLATFORM,POLICIES)/NO SPECIF	21	1.2%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	2	0.1%
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	2	0.1%
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	5	0.3%
45	THE CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
46	THE LEADER	5	0.3%
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	1	0.1%
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	2	0.1%
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	1	0.1%
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE : OTTAWA	0	
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	7	0.4%
53	PROPERTY TAXES	1	0.1%
54	GRANTS/AIDE	0	
88	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	74	4.2%
98	REFUSED	4	
99	N.A.	994	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v252: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1763 /-] [Invalid=998 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	SECOND RESPONSE?		
Notes	Q74E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1633	92.6%
1	INFLATION	3	0.2%
2	COST OF LIVING	1	0.1%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	3	0.2%

v252: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING; MORTGAGE/INTEREST RATES	0	
5	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	1	0.1%
6	WAGES/INCOMES	2	0.1%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	4	0.2%
8	WAGES AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	0	
9	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONABLE AGE	4	0.2%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	4	0.2%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS (INCLUDES DENTAL CA	4	0.2%
13	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	3	0.2%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	2	0.1%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BI	1	0.1%
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	1	0.1%
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	1	0.1%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	0	
20	OIL/ENERGY	4	0.2%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	2	0.1%
22	BILINGUALISM/FRENCH ISSUE/LANGUAGE	0	
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	1	0.1%
24	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	0	
26	UNITY	0	
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	1	0.1%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES	2	0.1%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	0	
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	0	
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL; THOSE THAT NEED HELP; OVERALL WELL B	2	0.1%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	1	0.1%
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	1	0.1%
35	JAMES BAY	0	
36	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
37	SOCIALISM	0	
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING; EVERYTHING IN GENERAL; GENERAL WELFARE O	0	
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE; GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	0	
40	GENERAL ISSUES	1	0.1%
41	GENERAL LIKE (INCLUDING OVERALL PLATFORM,POLICIES)/NO SPECIF	1	0.1%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	0	
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	0	

# v252: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	0	
45	THE CANDIDATE	0	
46	THE LEADER	0	
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	0	
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	0	
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	0	
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE : OTTAWA	1	0.1%
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	2	0.1%
53	PROPERTY TAXES	1	0.1%
54	GRANTS/AIDE	1	0.1%
88	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	74	4.2%
98	REFUSED	4	
99	N.A.	994	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v253: PARTY-APPROACH OR ISSUES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=461 /-] [Invalid=2300 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OT ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q74F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITION ON ISSUES	152	33.0%
2	GENERAL APPROACH	309	67.0%
8	D.K.	1482	
9	N.A.	818	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v254: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1614 /-] [Invalid=1147 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OT ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q74G. WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?		
Notes	Q74F, Q74G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	90.6%
1	INFLATION	5	0.3%
2	COST OF LIVING	3	0.2%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	5	0.3%

v254: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING; MORTGAGE/INTEREST RATES	2	0.1%
5	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	2	0.1%
6	WAGES/INCOMES	2	0.1%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	8	0.5%
8	WAGES AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	0	
9	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONABLE AGE	0	
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	5	0.3%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS (INCLUDES DENTAL CA	5	0.3%
13	AUTO INSURANCE	7	0.4%
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	3	0.2%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	6	0.4%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BIG	1	0.1%
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	5	0.3%
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	5	0.3%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	1	0.1%
20	OIL/ENERGY	7	0.4%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	1	0.1%
22	BILINGUALISM/FRENCH ISSUE/LANGUAGE	6	0.4%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	3	0.2%
24	FOR SEPARATISM	2	0.1%
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	0	
26	UNITY	1	0.1%
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	8	0.5%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES	2	0.1%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	0	
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	1	0.1%
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL; THOSE THAT NEED HELP; OVERALL WELL B	2	0.1%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	2	0.1%
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	0	
35	JAMES BAY	0	
36	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
37	SOCIALISM	0	
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING; EVERYTHING IN GENERAL; GENERAL WELFARE O	0	
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE; GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	0	
40	GENERAL ISSUES	5	0.3%
41	GENERAL LIKE (INCLUDING OVERALL PLATFORM,POLICIES)/NO SPECIF	7	0.4%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	3	0.2%
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	1	0.1%

# v254: WHICH ISSUES-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	2	0.1%
45	THE CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
46	THE LEADER	0	
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	1	0.1%
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.1%
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	1	0.1%
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	0	
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE : OTTAWA	2	0.1%
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.1%
53	PROPERTY TAXES	0	
54	GRANTS/AIDE	0	
88	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	26	1.6%
98	REFUSED	1	
99	N.A.	1146	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v255: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1614 /-] [Invalid=1147 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	SECOND RESPONSE		
Notes	Q74G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1541	95.5%
1	INFLATION	2	0.1%
2	COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	4	0.2%
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING; MORTGAGE/INTEREST RATES	0	
5	PRICES (IN GENERAL AND OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	1	0.1%
6	WAGES/INCOMES	1	0.1%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	1	0.1%
8	WAGES AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS/FREEZES	0	
9	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.1%
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONABLE AGE	4	0.2%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	1	0.1%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS (INCLUDES DENTAL CA	2	0.1%
13	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	1	0.1%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	6	0.4%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BIG	1	0.1%
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	2	0.1%

v255: WHICH ISSUES-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	0	
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	1	0.1%
20	OIL/ENERGY	0	
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	2	0.1%
22	BILINGUALISM/FRENCH ISSUE/LANGUAGE	3	0.2%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	0	
24	FOR SEPARATISM	0	
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
26	UNITY	0	
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	2	0.1%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES	0	
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	0	
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	0	
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL; THOSE THAT NEED HELP; OVERALL WELL B	3	0.2%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	0	
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	0	
35	JAMES BAY	0	
36	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
37	SOCIALISM	0	
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING; EVERYTHING IN GENERAL; GENERAL WELFARE O	0	
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE; GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	0	
40	GENERAL ISSUES	0	
41	GENERAL LIKE (INCLUDING OVERALL PLATFORM,POLICIES)/NO SPECIF	1	0.1%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	0	
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	1	0.1%
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	0	
45	THE CANDIDATE	0	
46	THE LEADER	0	
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	0	
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	2	0.1%
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	0	
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE : OTTAWA	0	
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	2	0.1%
53	PROPERTY TAXES	0	
54	GRANTS/AIDE	0	
88	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	26	1.6%
98	REFUSED	1	
99	N.A.	1146	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v256: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=244 /-] [Invalid=2517 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	I NOTICE THAT YOU VOTED FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY IN THE PROVINCIAL ELECTION THAN IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR VOTING FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES IN THE TWO ELECTIONS?
Notes	Q75 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO, NOT REALLY/NO REAL REASON	2	0.8%
1	I VOTE FOR THE MAN/DEPENDS ON THE MAN	7	2.9%
2	THE LEADERS (NO NAMES GIVEN)/LEADERSHIP	9	3.7%
3	PROV. P.C. LEADER (UNSPECIFIED LIKE OR DISLIKE	1	0.4%
4	LIKE PROV. P.C. LEADER/GOOD/HAS DONE WELL	1	0.4%
5	LIKE PROV. P. C. LEADER -- STAND ON ISSUES/PLATFORM/ POLICIES	1	0.4%
6	LIKE PROV. N.D.P. LEADER/GOOD/HAS DONE WELL	3	1.2%
7	LIKE PROV. LIBERAL LEADER/GAVE HIM ANOTHER CHANCE/WHAT HE CO	1	0.4%
8	DIDN'T LIKE PROV. P.C. LEADER/STAND ON ISSUE	2	0.8%
9	DISLIKED PROV. LIBERAL LEADER/WEAK	0	
10	DISLIKE STANFIELD/STANFIELD NO GOOD/NOT A GOOD LEADER	1	0.4%
11	DISAGREE WITH STANFIELD'S STAND ON ISSUES/ POLICIES	2	0.8%
12	LIKE STANFIELD/GOOD LEADER	4	1.6%
13	LIKE STANFIELD'S POSITION/STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES	0	
14	STANFIELD, P.C.'S (FED.) FAVOUR THE WEST/FARMERS	1	0.4%
15	LIKE TRUDEAU/GOOD MAN/GOOD LEADER	3	1.2%
16	LIKE TRUDEAU/HIS POSITION, STAND ON ISSUES/IDEAS	1	0.4%
17	DISLIKE TRUDEAU'S HANDLING OF CERTAIN ISSUES/ STAND ON CERT	1	0.4%
18	DISLIKE/NOT IMPRESSED WITH FED. NDP LEADER - LEWIS	0	
19	DISLIKE TRUDEAU/HIS WAYS	1	0.4%
20	LIKED CANDIDATE (PROV.)/VOTE FOR BEST CANDIDATE/ ONE WHO CA	16	6.6%
21	LIKED CANDIDATE (FED.)/VOTE FOR BEST CANDIDATE/ WHO CAN DO	6	2.5%
22	DISLIKED PROVINCIAL CANDIDATE FOR PARTY VOTED FOR FEDERALLY	0	
23	DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT FEDERAL CANDIDATE FOR PROV. PARTY	1	0.4%
24	CANDIDATES (UNSPECIFIED FED., PROV., AND/OR LIKE, DISLIKE)	12	4.9%
25	BECAUSE ISSUES ARE DIFFERENT/HAVE CHANGED	1	0.4%
26	VOTE FOR POLICIES/ISSUES I AGREE WITH/CONSIDER ALL PARTY ST	3	1.2%
27	SPECIFIC ISSUES (UNSPECIFIED FOR, AGAINST AND/OR PROVINCIAL,	7	2.9%

v256: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
28	LIKE CONSERVATIVE (PROV.) STAND ON ISSUES/ POLICIES	0	
29	LIKE LIBERAL (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/POLICIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
30	DISLIKED/DIDN'T AGREE WITH P.C. (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/THEI	0	
31	CONSERVATIVE/STANFIELD POLICIES/STAND ON ISSUES (UNSPECIFIE	0	
32	AGREE WITH/LIKE CONSERVATIVES (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/POLICI	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
33	NDP NO GOOD FOR FED. GOV'T/NOT CAPABLE OF GOOD JOB ON FED.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
34	LIBERALS (FED.) A STRONGER/BETTER PARTY/HAVE PERFORMED WELL	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
35	S.C. (PROV.) HAVE PERFORMED WELL/NO COMPLAINTS WITH THEM/VO	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
36	NDP GOOD FOR THIS PROVINCE/HAVE DONE A LOT FOR THIS PROVINC	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
37	P.C.'S (PROV.) HAVE PERFORMED WELL/GOOD PARTY FOR THIS PROV	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
38	FEDERAL PARTY NOT STRONG, NONEXISTENT IN THIS PROVINCE/HAD	9	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
39	S.C. HAD NO CHANCE FEDERALLY/WOULD BE A LOST VOTE/ INEFFECT	17	<div><div></div></div> 7.0%
40	NDP HAD NO CHANCE FEDERALLY	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
41	DON'T WANT NDP TO FROM FEDERAL GOV'T/GOOD PROVINCIALY, HAV	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
42	PROVINCIAL PARTY IS NOT A FEDERAL PARTY	9	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
43	NO CANDIDATE/COULDN'T VOTE THE SAME/FEDERAL PARTY NOT IN PR	0	
44	PARTY NOT THE SAME PROVINCIALY & FEDERALLY/NO CONNECTION B	0	
45	SAME PARTY SHOULD NOT CONTROL BOTH LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT/WAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
46	FEDERAL & PROVINCAIL POLITICS NOT REALLY RELATED -- EACH SE	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
47	WANTED TO GET RID OF OLD GOV'T (PROV.)/GIVE ANOTHER PARTY A	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
48	DISLIKE LIBERALS (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/PLATFORMS, POLICIES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
49	JUST NEEDED A CHANGE/TIME FOR A CHANGE/TRY SOMEONE NEW	11	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
50	WANTED/BETTER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT (FED.)	9	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
51	VAGUE ANSWERS: UNABLE TO DETERMINE ANY REAL REASON FROM RESP	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
52	PROTEST VOTE -- VOTED AGAINST OTHER PARTIES (PROV.)	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
53	FED UP WITH LIBERALS (FED.)/WEREN'T DOING A GOOD JOB/NOT DO	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
54	LIKED NDP (FED.)/OFFERED MORE/PLATFORM/GIVE THEM A CHANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
55	DISLIKED NDP (FED.)/FED UP WITH THEM/NOT GOOD ENOUGH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%

v256: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
56	DISLIKED CANDIDATE (FED.) OF PARTY VOTED FOR PROVINCIALY/N	2	0.8%
57	LIKED NDP (PROV.) PLATFORMS/STAND ON ISSUES	0	
58	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS (FOLLOW HUSBAND'S VOTE, PARENTS VO	1	0.4%
59	VOTED FOR PARTY MOST LIKELY/THOUGHT HAD BEST CHANCE OF DEFE	0	
60	THE MEN/PEOPLE ARE DIFFERENT	1	0.4%
61	LIKE CONS. (FED.)/WOULD DO A GOOD JOB/BETTER PARTY	4	1.6%
62	DISLIKED CONS. (FED.)/WOULDN'T BE GOOD/DIDN'T WANT THEM IN	0	
63	DIDN'T WANT TOO STRONG/LARGE A MAJORITY (FED.)	0	
64	WANTED A MAJORITY (PROV.)	0	
65	PROTEST VOTE - VOTED AGAINST OTHER PARTIES (FED.)	2	0.8%
66	LIKE LIB. (PROV.)/GOOD PARTY/THEIR IDEAS,POLICIES	1	0.4%
67	DISLIKE P.C.'S (PROV.)/DISAGREE WITH THEIR ACTIONS	1	0.4%
68	LIKE LIBERAL LEADER (PROV.)	0	
69	DIDN'T WANT TOO STRONG/LARGE A MAJORITY (PROV.)/ WANTED A G	0	
70	ISSUES/PLATFORMS (UNSPECIFIED)	10	4.1%
71	NDP (PROV.) A GOOD PARTY/LIKE WHAT THEY'VE DONE ELSEWHERE	1	0.4%
72	DISLIKE/DISAGREE WITH LIB. (PROV.) STAND ON ISSUE/ PLATFORM/A	2	0.8%
73	LIKE UNION NATIONALE/GOOD PARTY/HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THEM	0	
74	LIKE S.C. (PROV.); STRONG PARTY	2	0.8%
75	DISLIKE NDP (PROV.); WANTED TO KEEP THEM OUT	0	
76	PROV. PARTY VOTED FOR SECOND CHOICE/BEST ALTERNATIVE	0	
77	VOTED FOR LEADER PROVINCIALY	2	0.8%
78	VOTED FOR PARTY/VOTED FOR BEST PARTY	2	0.8%
79	LIKE IDEAS/POLICIES/PLATFORMS OF PARTI QUEBECOIS	3	1.2%
80	WANTED NEW/STRONG OPPOSITION TO PARTY IN POWER (PROV.)/DIDN	2	0.8%
81	LIKE P.C.'S (PROV.)/GENERAL LIKE/GOOD PARTY/ OFFERED MOST	0	
82	VOTED FOR THE MAN - FEDERALLY	0	
83	LIKE S.C. (PROV.)/THEIR PLATFORMS/POLICIES	0	
84	WANTED MINORITY GOV'T	0	
85	DISLIKE PARTY (UNSPECIFIED -- FED. OR PROV.)/THEIR PLATFORM/	1	0.4%
86	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
87	DISLIKE S.C. (FED.)	0	
88	NOT STATED, DON'T KNOW/CAN'T REMEMBER/NO OPINION	11	4.5%
89	NO CANDIDATE FOR PROV. PARTY IN FED. ELECTION	0	
98	REFUSED	1463	

# v256: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
99	N.A.	1054	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v257: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=244 /-] [Invalid=2517 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	I NOTICE THAT YOU VOTED FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY IN THE PROVINCIAL ELECTION THAN IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR VOTING FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES IN THE TWO ELECTIONS?		
Literal question	ANY OTHER REASONS?		
Notes	Q75 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	124	50.8%
1	I VOTE FOR THE MAN/DEPENDS ON THE MAN	1	0.4%
2	THE LEADERS (NO NAMES GIVEN)/LEADERSHIP	0	
3	PROV. P.C. LEADER (UNSPECIFIED LIKE OR DISLIKE	0	
4	LIKE PROV. P.C. LEADER/GOOD/HAS DONE WELL	2	0.8%
5	LIKE PROV. P. C. LEADER -- STAND ON ISSUES/PLATFORM/ POLICIES	1	0.4%
6	LIKE PROV. N.D.P. LEADER/GOOD/HAS DONE WELL	0	
7	LIKE PROV. LIBERAL LEADER/GAVE HIM ANOTHER CHANCE/WHAT HE CO	2	0.8%
8	DIDN'T LIKE PROV. P.C. LEADER/STAND ON ISSUE	2	0.8%
9	DISLIKED PROV. LIBERAL LEADER/WEAK	3	1.2%
10	DISLIKE STANFIELD/STANFIELD NO GOOD/NOT A GOOD LEADER	2	0.8%
11	DISAGREE WITH STANFIELD'S STAND ON ISSUES/ POLICIES	1	0.4%
12	LIKE STANFIELD/GOOD LEADER	0	
13	LIKE STANFIELD'S POSITION/STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES	0	
14	STANFIELD, P.C.'S (FED.) FAVOUR THE WEST/FARMERS	1	0.4%
15	LIKE TRUDEAU/GOOD MAN/GOOD LEADER	2	0.8%
16	LIKE TRUDEAU/HIS POSITION, STAND ON ISSUES/IDEAS	2	0.8%
17	DISLIKE TRUDEAU'S HANDLING OF CERTAIN ISSUES/ STAND ON CERT	0	
18	DISLIKE/NOT IMPRESSED WITH FED. NDP LEADER - LEWIS	2	0.8%
19	DISLIKE TRUDEAU/HIS WAYS	0	
20	LIKED CANDIDATE (PROV.)/VOTE FOR BEST CANDIDATE/ ONE WHO CA	1	0.4%
21	LIKED CANDIDATE (FED.)/VOTE FOR BEST CANDIDATE/ WHO CAN DO	12	4.9%
22	DISLIKED PROVINCIAL CANDIDATE FOR PARTY VOTED FOR FEDERALLY	3	1.2%
23	DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT FEDERAL CANDIDATE FOR PROV. PARTY	0	
24	CANDIDATES (UNSPECIFIED FED., PROV., AND/OR LIKE, DISLIKE)	0	

v257: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	BECAUSE ISSUES ARE DIFFERENT/HAVE CHANGED	2	0.8%
26	VOTE FOR POLICIES/ISSUES I AGREE WITH/CONSIDER ALL PARTY ST	0	
27	SPECIFIC ISSUES (UNSPECIFIED FOR, AGAINST AND/OR PROVINCIAL,	1	0.4%
28	LIKE CONSERVATIVE (PROV.) STAND ON ISSUES/ POLICIES	0	
29	LIKE LIBERAL (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/POLICIES	2	0.8%
30	DISLIKED/DIDN'T AGREE WITH P.C. (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/THEI	0	
31	CONSERVATIVE/STANFIELD POLICIES/STAND ON ISSUES (UNSPECIFIE	0	
32	AGREE WITH/LIKE CONSERVATIVES (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/POLICI	2	0.8%
33	NDP NO GOOD FOR FED. GOV'T/NOT CAPABLE OF GOOD JOB ON FED.	1	0.4%
34	LIBERALS (FED.) A STRONGER/BETTER PARTY/HAVE PERFORMED WELL	2	0.8%
35	S.C. (PROV.) HAVE PERFORMED WELL/NO COMPLAINTS WITH THEM/WO	1	0.4%
36	NDP GOOD FOR THIS PROVINCE/HAVE DONE A LOT FOR THIS PROVINC	4	1.6%
37	P.C.'S (PROV.) HAVE PERFORMED WELL/GOOD PARTY FOR THIS PROV	1	0.4%
38	FEDERAL PARTY NOT STRONG, NONEXISTENT IN THIS PROVINCE/HAD	3	1.2%
39	S.C. HAD NO CHANCE FEDERALLY/WOULD BE A LOST VOTE/ INEFFECT	2	0.8%
40	NDP HAD NO CHANCE FEDERALLY	3	1.2%
41	DON'T WANT NDP TO FROM FEDERAL GOV'T/GOOD PROVINCIALLY, HAV	1	0.4%
42	PROVINCIAL PARTY IS NOT A FEDERAL PARTY	0	
43	NO CANDIDATE/COULDN'T VOTE THE SAME/FEDERAL PARTY NOT IN PR	0	
44	PARTY NOT THE SAME PROVINCIALLY & FEDERALLY/NO CONNECTION B	0	
45	SAME PARTY SHOULD NOT CONTROL BOTH LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT/WAN	0	
46	FEDERAL & PROVINCIAL POLITICS NOT REALLY RELATED -- EACH SE	1	0.4%
47	WANTED TO GET RID OF OLD GOV'T (PROV.)/GIVE ANOTHER PARTY A	3	1.2%
48	DISLIKE LIBERALS (FED.) STAND ON ISSUES/PLATFORMS, POLICIES	1	0.4%
49	JUST NEEDED A CHANGE/TIME FOR A CHANGE/TRY SOMEONE NEW	2	0.8%
50	WANTED/BETTER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT (FED.)	4	1.6%
51	VAGUE ANSWERS: UNABLE TO DETERMINE ANY REAL REASON FROM RESP	0	
52	PROTEST VOTE -- VOTED AGAINST OTHER PARTIES (PROV.)	0	

v257: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	FED UP WITH LIBERALS (FED.)/WEREN'T DOING A GOOD JOB/NOT DO	2	0.8%
54	LIKED NDP (FED.)/OFFERED MORE/PLATFORM/GIVE THEM A CHANCE	2	0.8%
55	DISLIKED NDP (FED.)/FED UP WITH THEM/NOT GOOD ENOUGH	0	
56	DISLIKED CANDIDATE (FED.) OF PARTY VOTED FOR PROVINCIALY/N	0	
57	LIKED NDP (PROV.) PLATFORMS/STAND ON ISSUES	1	0.4%
58	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS (FOLLOW HUSBAND'S VOTE, PARENTS VO	0	
59	VOTED FOR PARTY MOST LIKELY/THOUGHT HAD BEST CHANCE OF DEFE	0	
60	THE MEN/PEOPLE ARE DIFFERENT	0	
61	LIKE CONS. (FED.)/WOULD DO A GOOD JOB/BETTER PARTY	5	2.0%
62	DISLIKED CONS. (FED.)/WOULDN'T BE GOOD/DIDN'T WANT THEM IN	2	0.8%
63	DIDN'T WANT TOO STRONG/LARGE A MAJORITY (FED.)	0	
64	WANTED A MAJORITY (PROV.)	2	0.8%
65	PROTEST VOTE - VOTED AGAINST OTHER PARTIES (FED.)	0	
66	LIKE LIB. (PROV.)/GOOD PARTY/THEIR IDEAS,POLICIES	3	1.2%
67	DISLIKE P.C.'S (PROV.)/DISAGREE WITH THEIR ACTIONS	0	
68	LIKE LIBERAL LEADER (PROV.)	2	0.8%
69	DIDN'T WANT TOO STRONG/LARGE A MAJORITY (PROV.)/WANTED A G	0	
70	ISSUES/PLATFORMS (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.8%
71	NDP (PROV.) A GOOD PARTY/LIKE WHAT THEY'VE DONE ELSEWHERE	0	
72	DISLIKE/DISAGREE WITH LIB. (PROV.) STAND ON ISSUE/PLATFORM/A	0	
73	LIKE UNION NATIONALE/GOOD PARTY/HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THEM	0	
74	LIKE S.C. (PROV.); STRONG PARTY	1	0.4%
75	DISLIKE NDP (PROV.); WANTED TO KEEP THEM OUT	0	
76	PROV. PARTY VOTED FOR SECOND CHOICE/BEST ALTERNATIVE	2	0.8%
77	VOTED FOR LEADER PROVINCIALY	1	0.4%
78	VOTED FOR PARTY/VOTED FOR BEST PARTY	1	0.4%
79	LIKE IDEAS/POLICIES/PLATFORMS OF PARTI QUEBECOIS	2	0.8%
80	WANTED NEW/STRONG OPPOSITION TO PARTY IN POWER (PROV.)/DIDN	3	1.2%
81	LIKE P.C.'S (PROV.)/GENERAL LIKE/GOOD PARTY/OFFERED MOST	2	0.8%
82	VOTED FOR THE MAN - FEDERALLY	1	0.4%
83	LIKE S.C. (PROV.)/THEIR PLATFORMS/POLICIES	2	0.8%
84	WANTED MINORITY GOV'T	0	
85	DISLIKE PARTY (UNSPECIFIED -- FED. OR PROV.)/THEIR PLATFORM/	0	
86	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	

# v257: WHY VOTED DIFFERENT PROVINCIAL-FEDERAL 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	DISLIKE S.C. (FED.)	0	
88	NOT STATED, DON'T KNOW/CAN'T REMEMBER/NO OPINION	11	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
89	NO CANDIDATE FOR PROV. PARTY IN FED. ELECTION	0	
98	REFUSED	1463	
99	N.A.	1054	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v258: FATHER LIVING OR YEAR DIED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	IS YOUR FATHER LIVING?		
Post-question	(IF NO) IN WHAT YEAR DID HE DIE?		
Notes	Q80A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	1919 OR EARLIER	17	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
2	1920'S	8	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
3	1930'S	27	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%
4	1940'S	43	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
5	1950'S	97	<div><div></div></div> 29.8%
6	1960'S	80	<div><div></div></div> 24.6%
7	1970'S	53	<div><div></div></div> 16.3%
8	A LONG TIME AGO	0	
0	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	2187	
9	N.A. OR FATHER LIVING	249	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v259: FATHER AGE OR AGE DIED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=577 /-] [Invalid=2184 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS YOUR FATHER LIVING? (IF NO) IN WHAT YEAR DID HE DIE? (MALES ONLY)		
Literal question	HOW OLD IS HE OR WAS HE THEN?		
Notes	Q80A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YOUNGER THAN 20	0	
2	IN HIS 20'S	0	
3	IN HIS 30'S	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
4	IN HIS 40'S	0	
5	IN HIS 50'S	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	IN HIS 60'S	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
7	IN HIS 70'S	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	IN HIS 80'S	0	
9	IN HIS 90'S	0	

v259: FATHER AGE OR AGE DIED

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
20	21 YEARS OR YOUNGER	0	
21	21 YEARS	1	0.2%
22	22 YEARS	0	
23	23 YEARS	0	
24	24 YEARS	0	
25	25 YEARS	0	
26	26 YEARS	0	
27	27 YEARS	1	0.2%
28	28 YEARS	0	
29	29 YEARS	2	0.3%
30	30 YEARS	0	
31	31 YEARS	0	
32	32 YEARS	3	0.5%
33	33 YEARS	1	0.2%
34	34 YEARS	0	
35	35 YEARS	0	
36	36 YEARS	0	
37	37 YEARS	2	0.3%
38	38 YEARS	0	
39	39 YEARS	6	1.0%
40	40 YEARS	5	0.9%
41	41 YEARS	3	0.5%
42	42 YEARS	3	0.5%
43	43 YEARS	1	0.2%
44	44 YEARS	3	0.5%
45	45 YEARS	10	1.7%
46	46 YEARS	10	1.7%
47	47 YEARS	7	1.2%
48	48 YEARS	5	0.9%
49	49 YEARS	7	1.2%
50	50 YEARS	12	2.1%
51	51 YEARS	10	1.7%
52	52 YEARS	10	1.7%
53	53 YEARS	11	1.9%
54	54 YEARS	13	2.3%
55	55 YEARS	9	1.6%
56	56 YEARS	14	2.4%
57	57 YEARS	15	2.6%
58	58 YEARS	17	2.9%
59	59 YEARS	15	2.6%
60	60 YEARS	14	2.4%
61	61 YEARS	15	2.6%
62	62 YEARS	15	2.6%
63	63 YEARS	19	3.3%
64	64 YEARS	10	1.7%

v259: FATHER AGE OR AGE DIED

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
65	65 YEARS	17	2.9%
66	66 YEARS	7	1.2%
67	67 YEARS	24	4.2%
68	68 YEARS	13	2.3%
69	69 YEARS	3	0.5%
70	70 YEARS	19	3.3%
71	71 YEARS	10	1.7%
72	72 YEARS	16	2.8%
73	73 YEARS	18	3.1%
74	74 YEARS	14	2.4%
75	75 YEARS	15	2.6%
76	76 YEARS	12	2.1%
77	77 YEARS	10	1.7%
78	78 YEARS	19	3.3%
79	79 YEARS	14	2.4%
80	80 YEARS	12	2.1%
81	81 YEARS	4	0.7%
82	82 YEARS	8	1.4%
83	83 YEARS	14	2.4%
84	84 YEARS	14	2.4%
85	85 YEARS	8	1.4%
86	86 YEARS	5	0.9%
87	87 YEARS	2	0.3%
88	88 YEARS	3	0.5%
89	89 YEARS	3	0.5%
90	90 YEARS	6	1.0%
91	91 YEARS	2	0.3%
92	92 YEARS	1	0.2%
93	93 YEARS	2	0.3%
94	94 YEARS	1	0.2%
95	95 YEARS	1	0.2%
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	1	0.2%
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	99 YEARS OR OLDER	0	
0	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	2184	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v260: FATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=586 /-] [Invalid=2175 /-]
Universe	Asked only to males
Literal question	WHAT IS (WAS) YOUR FATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION?
Notes	Q80B in the documentation.

v260: FATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STUDENT	0	
2	UNEMPLOYED	1	0.2%
3	RETIRED	1	0.2%
14	BLISHEN SCORE OF 14	0	
15	BLISHEN SCORE OF 15	0	
16	BLISHEN SCORE OF 16	0	
17	BLISHEN SCORE OF 17	0	
18	BLISHEN SCORE OF 18	15	2.6%
19	BLISHEN SCORE OF 19	5	0.9%
20	BLISHEN SCORE OF 20	4	0.7%
21	BLISHEN SCORE OF 21	1	0.2%
22	BLISHEN SCORE OF 22	6	1.0%
23	BLISHEN SCORE OF 23	180	30.7%
24	BLISHEN SCORE OF 24	12	2.0%
25	BLISHEN SCORE OF 25	10	1.7%
26	BLISHEN SCORE OF 26	14	2.4%
27	BLISHEN SCORE OF 27	13	2.2%
28	BLISHEN SCORE OF 28	46	7.8%
29	BLISHEN SCORE OF 29	24	4.1%
30	BLISHEN SCORE OF 30	3	0.5%
31	BLISHEN SCORE OF 31	8	1.4%
32	BLISHEN SCORE OF 32	9	1.5%
33	BLISHEN SCORE OF 33	12	2.0%
34	BLISHEN SCORE OF 34	13	2.2%
35	BLISHEN SCORE OF 35	7	1.2%
36	BLISHEN SCORE OF 36	1	0.2%
37	BLISHEN SCORE OF 37	16	2.7%
38	BLISHEN SCORE OF 38	6	1.0%
39	BLISHEN SCORE OF 39	4	0.7%
40	BLISHEN SCORE OF 40	4	0.7%
41	BLISHEN SCORE OF 41	20	3.4%
42	BLISHEN SCORE OF 42	9	1.5%
43	BLISHEN SCORE OF 43	19	3.2%
44	BLISHEN SCORE OF 44	6	1.0%
45	BLISHEN SCORE OF 45	8	1.4%
46	BLISHEN SCORE OF 46	11	1.9%
47	BLISHEN SCORE OF 47	14	2.4%
48	BLISHEN SCORE OF 48	12	2.0%
49	BLISHEN SCORE OF 49	4	0.7%
50	BLISHEN SCORE OF 50	11	1.9%
51	BLISHEN SCORE OF 51	5	0.9%
52	BLISHEN SCORE OF 52	1	0.2%
53	BLISHEN SCORE OF 53	0	
54	BLISHEN SCORE OF 54	4	0.7%
55	BLISHEN SCORE OF 55	3	0.5%

# v260: FATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
56	BLISHEN SCORE OF 56	3	0.5%
57	BLISHEN SCORE OF 57	4	0.7%
58	BLISHEN SCORE OF 58	1	0.2%
59	BLISHEN SCORE OF 59	2	0.3%
60	BLISHEN SCORE OF 60	4	0.7%
61	BLISHEN SCORE OF 61	2	0.3%
62	BLISHEN SCORE OF 62	3	0.5%
63	BLISHEN SCORE OF 63	0	
64	BLISHEN SCORE OF 64	0	
65	BLISHEN SCORE OF 65	3	0.5%
66	BLISHEN SCORE OF 66	1	0.2%
67	BLISHEN SCORE OF 67	2	0.3%
68	BLISHEN SCORE OF 68	8	1.4%
69	BLISHEN SCORE OF 69	0	
70	BLISHEN SCORE OF 70	0	
71	BLISHEN SCORE OF 71	2	0.3%
72	BLISHEN SCORE OF 72	1	0.2%
73	BLISHEN SCORE OF 73	1	0.2%
74	BLISHEN SCORE OF 74	6	1.0%
75	BLISHEN SCORE OF 75	1	0.2%
0	DON'T KNOW/CAN'T REMEMBER	1475	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v261: FATHER RESIDENCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=586 /-] [Invalid=2175 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males		
Literal question	DOES (DID) YOUR FATHER LIVE IN A CITY, OR IN A TOWN OR VILLAGE, OR IN THE COUNTRY OR ON A FARM?		
Notes	Q80C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CITY	198	33.8%
2	TOWN OR VILLAGE	172	29.4%
3	COUNTRY (NON-FARM)	45	7.7%
4	FARM	171	29.2%
8	D.K.	1475	
9	N.A.	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v262: FATHER OWN FARM			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=198 /-] [Invalid=2563 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	DOES (DID) YOUR FATHER OWN HIS OWN FARM OR DOES (DID) HE WORK ON SOMEONE ELSE'S FARM?		

# v262: FATHER OWN FARM			
Notes		Q80D in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OWN FARM	186	<div><div></div></div> 93.9%
2	WORKED ON FARM	12	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
8	D.K.	1464	
9	N.A.	1099	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v263: FATHER BORN IN CANADA			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=591 /-] [Invalid=2170 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to males.	
Literal question		WAS YOUR FATHER BORN IN CANADA?	
Notes		Q80E in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	404	<div><div></div></div> 68.4%
2	NO	187	<div><div></div></div> 31.6%
8	D.K.	1470	
9	N.A.	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v264: FATHER EDUCATION			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2061 /-] [Invalid=700 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to males.	
Literal question		WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL THAT YOUR FATHER COMPLETED?	
Notes		Q80F in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GRADE 1; 1 YEAR	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
2	GRADE 2; 2 YEARS	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	GRADE 3; 3 YEARS	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
4	GRADE 4; 4 YEARS	35	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
5	GRADE 5; 5 YEARS	33	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
6	GRADE 6; 6 YEARS	35	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
7	GRADE 7; 7 YEARS	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
8	GRADE 8; 8 YEARS	78	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
9	GRADE 9; 9 YEARS	26	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
10	GRADE 10; 10 YEARS	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
11	GRADE 11; 11 YEARS	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
12	GRADE 12; 12 YEARS	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
13	GRADE 13; 13 YEARS	20	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
14	FIRST YEAR UNIVERSITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
15	SECOND YEAR UNIVERSITY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
16	THIRD YEAR UNIVERSITY	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
17	FOURTH YEAR UNIVERSITY	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

# v264: FATHER EDUCATION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	FIVE OR MORE YEARS UNIVERSITY (INCLUDE MEDICAL DOCTORS, DEN	5	0.2%
19	FIVE OR MORE YEARS UNIVERSITY (EDUCATION, THEOLOGY)	2	0.1%
20	M.A.	0	
21	PH. D.	1	0.0%
22	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS TEACHER'S COLLEGE/BREVET. A.B. ETC.	1	0.0%
23	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS NURSING (R.N.)	0	
24	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS COMMERCIAL/TECHNICAL COURSES/ EXTENSION	5	0.2%
25	SOME HIGH SCHOOL PLUS COMMERCIAL/TECHNICAL COURSES/EXTENSION	0	
26	UNIVERSITY PLUS TEACHER'S COLLEGE, NURSING(R.N.)	0	
27	GRADE 8/GRADE SCHOOL PLUS BUSINESS COLLEGE/ TECHNICAL COURSE	4	0.2%
28	NO FORMAL SCHOOLING	22	1.1%
88	DON'T KNOW/CAN'T REMEMBER/NO ANSWER	1634	79.3%
99	N.A.	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v265: GRANDFATHER LIVING OR YEAR DIED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=308 /-] [Invalid=2453 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	IS YOUR GRANDFATHER ON YOUR FATHER'S SIDE LIVING?		
Post-question	(IF NO) IN WHAT YEAR DID HE DIE?		
Notes	Q81A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	1919 OR EARLIER	43	14.0%
2	1920'S	41	13.3%
3	1930'S	51	16.6%
4	1940'S	51	16.6%
5	1950'S	49	15.9%
6	1960'S	43	14.0%
7	1970'S	23	7.5%
8	A LONG TIME AGO	7	2.3%
0	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	1729	
9	N.A. OR GRANDFATHER LIVING	724	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v266: GRANDFATHER AGE OR AGE DIED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=354 /-] [Invalid=2407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Pre-question	Q81A. IS YOUR GRANDFATHER ON YOUR FATHER'S SIDE LIVING? IN WHAT YEAR DID HE DIE?		
Literal question	HOW OLD IS HE OR WAS HE THEN?		

v266: GRANDFATHER AGE OR AGE DIED

Notes

Q81A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YOUNGER THAN 20	0	
2	IN HIS 20'S	1	0.3%
3	IN HIS 30'S	0	
4	IN HIS 40'S	1	0.3%
5	IN HIS 50'S	5	1.4%
6	IN HIS 60'S	7	2.0%
7	IN HIS 70'S	15	4.2%
8	IN HIS 80'S	10	2.8%
9	IN HIS 90'S OR OLDER	1	0.3%
20	20 YEARS OR YOUNGER	0	
21	21 YEARS	0	
22	22 YEARS	0	
23	23 YEARS	0	
24	24 YEARS	1	0.3%
25	25 YEARS	0	
26	26 YEARS	0	
27	27 YEARS	0	
28	28 YEARS	0	
29	29 YEARS	1	0.3%
30	30 YEARS	0	
31	31 YEARS	0	
32	32 YEARS	0	
33	33 YEARS	1	0.3%
34	34 YEARS	0	
35	35 YEARS	0	
36	36 YEARS	0	
37	37 YEARS	0	
38	38 YEARS	0	
39	39 YEARS	2	0.6%
40	40 YEARS	1	0.3%
41	41 YEARS	0	
42	42 YEARS	1	0.3%
43	43 YEARS	0	
44	44 YEARS	1	0.3%
45	45 YEARS	1	0.3%
46	46 YEARS	1	0.3%
47	47 YEARS	3	0.8%
48	48 YEARS	2	0.6%
49	49 YEARS	3	0.8%
50	50 YEARS	5	1.4%
51	51 YEARS	1	0.3%
52	52 YEARS	3	0.8%
53	53 YEARS	2	0.6%
54	54 YEARS	0	

v266: GRANDFATHER AGE OR AGE DIED

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
55	55 YEARS	5	1.4%
56	56 YEARS	4	1.1%
57	57 YEARS	1	0.3%
58	58 YEARS	4	1.1%
59	59 YEARS	0	
60	60 YEARS	11	3.1%
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	2	0.6%
63	63 YEARS	2	0.6%
64	64 YEARS	1	0.3%
65	65 YEARS	7	2.0%
66	66 YEARS	5	1.4%
67	67 YEARS	5	1.4%
68	68 YEARS	11	3.1%
69	69 YEARS	7	2.0%
70	70 YEARS	21	5.9%
71	71 YEARS	6	1.7%
72	72 YEARS	12	3.4%
73	73 YEARS	4	1.1%
74	74 YEARS	3	0.8%
75	75 YEARS	20	5.6%
76	76 YEARS	7	2.0%
77	77 YEARS	3	0.8%
78	78 YEARS	9	2.5%
79	79 YEARS	8	2.3%
80	80 YEARS	18	5.1%
81	81 YEARS	9	2.5%
82	82 YEARS	14	4.0%
83	83 YEARS	11	3.1%
84	84 YEARS	15	4.2%
85	85 YEARS	13	3.7%
86	86 YEARS	10	2.8%
87	87 YEARS	6	1.7%
88	88 YEARS	5	1.4%
89	89 YEARS	3	0.8%
90	90 YEARS	4	1.1%
91	91 YEARS	2	0.6%
92	92 YEARS	4	1.1%
93	93 YEARS	4	1.1%
94	94 YEARS	4	1.1%
95	95 YEARS	0	
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	2	0.6%
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	99 YEARS OR OLDER	3	0.8%

# v266: GRANDFATHER AGE OR AGE DIED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	2407	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v267: GRANDFATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=484 /-] [Invalid=2277 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	WHAT IS(WAS) YOUR GRANDFATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION?		
Notes	Q81B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STUDENT	0	
2	UNEMPLOYED	2	0.4%
3	RETIRED	3	0.6%
14	BLISHEN SCORE OF 14	0	
15	BLISHEN SCORE OF 15	0	
16	BLISHEN SCORE OF 16	0	
17	BLISHEN SCORE OF 17	0	
18	BLISHEN SCORE OF 18	15	3.1%
19	BLISHEN SCORE OF 19	8	1.7%
20	BLISHEN SCORE OF 20	5	1.0%
21	BLISHEN SCORE OF 21	1	0.2%
22	BLISHEN SCORE OF 22	5	1.0%
23	BLISHEN SCORE OF 23	244	50.4%
24	BLISHEN SCORE OF 24	16	3.3%
25	BLISHEN SCORE OF 25	6	1.2%
26	BLISHEN SCORE OF 26	3	0.6%
27	BLISHEN SCORE OF 27	7	1.4%
28	BLISHEN SCORE OF 28	24	5.0%
29	BLISHEN SCORE OF 29	14	2.9%
30	BLISHEN SCORE OF 30	1	0.2%
31	BLISHEN SCORE OF 31	4	0.8%
32	BLISHEN SCORE OF 32	2	0.4%
33	BLISHEN SCORE OF 33	12	2.5%
34	BLISHEN SCORE OF 34	6	1.2%
35	BLISHEN SCORE OF 35	5	1.0%
36	BLISHEN SCORE OF 36	0	
37	BLISHEN SCORE OF 37	6	1.2%
38	BLISHEN SCORE OF 38	1	0.2%
39	BLISHEN SCORE OF 39	7	1.4%
40	BLISHEN SCORE OF 40	3	0.6%
41	BLISHEN SCORE OF 41	5	1.0%
42	BLISHEN SCORE OF 42	2	0.4%
43	BLISHEN SCORE OF 43	6	1.2%
44	BLISHEN SCORE OF 44	2	0.4%
45	BLISHEN SCORE OF 45	4	0.8%

v267: GRANDFATHER OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	BLISHEN SCORE OF 46	5	1.0%
47	BLISHEN SCORE OF 47	11	2.3%
48	BLISHEN SCORE OF 48	4	0.8%
49	BLISHEN SCORE OF 49	2	0.4%
50	BLISHEN SCORE OF 50	5	1.0%
51	BLISHEN SCORE OF 51	2	0.4%
52	BLISHEN SCORE OF 52	1	0.2%
53	BLISHEN SCORE OF 53	1	0.2%
54	BLISHEN SCORE OF 54	1	0.2%
55	BLISHEN SCORE OF 55	4	0.8%
56	BLISHEN SCORE OF 56	1	0.2%
57	BLISHEN SCORE OF 57	1	0.2%
58	BLISHEN SCORE OF 58	1	0.2%
59	BLISHEN SCORE OF 59	3	0.6%
60	BLISHEN SCORE OF 60	6	1.2%
61	BLISHEN SCORE OF 61	3	0.6%
62	BLISHEN SCORE OF 62	0	
63	BLISHEN SCORE OF 63	0	
64	BLISHEN SCORE OF 64	0	
65	BLISHEN SCORE OF 65	5	1.0%
66	BLISHEN SCORE OF 66	0	
67	BLISHEN SCORE OF 67	2	0.4%
68	BLISHEN SCORE OF 68	3	0.6%
69	BLISHEN SCORE OF 69	0	
70	BLISHEN SCORE OF 70	0	
71	BLISHEN SCORE OF 71	1	0.2%
72	BLISHEN SCORE OF 72	1	0.2%
73	BLISHEN SCORE OF 73	0	
74	BLISHEN SCORE OF 74	1	0.2%
75	BLISHEN SCORE OF 75	1	0.2%
0	DON'T KNOW/CAN'T REMEMBER	1577	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	700	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v268: GRANDFATHER RESIDENCE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=533 /-] [Invalid=2228 /-]
Universe	Asked only to males.
Literal question	DOES (DID) YOUR GRANDFATHER LIVE IN A CITY, OR IN A TOWN OR VILLAGE, OR IN THE COUNTRY OR ON A FARM?
Notes	Q81C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CITY	108	20.3%
2	TOWN OR VILLAGE	144	27.0%
3	COUNTRY (NON-FARM)	40	7.5%

# v268: GRANDFATHER RESIDENCE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	FARM	241	45.2%
8	D.K.	1528	
9	N.A.	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v269: GRANDFATHER OWN FARM			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=247 /-] [Invalid=2514 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	DOES (DID) YOUR GRANDFATHER OWN HIS FARM OR DOES (DID) HE WORK ON SOMEONE ELSE'S FARM?		
Notes	Q81D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OWN FARM	241	97.6%
2	WORKED ON FARM	6	2.4%
8	D.K.	1478	
9	N.A.	1036	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v270: GRANDFATHER BORN IN CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=552 /-] [Invalid=2209 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	WAS YOUR GRANDFATHER ON YOUR FATHER'S SIDE BORN IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q81E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	297	53.8%
2	NO	255	46.2%
8	D.K.	1509	
9	N.A.	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v271: GRANDFATHER EDUCATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2061 /-] [Invalid=700 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL THAT YOUR GRANDFATHER COMPLETED?		
Notes	Q81F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GRADE 1; 1 YEAR	2	0.1%
2	GRADE 2; 2 YEARS	3	0.1%
3	GRADE 3; 3 YEARS	8	0.4%
4	GRADE 4; 4 YEARS	13	0.6%
5	GRADE 5; 5 YEARS	8	0.4%
6	GRADE 6; 6 YEARS	6	0.3%
7	GRADE 7; 7 YEARS	1	0.0%

# v271: GRANDFATHER EDUCATION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	GRADE 8; 8 YEARS	11	0.5%
9	GRADE 9; 9 YEARS	5	0.2%
10	GRADE 10; 10 YEARS	2	0.1%
11	GRADE 11; 11 YEARS	3	0.1%
12	GRADE 12; 12 YEARS	7	0.3%
13	GRADE 13; 13 YEARS	6	0.3%
14	FIRST YEAR UNIVERSITY	0	
15	SECOND YEAR UNIVERSITY	0	
16	THIRD YEAR UNIVERSITY	3	0.1%
17	FOURTH YEAR UNIVERSITY	3	0.1%
18	FIVE OR MORE YEARS UNIVERSITY (INCLUDE MEDICAL DOCTORS, DEN	2	0.1%
19	FIVE OR MORE YEARS UNIVERSITY (EDUCATION, THEOLOGY)	0	
20	M.A.	0	
21	PH.D.	0	
22	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS TEACHER'S COLLEGE/BREFET. A.B. ETC.	0	
23	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS NURSING (R.N.)	0	
24	HIGH SCHOOL PLUS COMMERCIAL/TECHNICAL COURSES/ EXTENSION	1	0.0%
25	SOME HIGH SCHOOL PLUS COMMERCIAL/TECHNICAL COURSES/EXTENSION	0	
26	UNIVERSITY PLUS TEACHERS COLLEGE, NURSING (R.N.)	0	
27	GRADE 8/GRADE SCHOOL PLUS BUSINESS COLLEGE/ TECHNICAL COURSE	0	
28	NO FORMAL SCHOOLING	27	1.3%
88	DON'T KNOW/CAN'T REMEMBER/NO ANSWER	1950	94.6%
99	N.A.	700	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v272: R HAVE CHILDREN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=495 /-] [Invalid=2266 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to males.		
Literal question	DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN?		
Notes	Q82A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	430	86.9%
2	NO	65	13.1%
9	N.A.	2266	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v273: SON OR DAUGHTER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=430 /-] [Invalid=2331 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are male and who have children.		

# v273: SON OR DAUGHTER				
Pre-question		DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN?		
Literal question		SON OR DAUGHTER?		
Notes		Q82B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	SON	106	<div></div>	24.7%
2	DAUGHTER	69	<div></div>	16.0%
3	BOTH	255	<div></div>	59.3%
9	N.A.	2331		
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>				
# v274: AGE OF OLDEST SON				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=361 /-] [Invalid=2400 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to respondents who are male, and who have a son or a son and daughter.		
Literal question		HOW OLD IS YOUR ELDEST SON?		
Notes		Q82C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	1 YEAR OR YOUNGER	21	<div></div>	5.8%
2	2 YEARS	7	<div></div>	1.9%
3	3 YEARS	8	<div></div>	2.2%
4	4 YEARS	11	<div></div>	3.0%
5	5 YEARS	10	<div></div>	2.8%
6	6 YEARS	7	<div></div>	1.9%
7	7 YEARS	12	<div></div>	3.3%
8	8 YEARS	7	<div></div>	1.9%
9	9 YEARS	10	<div></div>	2.8%
10	10 YEARS	7	<div></div>	1.9%
11	11 YEARS	14	<div></div>	3.9%
12	12 YEARS	13	<div></div>	3.6%
13	13 YEARS	8	<div></div>	2.2%
14	14 YEARS	14	<div></div>	3.9%
15	15 YEARS	7	<div></div>	1.9%
16	16 YEARS	5	<div></div>	1.4%
17	17 YEARS	11	<div></div>	3.0%
18	18 YEARS	9	<div></div>	2.5%
19	19 YEARS	6	<div></div>	1.7%
20	20 YEARS	12	<div></div>	3.3%
21	21 YEARS	11	<div></div>	3.0%
22	22 YEARS	19	<div></div>	5.3%
23	23 YEARS	13	<div></div>	3.6%
24	24 YEARS	10	<div></div>	2.8%
25	25 YEARS	16	<div></div>	4.4%
26	26 YEARS	8	<div></div>	2.2%
27	27 YEARS	4	<div></div>	1.1%
28	28 YEARS	10	<div></div>	2.8%

v274: AGE OF OLDEST SON

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	29 YEARS	6	<div></div> 1.7%
30	30 YEARS	7	<div></div> 1.9%
31	31 YEARS	4	<div></div> 1.1%
32	32 YEARS	9	<div></div> 2.5%
33	33 YEARS	3	<div></div> 0.8%
34	34 YEARS	3	<div></div> 0.8%
35	35 YEARS	4	<div></div> 1.1%
36	36 YEARS	7	<div></div> 1.9%
37	37 YEARS	5	<div></div> 1.4%
38	38 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
39	39 YEARS	4	<div></div> 1.1%
40	40 YEARS	3	<div></div> 0.8%
41	41 YEARS	4	<div></div> 1.1%
42	42 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
43	43 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
44	44 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
45	45 YEARS	0	
46	46 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
47	47 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
48	48 YEARS	0	
49	49 YEARS	0	
50	50 YEARS	3	<div></div> 0.8%
51	51 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
52	52 YEARS	0	
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
55	55 YEARS	0	
56	56 YEARS	0	
57	57 YEARS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	0	
60	60 YEARS	0	
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	0	
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	0	
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS OR OLDER	0	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	2400	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v275: SON OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/99]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=196 /-] [Invalid=2565 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are male and who have a son over the age of 16.			
Literal question	WHAT IS YOUR SON'S MAIN OCCUPATION?			
Notes	Q82D in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	STUDENT	39	<div></div>	19.9%
2	UNEMPLOYED	5	<div></div>	2.6%
3	RETIRED	0		
14	BLISHEN SCORE OF 14	0		
15	BLISHEN SCORE OF 15	0		
16	BLISHEN SCORE OF 16	0		
17	BLISHEN SCORE OF 17	0		
18	BLISHEN SCORE OF 18	1	<div></div>	0.5%
19	BLISHEN SCORE OF 19	1	<div></div>	0.5%
20	BLISHEN SCORE OF 20	0		
21	BLISHEN SCORE OF 21	0		
22	BLISHEN SCORE OF 22	3	<div></div>	1.5%
23	BLISHEN SCORE OF 23	7	<div></div>	3.6%
24	BLISHEN SCORE OF 24	2	<div></div>	1.0%
25	BLISHEN SCORE OF 25	3	<div></div>	1.5%
26	BLISHEN SCORE OF 26	3	<div></div>	1.5%
27	BLISHEN SCORE OF 27	3	<div></div>	1.5%
28	BLISHEN SCORE OF 28	7	<div></div>	3.6%
29	BLISHEN SCORE OF 29	11	<div></div>	5.6%
30	BLISHEN SCORE OF 30	4	<div></div>	2.0%
31	BLISHEN SCORE OF 31	2	<div></div>	1.0%
32	BLISHEN SCORE OF 32	3	<div></div>	1.5%
33	BLISHEN SCORE OF 33	1	<div></div>	0.5%
34	BLISHEN SCORE OF 34	0		
35	BLISHEN SCORE OF 35	3	<div></div>	1.5%
36	BLISHEN SCORE OF 36	1	<div></div>	0.5%
37	BLISHEN SCORE OF 37	11	<div></div>	5.6%
38	BLISHEN SCORE OF 38	6	<div></div>	3.1%
39	BLISHEN SCORE OF 39	1	<div></div>	0.5%
40	BLISHEN SCORE OF 40	1	<div></div>	0.5%
41	BLISHEN SCORE OF 41	4	<div></div>	2.0%
42	BLISHEN SCORE OF 42	4	<div></div>	2.0%
43	BLISHEN SCORE OF 43	8	<div></div>	4.1%
44	BLISHEN SCORE OF 44	1	<div></div>	0.5%
45	BLISHEN SCORE OF 45	1	<div></div>	0.5%
46	BLISHEN SCORE OF 46	3	<div></div>	1.5%
47	BLISHEN SCORE OF 47	7	<div></div>	3.6%
48	BLISHEN SCORE OF 48	3	<div></div>	1.5%
49	BLISHEN SCORE OF 49	1	<div></div>	0.5%

v275: SON OCCUPATION-BLISHEN SCALE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	BLISHEN SCORE OF 50	4	2.0%
51	BLISHEN SCORE OF 51	0	
52	BLISHEN SCORE OF 52	2	1.0%
53	BLISHEN SCORE OF 53	1	0.5%
54	BLISHEN SCORE OF 54	2	1.0%
55	BLISHEN SCORE OF 55	8	4.1%
56	BLISHEN SCORE OF 56	0	
57	BLISHEN SCORE OF 57	3	1.5%
58	BLISHEN SCORE OF 58	0	
59	BLISHEN SCORE OF 59	4	2.0%
60	BLISHEN SCORE OF 60	4	2.0%
61	BLISHEN SCORE OF 61	1	0.5%
62	BLISHEN SCORE OF 62	1	0.5%
63	BLISHEN SCORE OF 63	0	
64	BLISHEN SCORE OF 64	0	
65	BLISHEN SCORE OF 65	2	1.0%
66	BLISHEN SCORE OF 66	0	
67	BLISHEN SCORE OF 67	4	2.0%
68	BLISHEN SCORE OF 68	1	0.5%
69	BLISHEN SCORE OF 69	0	
70	BLISHEN SCORE OF 70	0	
71	BLISHEN SCORE OF 71	2	1.0%
72	BLISHEN SCORE OF 72	4	2.0%
73	BLISHEN SCORE OF 73	0	
74	BLISHEN SCORE OF 74	1	0.5%
75	BLISHEN SCORE OF 75	2	1.0%
0	DON'T KNOW/DON'T REMEMBER	1467	
99	NOT APPLICABLE	1098	








Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v276: MP-VOTERS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=607 /-] [Invalid=2154 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	SINCE THE PURPOSE OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION WAS TO ELECT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS CONCERNING WHAT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE DOING. IF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT IS FACED WITH A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, HOW DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD MAKE UP HIS MIND ON SUCH AN ISSUE? PLEASE TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS, VERY IMPORTANT, FAIRLY IMPORTANT, OR NOT VERY IMPORTANT.
Literal question	VIEWS OF HIS RIDING'S VOTERS?
Notes	Q83A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	427	70.3%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	147	24.2%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	33	5.4%

# v276: MP-VOTERS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	1481	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v277: MP-PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=604 /-] [Invalid=2157 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SINCE THE PURPOSE OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION WAS TO ELECT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS CONCERNING WHAT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE DOING. IF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT IS FACED WITH A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, HOW DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD MAKE UP HIS MIND ON SUCH AN ISSUE? PLEASE TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS, VERY IMPORTANT, FAIRLY IMPORTANT, OR NOT VERY IMPORTANT.		
Literal question	VIEWS OF HIS PARTY?		
Notes	Q83B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	240	<div></div> 39.7%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	296	<div></div> 49.0%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	68	<div></div> 11.3%
8	D.K.	1484	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v278: MP-CIVIL SERVICE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=560 /-] [Invalid=2201 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SINCE THE PURPOSE OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION WAS TO ELECT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS CONCERNING WHAT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE DOING. IF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT IS FACED WITH A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, HOW DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD MAKE UP HIS MIND ON SUCH AN ISSUE? PLEASE TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS, VERY IMPORTANT, FAIRLY IMPORTANT, OR NOT VERY IMPORTANT.		
Literal question	VIEWS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE?		
Notes	Q83C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	129	<div></div> 23.0%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	248	<div></div> 44.3%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	183	<div></div> 32.7%
8	D.K.	1528	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v279: MP-GROUPS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=580 /-] [Invalid=2181 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		

# v279: MP-GROUPS			
Pre-question	SINCE THE PURPOSE OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION WAS TO ELECT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS CONCERNING WHAT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE DOING. IF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT IS FACED WITH A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, HOW DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD MAKE UP HIS MIND ON SUCH AN ISSUE? PLEASE TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS, VERY IMPORTANT, FAIRLY IMPORTANT, OR NOT VERY IMPORTANT.		
Literal question	VIEWS OF ORGANIZED GROUPS THAT HE REPRESENTS?		
Notes	Q83D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	211	 36.4%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	253	 43.6%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	116	 20.0%
8	D.K.	1508	
9	N.A.	673	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v280: MP-FRIENDS AND ADVISERS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=590 /-] [Invalid=2171 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SINCE THE PURPOSE OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION WAS TO ELECT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS CONCERNING WHAT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE DOING. IF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT IS FACED WITH A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, HOW DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD MAKE UP HIS MIND ON SUCH AN ISSUE? PLEASE TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS, VERY IMPORTANT, FAIRLY IMPORTANT, OR NOT VERY IMPORTANT.		
Literal question	VIEWS OF HIS ADVISERS AND FRIENDS?		
Notes	Q83E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	156	 26.4%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	259	 43.9%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	175	 29.7%
8	D.K.	1498	
9	N.A.	673	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v281: MP-OWN BELIEFS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=601 /-] [Invalid=2160 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SINCE THE PURPOSE OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION WAS TO ELECT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, WE WOULD LIKE TO GET SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS CONCERNING WHAT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE DOING. IF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT IS FACED WITH A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, HOW DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD MAKE UP HIS MIND ON SUCH AN ISSUE? PLEASE TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IS, VERY IMPORTANT, FAIRLY IMPORTANT, OR NOT VERY IMPORTANT.		
Literal question	HIS OWN BELIEFS?		
Notes	Q83F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	347	 57.7%

# v281: MP-OWN BELIEFS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	174	<div></div> 29.0%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	80	<div></div> 13.3%
8	D.K.	1487	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v282: R HAS WRITTEN MP			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=616 /-] [Invalid=2145 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HAVE YOU EVER TALKED WITH OR WRITTEN TO A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ABOUT ANY PROBLEM?		
Notes	Q84 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	164	<div></div> 26.6%
2	NO	452	<div></div> 73.4%
8	D.K.	1472	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v283: MP DO ANYTHING FOR R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=616 /-] [Invalid=2145 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HAS A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DONE ANYTHING FOR YOU PERSONALLY?		
Notes	Q85A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	79	<div></div> 12.8%
2	NO	537	<div></div> 87.2%
8	D.K.	1472	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v284: WHAT MP HAS DONE FOR R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=75 /-] [Invalid=2686 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2, and those who answered "yes" for Q85A.		
Pre-question	Q85A. HAS A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DONE ANYTHING FOR YOU PERSONALLY?		
Literal question	Q85B. WHAT WAS THIS?		
Notes	Q85A, Q85B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	5	<div></div> 6.7%
2	WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION	1	<div></div> 1.3%
3	MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	0	
4	BABY BONUS, FAMILY ALLOWANCE, YOUTH ALLOWANCE	1	<div></div> 1.3%

# v284: WHAT MP HAS DONE FOR R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	PENSION (OLD AGE, CANADA)	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
6	SOCIAL WELFARE OR AID	5	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
7	HOUSING	5	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
8	LANDLORD - TENANT PROBLEM	0	
9	FARM OR AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM	5	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
10	HELP WITH LEGAL AFFAIRS	10	<div><div></div></div> 13.3%
11	HELPED OR TRIED TO GET ME A JOB	7	<div><div></div></div> 9.3%
12	HELPED GET PASSPORT VISA	3	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
13	HELP WITH CITIZENSHIP, IMMIGRATION	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
14	HE ANSWERED MY LETTER	3	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
15	SENT INFORMATION, GAVE TALK, LISTENED TO WHAT I HAD TO SAY,	4	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
16	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	17	<div><div></div></div> 22.7%
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, NO ANSWER	5	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
0	REFUSED	1467	
99	N.A.	1219	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v285: MP WOULD READ LETTER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=541 /-] [Invalid=2220 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IF YOU WROTE A LETTER TO YOUR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, DO YOU THINK THAT HE WOULD READ IT?		
Notes	Q86A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	423	<div><div></div></div> 78.2%
2	NO	118	<div><div></div></div> 21.8%
8	D.K.	1547	
9	N.A.	673	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v286: MP WOULD ANSWER LETTER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=381 /-] [Invalid=2380 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q86A. IF YOU WROTE A LETTER TO YOUR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, DO YOU THINK THAT HE WOULD READ IT?		
Literal question	Q86B. WOULD HE ANSWER IT?		
Notes	Q86A, Q86B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	360	<div><div></div></div> 94.5%
2	NO	21	<div><div></div></div> 5.5%
8	D.K.	1505	
9	N.A.	875	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v287: MP WOULD ACT ON PROBLEM			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=374 /-] [Invalid=2387 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IF YOU WROTE HIM ABOUT A SPECIFIC PROBLEM, DO YOU THINK HE WOULD TRY TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?		
Notes	Q86C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	349	<div></div> 93.3%
2	NO	25	<div></div> 6.7%
8	D.K.	1512	
9	N.A.	875	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2731 /-] [Invalid=30 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 53.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	47	<div></div> 1.7%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	7	<div></div> 0.3%
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	4	<div></div> 0.1%
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	2	<div></div> 0.1%
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	12	<div></div> 0.4%
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	3	<div></div> 0.1%
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	1	<div></div> 0.0%
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	1	<div></div> 0.0%
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	1	0.0%
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	2	0.1%
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	16	0.6%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	20	0.7%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	4	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	8	0.3%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
101	LIBERALISM	6	0.2%
102	SOCIALISM	3	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	0	

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	1	0.0%
107	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	3	0.1%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	47	1.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	8	0.3%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	4	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	2	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	10	0.4%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.1%
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	2	0.1%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	2	0.1%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	2	0.1%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	21	0.8%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	10	0.4%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	59	2.2%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	4	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	2	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	5	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	10	0.4%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	2	0.1%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	2	0.1%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	8	0.3%
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	9	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	2	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	8	0.3%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	4	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	27	1.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	2	0.1%
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	2	0.1%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	3	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	1	0.0%
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	2	0.1%

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	2	0.1%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	2	0.1%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.0%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	12	0.4%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	4	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	5	0.2%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	4	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	1	0.0%
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	1	0.0%
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	2	0.1%
402	PRO WEST	1	0.0%

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	1	0.0%
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	2	0.1%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	10	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	58	2.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	5	0.2%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	13	0.5%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	3	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	45	1.6%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	2	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	8	0.3%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	7	0.3%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	6	0.2%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	5	0.2%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	12	0.4%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	3	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	9	0.3%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	3	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	34	1.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	6	0.2%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	

v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	3	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	2	0.1%
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	3	0.1%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	

# v288: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	80	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	48	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
948	NOTHING	106	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	277	<div><div></div></div> 10.1%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	14	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	16	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v289: LIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=760 /-] [Invalid=2001 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY. ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
2	MEDIUM	55	<div><div></div></div> 7.2%
3	LOW	700	<div><div></div></div> 92.1%
0	N.A.	2001	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v290: LIKE LIBERAL -INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=760 /-] [Invalid=2001 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	716	<div><div></div></div> 94.2%

# v290: LIKE LIBERAL -INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	STRONG	44	5.8%
0	N.A.	2001	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2758 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2445	88.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	9	0.3%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	3	0.1%
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	2	0.1%
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	4	0.1%
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	4	0.1%
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	1	0.0%
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST, UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	6	0.2%
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	13	0.5%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	15	0.5%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	2	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	4	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	2	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	6	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	22	0.8%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	6	0.2%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	24	0.9%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	1	0.0%
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	5	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	5	0.2%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	1	0.0%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	2	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	1	0.0%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	6	0.2%
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	4	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	1	0.0%

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	4	0.1%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	3	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	15	0.5%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	4	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
328	SALES TAX	2	0.1%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	6	0.2%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	3	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	3	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	2	0.1%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	3	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	1	0.0%
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	12	0.4%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.0%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	2	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	2	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	16	0.6%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	3	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	4	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	2	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	7	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	2	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%

v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	1	0.0%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	2	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	1	0.0%

# v291: LIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	2	0.1%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	1	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v292: LIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=305 /-] [Invalid=2456 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	4	1.3%
2	MEDIUM	23	7.5%
3	LOW	278	91.1%
0	N.A.	2456	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v293: LIKE LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=305 /-] [Invalid=2456 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	284	93.1%
2	STRONG	21	6.9%
0	N.A.	2456	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/95]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2747 /-] [Invalid=14 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q55B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	53.3%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	19	0.7%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	9	0.3%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	7	0.3%
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	2	0.1%
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	2	0.1%
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	2	0.1%
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	2	0.1%

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	5	0.2%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	8	0.3%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
101	LIBERALISM	2	0.1%
102	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	1	0.0%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	2	0.1%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	14	0.5%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	6	0.2%

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	7	0.3%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	2	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	29	1.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	66	2.4%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.0%
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	2	0.1%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	2	0.1%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	2	0.1%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	13	0.5%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	4	0.1%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	8	0.3%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	8	0.3%
176	FISHING POLICY	2	0.1%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	4	0.1%
179	HOUSING POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	8	0.3%

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	7	0.3%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	19	0.7%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	3	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	4	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	1	0.0%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	1	0.0%
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	6	0.2%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	2	0.1%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	5	0.2%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	26	0.9%
223	BILL 22	3	0.1%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	2	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	12	0.4%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	3	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	2	0.1%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.0%
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	7	0.3%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	2	0.1%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	2	0.1%
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	4	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	11	0.4%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	3	0.1%

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	2	0.1%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	2	0.1%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	1	0.0%
375	PRO YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	17	0.6%
390	PRO MARITIMES	1	0.0%
391	ANTI MARITIMES	1	0.0%
392	PRO QUEBEC	11	0.4%
393	ANTI QUEBEC	2	0.1%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	11	0.4%
402	PRO WEST	4	0.1%
403	ANTI WEST	3	0.1%
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	5	0.2%
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	1	0.0%
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	2	0.1%
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	1	0.0%
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	1	0.0%
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	3	0.1%
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	4	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.1%

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	29	1.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	16	0.6%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	3	0.1%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	3	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	9	0.3%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	6	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	2	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	8	0.3%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	3	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	2	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	2	0.1%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	12	0.4%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	2	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	20	0.7%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	5	0.2%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	4	0.1%
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	5	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	35	1.3%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	5	0.2%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	

v294: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	2	0.1%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.1%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	50	1.8%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	10	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	3	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	41	1.5%
948	NOTHING	90	3.3%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	384	14.0%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	15	0.5%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	5	0.2%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	13	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v295: DISLIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=723 /-] [Invalid=2038 /-]
Universe	All respondents

# v295: DISLIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q55B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	14	1.9%
2	MEDIUM	65	9.0%
3	LOW	644	89.1%
0	N.A.	2038	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v296: DISLIKE LIBERAL-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=723 /-] [Invalid=2038 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q55B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	654	90.5%
2	STRONG	69	9.5%
0	N.A.	2038	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q55B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2476	89.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	2	0.1%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	1	0.0%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	4	0.1%
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	3	0.1%

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	1	0.0%
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	5	0.2%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	1	0.0%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	2	0.1%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	3	0.1%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	14	0.5%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	16	0.6%

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	5	0.2%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	2	0.1%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	6	0.2%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	4	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	6	0.2%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	3	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	5	0.2%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	4	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	14	0.5%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	2	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	1	0.0%
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	1	0.0%
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	2	0.1%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	2	0.1%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	6	0.2%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.0%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	5	0.2%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	1	0.0%
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	1	0.0%
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	4	0.1%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	3	0.1%
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	6	0.2%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	1	0.0%
368	AGAINST INDIANS	1	0.0%
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	1	0.0%
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	9	0.3%
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	4	0.1%
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	5	0.2%
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	2	0.1%
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	2	0.1%
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	6	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	4	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	2	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	2	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	3	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	4	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	2	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	2	0.1%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	3	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	13	0.5%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	6	0.2%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	2	0.1%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	

v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	6	0.2%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	1	0.0%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	

# v297: DISLIKE LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	1	0.0%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	6	0.2%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v298: DISLIKE LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=274 /-] [Invalid=2487 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q55B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	7	2.6%
2	MEDIUM	26	9.5%
3	LOW	241	88.0%
0	N.A.	2487	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v299: DISLIKE LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		

# v299: DISLIKE LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=274 -/] [Invalid=2487 -/]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q55B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	234	<div><div></div></div> 85.4%
2	STRONG	40	<div><div></div></div> 14.6%
0	N.A.	2487	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/95]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2736 -/] [Invalid=25 -/]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q56A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOUCETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOUCETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOUCETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOUCETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOUCETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOUCETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOUCETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	7	0.3%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	3	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	1	0.0%
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	19	0.7%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
100	CONSERVATISM	7	0.3%
101	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	1	0.0%
106	CENTRE	1	0.0%
107	LEFT WING	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	30	1.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	7	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	44	1.6%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	18	0.7%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	8	0.3%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	1	0.0%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	5	0.2%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	3	0.1%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	3	0.1%
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	2	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	8	0.3%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	4	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	4	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	7	0.3%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	2	0.1%
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	1	0.0%
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	15	0.5%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	7	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	13	0.5%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	4	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	14	0.5%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	5	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	1	0.0%
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	3	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	5	0.2%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	15	0.5%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	3	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	7	0.3%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.0%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	23	0.8%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	17	0.6%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	2	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	1	0.0%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	3	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	2	0.1%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	8	0.3%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	1	0.0%
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	4	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	5	0.2%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	94	3.4%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	7	0.3%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.1%

v300: LIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	4	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	3	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	16	0.6%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.1%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	76	2.8%
948	NOTHING	139	5.1%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	438	16.0%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	16	0.6%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	24	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v301: LIKE PC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=512 /-] [Invalid=2249 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q56A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	0.2%
2	MEDIUM	26	5.1%
3	LOW	485	94.7%
0	N.A.	2249	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v302: LIKE PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=512 /-] [Invalid=2249 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q56A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	481	93.9%
2	STRONG	30	5.9%
8		1	0.2%
0	N.A.	2249	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/95]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2755 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q56A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2625	95.3%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	4	0.1%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	3	0.1%
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	6	0.2%
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	7	0.3%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	3	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO)	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	9	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	3	0.1%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	2	0.1%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	1	0.0%
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	2	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	2	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	1	0.0%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	3	0.1%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.0%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.1%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	1	0.0%
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	1	0.0%
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	3	0.1%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	3	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.0%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	5	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	3	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	2	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	1	0.0%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%

v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	4	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.0%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.0%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	1	0.0%
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	

# v303: LIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	1	0.0%
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	1	0.0%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	5	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v304: LIKE PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=128 /-] [Invalid=2633 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q56A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	5	3.9%

# v304: LIKE PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	LOW	123	<div><div></div></div> 96.1%
0	N.A.	2633	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v305: LIKE PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=128 /-] [Invalid=2633 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q56A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	120	<div><div></div></div> 93.8%
2	STRONG	8	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
0	N.A.	2633	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/95]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2736 /-] [Invalid=25 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q56B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	65	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	51	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	3	0.1%
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	5	0.2%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	7	0.3%
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	1	0.0%
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	1	0.0%
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOUCETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOUCETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOUCETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOUCETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOUCETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOUCETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOUCETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	4	0.1%
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	7	0.3%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	12	0.4%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	4	0.1%
101	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
102	SOCIALISM	1	0.0%
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	4	0.1%
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	1	0.0%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	2	0.1%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	20	0.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	4	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	8	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	9	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	4	0.1%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	34	1.2%
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	12	0.4%
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	11	0.4%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	3	0.1%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	1	0.0%
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	3	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	1	0.0%

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	2	0.1%
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	5	0.2%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	1	0.0%
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	3	0.1%
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	17	0.6%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	2	0.1%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	1	0.0%
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	2	0.1%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	2	0.1%
402	PRO WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	1	0.0%
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	3	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	2	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	30	1.1%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	9	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	6	0.2%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	7	0.3%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	4	0.1%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	5	0.2%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	6	0.2%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	4	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	4	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	2	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	2	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.0%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	4	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	4	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	6	0.2%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	5	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	14	0.5%

v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	5	0.2%
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	6	0.2%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	7	0.3%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.0%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	3	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	5	0.2%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	4	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	2	0.1%
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	2	0.1%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	5	0.2%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	

# v306: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	3	0.1%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	75	2.7%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	6	0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	62	2.3%
948	NOTHING	102	3.7%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	461	16.8%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	18	0.7%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	3	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	22	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v307: DISLIKE PC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=589 /-] [Invalid=2172 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q56B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	4	0.7%
2	MEDIUM	35	5.9%
3	LOW	550	93.4%
0	N.A.	2172	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v308: DISLIKE PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=589 /-] [Invalid=2172 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		

# v308: DISLIKE PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Notes		Q56B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	535	<div><div></div></div> 90.8%
2	STRONG	54	<div><div></div></div> 9.2%
0	N.A.	2172	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/95]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2757 /-] [Invalid=4 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)	
Notes		Q56B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2604	<div><div></div></div> 94.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	4	0.1%
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	4	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	3	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	4	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
111	PHILOSOPHY,IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM,TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	2	0.1%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	8	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	4	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.0%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	10	0.4%
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	2	0.1%
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	2	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	3	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	3	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	2	0.1%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	1	0.0%
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	1	0.0%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	6	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	3	0.1%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	2	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	4	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	4	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	2	0.1%
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	

v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	3	0.1%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	

# v309: DISLIKE PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v310: DISLIKE PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=154 /-] [Invalid=2607 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q56B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	5	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
2	MEDIUM	16	<div><div></div></div> 10.4%
3	LOW	133	<div><div></div></div> 86.4%
0	N.A.	2607	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v311: DISLIKE PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=154 /-] [Invalid=2607 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q56B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	141	<div><div></div></div> 91.6%
2	STRONG	13	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
0	N.A.	2607	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2724 /-] [Invalid=37 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)		

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Notes	Q57A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.
-------	--

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	53.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	32	1.2%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	1	0.0%
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	16	0.6%
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	5	0.2%
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	3	0.1%
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	1	0.0%
55	CAOQUETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOQUETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOQUETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOQUETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOQUETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOQUETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
102	SOCIALISM	4	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	5	0.2%
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	31	1.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	2	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	4	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	2	0.1%

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	6	0.2%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	6	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	2	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	2	0.1%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	3	0.1%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	4	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	14	0.5%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	2	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	4	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	7	0.3%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	2	0.1%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	5	0.2%
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.0%
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.0%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	4	0.1%
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	2	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	4	0.1%

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	2	0.1%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	24	0.9%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	41	1.5%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	4	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	4	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	6	0.2%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	2	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	7	0.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.0%

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	1	0.0%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	12	0.4%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	1	0.0%
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	9	0.3%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	3	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	5	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	

v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	25	0.9%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	4	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.0%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	13	0.5%
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	1	0.0%

# v312: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	1	0.0%
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	139	5.1%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	3	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	85	3.1%
948	NOTHING	135	5.0%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	495	18.2%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	17	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	20	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v313: LIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=445 /-] [Invalid=2316 /-]		

# v313: LIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q57A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	36	8.1%
3	LOW	409	91.9%
0	N.A.	2316	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v314: LIKE NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=445 /-] [Invalid=2316 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q57A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	412	92.6%
2	STRONG	33	7.4%
0	N.A.	2316	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/95]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2758 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q57A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2619	95.0%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD)	4	0.1%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	3	0.1%
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	2	0.1%
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	1	0.0%
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOUCETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOUCETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOUCETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOUCETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOUCETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOUCETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOUCETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	2	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	6	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	5	0.2%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	4	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	5	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.0%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	5	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	2	0.1%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	4	0.1%
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	6	0.2%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	1	0.0%
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	2	0.1%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	4	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	8	0.3%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	2	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	2	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	3	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	3	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	2	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	3	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	3	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	4	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	

v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	2	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	2	0.1%
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	

# v315: LIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v316: LIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=136 /-] [Invalid=2625 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q57A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	13	9.6%
3	LOW	123	90.4%
0	N.A.	2625	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v317: LIKE NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=136 /-] [Invalid=2625 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q57A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	126	<div><div></div></div> 92.6%
2	STRONG	10	<div><div></div></div> 7.4%
0	N.A.	2625	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2696 /-] [Invalid=65 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN APTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q57B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 54.3%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	1	0.0%
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	2	0.1%
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	6	0.2%
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	1	0.0%
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	3	0.1%
55	CAOUCETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOUCETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOUCETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOUCETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOUCETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOUCETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOUCETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	5	0.2%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	3	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	32	1.2%
103	COMMUNISM	13	0.5%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
107	LEFT WING	4	0.1%
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	16	0.6%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	1	0.0%
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	8	0.3%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	2	0.1%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	35	1.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	14	0.5%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	15	0.6%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	11	0.4%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	2	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	2	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	1	0.0%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	1	0.0%
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	3	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	1	0.0%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	3	0.1%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	3	0.1%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	10	0.4%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	14	0.5%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	11	0.4%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	1	0.0%
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	5	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	3	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	5	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	11	0.4%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	5	0.2%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	3	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	8	0.3%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	5	0.2%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	3	0.1%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	2	0.1%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	10	0.4%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	15	0.6%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	1	0.0%
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	

v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	4	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	3	0.1%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	8	0.3%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	3	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	1	0.0%
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	23	0.9%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	1	0.0%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	2	0.1%
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	2	0.1%
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	109	4.0%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%

# v318: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	11	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	71	2.6%
948	NOTHING	92	3.4%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	512	19.0%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	24	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	41	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v319: DISLIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=483 /-] [Invalid=2278 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q57B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	4	0.8%
2	MEDIUM	37	7.7%
3	LOW	442	91.5%
0	N.A.	2278	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v320: DISLIKE NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=482 /-] [Invalid=2279 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q57B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	423	87.8%
2	STRONG	59	12.2%
0	N.A.	2279	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		

# v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2760 /-] [Invalid=1 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q57B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2665	96.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	4	0.1%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	1	0.0%
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	1	0.0%
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	2	0.1%
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	CAOINET STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINET GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINET POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINET ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINET SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	4	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	1	0.0%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	2	0.1%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	8	0.3%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	8	0.3%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	0.0%
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	6	0.2%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	1	0.0%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	1	0.0%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	

v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	6	0.2%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	1	0.0%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	

# v321: DISLIKE NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	1	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v322: DISLIKE NDP-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=94 /-] [Invalid=2667 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q57B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	1.1%
2	MEDIUM	9	9.6%
3	LOW	84	89.4%
0	N.A.	2667	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v323: DISLIKE NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=94 /-] [Invalid=2667 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q57B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	81	86.2%
2	STRONG	13	13.8%
0	N.A.	2667	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2677 /-] [Invalid=84 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	54.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	27	1.0%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	1	0.0%
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	1	0.0%
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	31	1.2%
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	2	0.1%
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	4	0.1%
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	3	0.1%
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	3	0.1%
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	3	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	2	0.1%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	23	0.9%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	4	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	4	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	7	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	3	0.1%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	2	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	2	0.1%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	1	0.0%
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	2	0.1%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	1	0.0%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	2	0.1%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	4	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	1	0.0%
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	2	0.1%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	1	0.0%
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	4	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	4	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	3	0.1%

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	3	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	10	0.4%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	5	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.0%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	4	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.0%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	

# v324: LIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.0%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	20	0.7%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	173	6.5%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	3	0.1%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	3	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	6	0.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	4	0.1%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	117	4.4%
948	NOTHING	106	4.0%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	559	20.9%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	22	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	62	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v325: LIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=261 /-] [Invalid=2500 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A in the documentation.		

# v325: LIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	4	1.5%
2	MEDIUM	17	6.5%
3	LOW	240	92.0%
0	N.A.	2500	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v326: LIKE SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=261 /-] [Invalid=2500 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	246	94.3%
2	STRONG	15	5.7%
0	N.A.	2500	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950/998]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2692	97.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	1	0.0%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	1	0.0%
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	4	0.1%
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	4	0.1%
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	1	0.0%
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOINETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	2	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	4	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	0.0%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	1	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	0.0%
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	0.0%
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
393	ANTI QUEBEC	1	0.0%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	2	0.1%
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	3	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	5	0.2%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	

v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	1	0.0%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	

# v327: LIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	2	0.1%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	1	0.0%
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	1	0.0%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v328: LIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=64 /-] [Invalid=2697 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	1.6%
2	MEDIUM	3	4.7%
3	LOW	60	93.8%
0	N.A.	2697	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v329: LIKE SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=64 /-] [Invalid=2697 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		

# v329: LIKE SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Notes		Q58A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	63	98.4%
2	STRONG	1	1.6%
0	N.A.	2697	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2649 /-] [Invalid=112 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)	
Notes		Q58B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	55.2%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	17	0.6%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER DIEFENBAKER, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	1	0.0%
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	1	0.0%
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOUCETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	3	0.1%
56	CAOUCETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOUCETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOUCETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOUCETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOUCETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	
61	CAOUCETTE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	2	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	4	0.2%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	1	0.0%
103	COMMUNISM	4	0.2%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	5	0.2%
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
111	PHILOSOPHY,IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	3	0.1%

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	2	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	4	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	11	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	4	0.2%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	23	0.9%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	10	0.4%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	2	0.1%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	4	0.2%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	2	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.1%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	3	0.1%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	1	0.0%
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	1	0.0%
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	1	0.0%
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	1	0.0%
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	5	0.2%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	4	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	6	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	3	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	4	0.2%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	2	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	9	0.3%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.0%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	20	0.8%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	11	0.4%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	0.1%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	3	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	

v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	7	0.3%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	13	0.5%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.0%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	4	0.2%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	2	0.1%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	1	0.0%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	13	0.5%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	125	4.7%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	3	0.1%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	7	0.3%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	

# v330: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	112	4.2%
948	NOTHING	89	3.4%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	588	22.2%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	30	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	82	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v331: DISLIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=291 /-] [Invalid=2470 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	2	0.7%
2	MEDIUM	13	4.5%
3	LOW	276	94.8%
0	N.A.	2470	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v332: DISLIKE SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=291 /-] [Invalid=2470 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	267	91.8%
2	STRONG	24	8.2%
0	N.A.	2470	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2759 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Notes	Q58B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.
--------------	--

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2708	98.2%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU,STANFIELD	3	0.1%
2	TRUDEAU-CULTURAL,INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU ARROGANT	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
7	TRUDEAU ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
8	TRUDEAU INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
11	TRUDEAU AND INFLATION	0	
15	REFERENCE TO PEARSON	0	
20	STANFIELD HONEST	0	
21	STANFIELD, PERSONALITY OR INSTRUMENTAL REFERENCE, NEGATIVE	0	
22	STANFIELD NOT FLUENT IN FRENCH	0	
23	STANFIELD UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE	0	
25	STANFIELD POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
26	STANFIELD INFLATION POLICY	0	
27	STANFIELD, ABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
28	STANFIELD UNABLE TO LEAD COUNTRY, GOVERN	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO Diefenbaker	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO Diefenbaker	0	
32	REFERENCE TO P.C. POLICIES UNDER Diefenbaker, EG. AVRO ARROW	0	
33	DISPLACEMENT OF Diefenbaker	0	
40	LEWIS LACKS POLISH,FINESSE	0	
41	LEWIS LACKS DYNAMISM	0	
42	LEWIS A FIGHTER,GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
43	LEWIS ECONOMIC POLICIES(EG. CORPORATE WELFARE BUMS)	0	
45	LEWIS POLICY (OTHER THAN INFLATION)	0	
46	LEWIS INFLATION POLICY	0	
47	LEWIS LACKS CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS ABOUT POLICY	0	
48	LEWIS DISHONEST,UNTRUSTWORTHY	0	
55	CAOINETTE IS HONEST OR OTHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	0	
56	CAOINETTE HELPS ORDINARY PERSON	0	
57	CAOINETTE STANDS UP FOR FEDERALISM	0	
58	CAOINETTE GOOD CAMPAIGNER	0	
59	CAOINETTE POLICY (OTHER THAN ECONOMIC OR INFLATION)	0	
60	CAOINETTE ECONOMIC POLICY	0	

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
61	CAOINETE SPLIT SOCRED PARTY	0	
66	WHELAN AND FARMERS	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	4	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	3	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	2	0.1%

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	1	0.0%
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
405	CONTROLLED BY QUEBEC	1	0.0%
406	CONTROLLED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	3	0.1%

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	2	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	

v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	USED BALANCE OF POWER EFFECTIVELY	0	
735	MISUSED BALANCE OF POWER, CAUSED ELECTION	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	

# v333: DISLIKE SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	1	0.0%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
756	OPPOSITION TO LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
762	APPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.0%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	1	0.0%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	1	0.0%
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	2	0.1%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v334: DISLIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=46 /-] [Invalid=2715 /-]		

# v334: DISLIKE SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICLUATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	2.2%
2	MEDIUM	0	
3	LOW	45	97.8%
0	N.A.	2715	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v335: DISLIKE SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=46 /-] [Invalid=2715 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	44	95.7%
2	STRONG	2	4.3%
0	N.A.	2715	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v336: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PARTIES-FEDERAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1253 /-] [Invalid=1508 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT IT DOESN'T MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE WHICH PARTY IS IN POWER IN OTTAWA, WHILE OTHERS THINK THAT IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?		
Notes	Q59A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE	561	44.8%
2	SOME DIFFERENCE	422	33.7%
3	NO DIFFERENCE	260	20.8%
4	DEPENDS	10	0.8%
8	D.K.	1506	
9	N.A.	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v337: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=366.294 /-] [StdDev=446.023 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		

# v338: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=379 /-] [Invalid=2382 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q66A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	4	1.1%
2	MEDIUM	30	7.9%
3	LOW	345	91.0%
0	N.A.	2382	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v339: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=379 /-] [Invalid=2382 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)		
Notes	Q66A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	344	90.8%
2	STRONG	35	9.2%
0	N.A.	2382	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2445 /-] [Invalid=316 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)		
Literal question	(SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q66A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2307	94.4%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	8	0.3%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	3	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	5	0.2%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	6	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	4	0.2%

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	2	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	2	0.1%

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	3	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	2	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	6	0.2%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	4	0.2%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
315	TOURISM	2	0.1%
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	1	0.0%
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	10	0.4%
328	SALES TAX	4	0.2%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.0%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	3	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	2	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.0%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	1	0.0%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	9	0.4%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	1	0.0%
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	4	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEIN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.0%

v340: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	3	0.1%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	3	0.1%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v341: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=137 /-] [Invalid=2624 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q66A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	0.7%
2	MEDIUM	9	6.6%
3	LOW	127	92.7%
0	N.A.	2624	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v342: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=137 /-] [Invalid=2624 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q66A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	125	91.2%
2	STRONG	12	8.8%
0	N.A.	2624	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2411 /-] [Invalid=350 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	60.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	33	1.4%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	14	0.6%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	10	0.4%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	6	0.2%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	4	0.2%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	1	0.0%
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	5	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	3	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	3	0.1%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	1	0.0%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	5	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	2	0.1%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	3	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	2	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	2	0.1%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.0%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	1	0.0%
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	25	1.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	3	0.1%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	3	0.1%
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	3	0.1%
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	7	0.3%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	1	0.0%
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	4	0.2%
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	4	0.2%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.0%
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	4	0.2%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	1	0.0%
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	13	0.5%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	3	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	5	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	15	0.6%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	7	0.3%
517	WEAK	4	0.2%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	4	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	2	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	4	0.2%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	4	0.2%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	2	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	3	0.1%

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	8	0.3%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	7	0.3%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	1	0.0%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	4	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	5	0.2%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMEMTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	0.1%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	7	0.3%

v343: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	2	0.1%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	2	0.1%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	1	0.0%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	1	0.0%
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	8	0.3%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	66	2.7%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	3	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	42	1.7%
948	NOTHING	58	2.4%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	433	18.0%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	14	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	22	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v344: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=370 /-] [Invalid=2391 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	11	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
2	MEDIUM	42	<div><div></div></div> 11.4%
3	LOW	317	<div><div></div></div> 85.7%
0	N.A.	2391	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v345: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=370 /-] [Invalid=2391 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	321	<div><div></div></div> 86.8%
2	STRONG	49	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
0	N.A.	2391	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2447 /-] [Invalid=314 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2327	<div><div></div></div> 95.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	5	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	1	0.0%
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	3	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	3	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.0%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	6	0.2%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	6	0.2%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	1	0.0%
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	7	0.3%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	4	0.2%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	1	0.0%
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	2	0.1%
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	3	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	3	0.1%

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	3	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	2	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.0%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	4	0.2%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	1	0.0%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	

v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.0%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	1	0.0%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	

# v346: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v347: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=119 /-] [Invalid=2642 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	5	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
2	MEDIUM	10	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
3	LOW	104	<div><div></div></div> 87.4%
0	N.A.	2642	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v348: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=119 /-] [Invalid=2642 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	106	<div><div></div></div> 89.1%
2	STRONG	13	<div><div></div></div> 10.9%
0	N.A.	2642	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1772 /-] [Invalid=989 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q71A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 82.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.2%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.1%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.1%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	7	0.4%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.1%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	2	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	1	0.1%
517	WEAK	1	0.1%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.1%

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	1	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	

v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.1%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.1%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	9	0.5%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	31	1.7%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.1%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%

# v349: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.2%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	18	1.0%
948	NOTHING	51	2.9%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	140	7.9%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	3	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v350: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=52 /-] [Invalid=2709 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q71A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	1	1.9%
3	LOW	51	98.1%
0	N.A.	2709	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v351: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=52 /-] [Invalid=2709 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q71A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	52	100.0%
2	STRONG	0	
0	N.A.	2709	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1777 /-] [Invalid=984 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (SECOND MENTION) (QUEBEC ONLY)		
Notes	Q71A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1766	99.4%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	0	
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	3	0.2%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO Diefenbaker	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO Diefenbaker	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	Flora MacDonald	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	0.1%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	0	
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	

# v352: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.1%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	1	0.1%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	1	0.1%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v353: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=9 /-] [Invalid=2752 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q71A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	0	

# v353: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	LOW	9	<div></div> 100.0%
0	N.A.	2752	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v354: LIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=9 /-] [Invalid=2752 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q71A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	9	<div></div> 100.0%
2	STRONG	0	
0	N.A.	2752	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1771 /-] [Invalid=990 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q71B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div></div> 82.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.2%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	5	0.3%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.2%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	12	0.7%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.1%

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	5	0.3%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.1%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	5	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	4	0.2%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	6	0.3%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	3	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	3	0.2%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	

v355: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	3	0.2%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	23	1.3%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.1%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	4	0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	14	0.8%
948	NOTHING	45	2.5%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	134	7.6%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	3	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v356: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=82 /-] [Invalid=2679 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?

# v356: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q71B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	2	2.4%
2	MEDIUM	3	3.7%
3	LOW	77	93.9%
0	N.A.	2679	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v357: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=82 /-] [Invalid=2679 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q71B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	80	97.6%
2	STRONG	2	2.4%
0	N.A.	2679	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1777 /-] [Invalid=984 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q71B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1757	98.9%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	0	
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	0.2%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	3	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	0.2%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	0.2%
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	0.2%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	0	
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	0.2%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.1%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.1%

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	0.2%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	1	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMEMTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	0.1%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	

v358: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	1	0.1%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v359: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=19 /-] [Invalid=2742 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q71B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	2	<div><div></div></div> 10.5%
2	MEDIUM	0	
3	LOW	17	<div><div></div></div> 89.5%
0	N.A.	2742	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v360: DISLIKE UNION NATIONALE-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=19 /-] [Invalid=2742 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q71B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	18	<div><div></div></div> 94.7%
2	STRONG	1	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
0	N.A.	2742	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2704 /-] [Invalid=57 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q67A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 54.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	36	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	40	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	15	0.6%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	5	0.2%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	1	0.0%
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	13	0.5%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	2	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	2	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	3	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	15	0.6%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	2	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	4	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	2	0.1%
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.0%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	7	0.3%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	16	0.6%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	8	0.3%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	5	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	1	0.0%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	4	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	2	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	1	0.0%
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	2	0.1%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	6	0.2%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	9	0.3%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	2	0.1%
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	6	0.2%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	7	0.3%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	5	0.2%
285	SCHOOL TAX	1	0.0%
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	2	0.1%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	2	0.1%
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	1	0.0%
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	3	0.1%
328	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	2	0.1%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	7	0.3%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	4	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	1	0.0%
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	34	1.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	8	0.3%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	4	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	1	0.0%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	17	0.6%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	1	0.0%
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	3	0.1%
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	4	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	4	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	3	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	5	0.2%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	14	0.5%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	19	0.7%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	3	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	4	0.1%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	2	0.1%
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	

v361: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	6	0.2%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	3	0.1%
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.0%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	3	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.1%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	14	0.5%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	103	3.8%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	8	0.3%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	5	0.2%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	3	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	4	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	6	0.2%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	7	0.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.1%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	65	2.4%
948	NOTHING	110	4.1%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	434	16.1%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	27	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	30	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=514 /-] [Invalid=2247 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q67A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	3	0.6%
2	MEDIUM	27	5.3%
3	LOW	484	94.2%
0	N.A.	2247	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=514 /-] [Invalid=2247 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q67A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	483	94.0%
2	STRONG	31	6.0%
0	N.A.	2247	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2759 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (SECOND MENTION) (ALL PROVINCES)		
Notes	Q67A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2605	94.4%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	5	0.2%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	3	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	4	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	4	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	1	0.0%
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	2	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	1	0.0%
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	3	0.1%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	9	0.3%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	11	0.4%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	3	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	1	0.0%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	3	0.1%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	2	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	2	0.1%
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	2	0.1%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	3	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	3	0.1%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	1	0.0%
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	3	0.1%
328	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	1	0.0%
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	3	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	2	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	9	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	4	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	3	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	

v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	1	0.0%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	

# v364: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v365: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=151 /-] [Invalid=2610 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q67A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	7	4.6%
3	LOW	144	95.4%
0	N.A.	2610	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v366: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=151 /-] [Invalid=2610 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q67A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	144	95.4%
2	STRONG	7	4.6%
0	N.A.	2610	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2702 /-] [Invalid=59 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY?		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION) (ALL PROVINCES)		
Notes	Q67B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	54.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	37	1.4%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	21	0.8%

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	11	0.4%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	6	0.2%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	8	0.3%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	7	0.3%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	1	0.0%
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	5	0.2%

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	2	0.1%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	13	0.5%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	8	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	5	0.2%
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	2	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	7	0.3%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	1	0.0%
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	5	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	6	0.2%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	2	0.1%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	4	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	23	0.9%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	2	0.1%
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
243	AUTO INSURANCE	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	4	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	6	0.2%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	4	0.1%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	8	0.3%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	6	0.2%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	1	0.0%
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.0%

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	5	0.2%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	6	0.2%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	1	0.0%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	3	0.1%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	1	0.0%
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	4	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	6	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	24	0.9%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	4	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	4	0.1%
517	WEAK	16	0.6%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	2	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	6	0.2%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	4	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	2	0.1%

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	2	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.0%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	2	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	5	0.2%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	3	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	1	0.0%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	3	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	3	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	12	0.4%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	

v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	10	0.4%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	4	0.1%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	2	0.1%
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	2	0.1%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	5	0.2%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	6	0.2%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	1	0.0%
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	2	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	6	0.2%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	68	2.5%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	2	0.1%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%

# v367: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	58	2.1%
948	NOTHING	97	3.6%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	574	21.2%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	1	0.0%
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	28	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	1	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	30	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=466 /-] [Invalid=2295 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q67B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	8	1.7%
2	MEDIUM	35	7.5%
3	LOW	423	90.8%
0	N.A.	2295	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=466 /-] [Invalid=2295 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q67B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	428	91.8%
2	STRONG	38	8.2%
0	N.A.	2295	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Notes	Q67B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.
--------------	--

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2643	95.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	0	
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	6	0.2%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	1	0.0%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	6	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	5	0.2%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	4	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	1	0.0%
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	2	0.1%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	4	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	1	0.0%
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	1	0.0%
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	1	0.0%
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.0%
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	2	0.1%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	1	0.0%
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	3	0.1%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	3	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	7	0.3%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	5	0.2%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	3	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	2	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMEMTATION	0	

v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	2	0.1%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	

# v370: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	1	0.0%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v371: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=117 /-] [Invalid=2644 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q67B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	3	2.6%
2	MEDIUM	10	8.5%
3	LOW	104	88.9%
0	N.A.	2644	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=117 /-] [Invalid=2644 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q67B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	104	88.9%
2	STRONG	13	11.1%
0	N.A.	2644	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		

# v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2393 /-] [Invalid=368 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q68A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	61.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	11	0.5%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	10	0.4%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	9	0.4%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	2	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	13	0.5%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	3	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	10	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	1	0.0%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	1	0.0%
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	17	0.7%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	6	0.3%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.2%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	4	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	15	0.6%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	2	0.1%
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	1	0.0%
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	2	0.1%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	7	0.3%
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.0%
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.0%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	12	0.5%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	11	0.5%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	3	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	7	0.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	19	0.8%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	4	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	5	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	16	0.7%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	8	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	

v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	2	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	1	0.0%
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	15	0.6%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	102	4.3%

# v373: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	2	0.1%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	3	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	2	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	60	2.5%
948	NOTHING	71	3.0%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	411	17.2%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	26	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	28	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v374: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=305 /-] [Invalid=2456 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q68A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	18	5.9%
3	LOW	287	94.1%
0	N.A.	2456	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v375: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=305 /-] [Invalid=2456 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q68A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	275	90.2%
2	STRONG	30	9.8%

# v375: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	N.A.	2456	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2445 /-] [Invalid=316 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q68A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2354	96.3%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	3	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	2	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	2	0.1%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	1	0.0%
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	8	0.3%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.2%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	7	0.3%
245	MINING POLICY	3	0.1%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	3	0.1%
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	7	0.3%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	3	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	5	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%

v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	2	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	1	0.0%
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	

# v376: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v377: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=90 /-] [Invalid=2671 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q68A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	4	4.4%
3	LOW	86	95.6%
0	N.A.	2671	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v378: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=90 /-] [Invalid=2671 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		

# v378: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Notes		Q68A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	86	<div><div></div></div> 95.6%
2	STRONG	4	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
0	N.A.	2671	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2376 /-] [Invalid=385 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.	
Literal question		(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)	
Notes		Q68B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 61.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	11	0.5%
103	COMMUNISM	3	0.1%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	6	0.3%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	2	0.1%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	2	0.1%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	16	0.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	21	0.9%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	10	0.4%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	3	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	4	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	5	0.2%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	2	0.1%
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	13	0.5%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	2	0.1%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	5	0.2%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	1	0.0%
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	3	0.1%

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	3	0.1%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	5	0.2%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	1	0.0%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	4	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	5	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	14	0.6%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	7	0.3%

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	4	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	2	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	3	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	3	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	5	0.2%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	1	0.0%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	2	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	2	0.1%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	4	0.2%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	1	0.0%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	

v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	9	0.4%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	4	0.2%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.0%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	5	0.2%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	1	0.0%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	

# v379: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	7	0.3%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	80	3.4%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	6	0.3%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	52	2.2%
948	NOTHING	54	2.3%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	427	18.0%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	29	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	42	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v380: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=333 /-] [Invalid=2428 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q68B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	0.3%
2	MEDIUM	22	6.6%
3	LOW	310	93.1%
0	N.A.	2428	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v381: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=333 /-] [Invalid=2428 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.?		

# v381: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q68B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	292	87.7%
2	STRONG	41	12.3%
0	N.A.	2428	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2447 /-] [Invalid=314 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.? (SECOND MENTION) (NOT ASKED IN QUEBEC)		
Notes	Q68B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2332	95.3%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	2	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
103	COMMUNISM	2	0.1%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	1	0.0%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	1	0.0%
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	5	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	7	0.3%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	8	0.3%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	4	0.2%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	2	0.1%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	1	0.0%
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	9	0.4%
245	MINING POLICY	7	0.3%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	1	0.0%
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	1	0.0%
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	1	0.0%
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.0%
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	4	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	4	0.2%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	2	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	3	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	

v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	

# v382: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	1	0.0%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	314	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v383: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-ARTICLATE 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=113 /-] [Invalid=2648 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q68B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	1	0.9%
2	MEDIUM	14	12.4%
3	LOW	98	86.7%
0	N.A.	2648	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v384: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=113 /-] [Invalid=2648 /-]		

# v384: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE N.D.P.?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q68B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	101	<div><div></div></div> 89.4%
2	STRONG	12	<div><div></div></div> 10.6%
0	N.A.	2648	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1775 /-] [Invalid=986 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 82.4%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	0	
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO Diefenbaker	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO Diefenbaker	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	Flora MacDonald	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	2	0.1%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.1%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	17	1.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	3	0.2%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	14	0.8%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	1	0.1%

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	17	1.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.1%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.1%
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	2	0.1%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	1	0.1%
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.1%

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	1	0.1%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	1	0.1%
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	2	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	5	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	4	0.2%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	1	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	2	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	1	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	9	0.5%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	6	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTTATION	2	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	1	0.1%
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.1%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	

# v385: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	20	1.1%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.1%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	16	0.9%
948	NOTHING	43	2.4%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	102	5.7%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	2	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v386: LIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=130 /-] [Invalid=2631 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	4	3.1%
2	MEDIUM	9	6.9%
3	LOW	117	90.0%
0	N.A.	2631	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v387: LIKE PQ-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=130 /-] [Invalid=2631 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	126	96.9%
2	STRONG	4	3.1%
0	N.A.	2631	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1776 /-] [Invalid=985 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1729	97.4%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	0	
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.2%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.1%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	4	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.2%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	3	0.2%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.1%
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	1	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	2	0.1%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	1	0.1%
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.1%
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	

# v388: LIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v389: LIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=47 /-] [Invalid=2714 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	2	4.3%
3	LOW	45	95.7%
0	N.A.	2714	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v390: LIKE PQ-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=47 /-] [Invalid=2714 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	47	100.0%
2	STRONG	0	
0	N.A.	2714	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1774 /-] [Invalid=987 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q70B in the documentation RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	82.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	9	0.5%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	3	0.2%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.1%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	6	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	3	0.2%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	99	5.6%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
196	TOO SEPARATIST	6	0.3%
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	2	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	1	0.1%
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.1%
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	1	0.1%
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	2	0.1%
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	8	0.5%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH","REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	1	0.1%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.1%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.1%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.1%
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.1%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	1	0.1%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	

# v391: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.1%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	13	0.7%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.1%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.1%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	8	0.5%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	11	0.6%
948	NOTHING	16	0.9%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	81	4.6%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	3	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v392: DISLIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=178 /-] [Invalid=2583 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q70B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	8	4.5%
2	MEDIUM	21	11.8%
3	LOW	149	83.7%
0	N.A.	2583	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v393: DISLIKE PQ-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=178 /-] [Invalid=2583 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q70B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	168	94.4%
2	STRONG	10	5.6%
0	N.A.	2583	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1776 /-] [Invalid=985 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS? (SECOND MENTION) (QUEBEC ONLY)		
Notes	Q70B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1724	97.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	0	
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	1	0.1%
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	1	0.1%
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	3	0.2%
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	0	
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	1	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.1%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	8	0.5%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
196	TOO SEPARATIST	1	0.1%
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	4	0.2%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.1%
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.1%
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.1%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	3	0.2%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, SC	2	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	1	0.1%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	0.1%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	

# v394: DISLIKE PQ-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.1%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	1	0.1%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	984	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v395: DISLIKE PQ-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=51 /-] [Invalid=2710 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q70B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	2	3.9%
2	MEDIUM	6	11.8%
3	LOW	43	84.3%
0	N.A.	2710	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v396: DISLIKE PQ-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=51 /-] [Invalid=2710 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q70B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	45	<div><div></div></div> 88.2%
2	STRONG	6	<div><div></div></div> 11.8%
0	N.A.	2710	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2029 /-] [Invalid=732 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q69A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 72.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	2	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	12	0.6%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	2	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	2	0.1%
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	9	0.4%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	1	0.0%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	1	0.0%
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	1	0.0%
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
243	AUTO INSURANCE	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	2	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	11	0.5%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL	1	0.0%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	4	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	3	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	4	0.2%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, SC	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	4	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	5	0.2%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	3	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.0%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALLY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	

v397: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	13	0.6%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	53	2.6%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.1%
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	38	1.9%
948	NOTHING	66	3.3%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	246	12.1%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	7	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	718	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	7	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v398: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=138 /-] [Invalid=2623 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q69A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	7	5.1%
3	LOW	131	94.9%
0	N.A.	2623	

# v398: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v399: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=138 /-] [Invalid=2623 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q69A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	135	97.8%
2	STRONG	3	2.2%
0	N.A.	2623	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950/998]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2043 /-] [Invalid=718 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)? SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q69A in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	1994	97.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	2	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	3	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	4	0.2%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	0	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0%
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	

v400: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVENT HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	718	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v401: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=48 /-] [Invalid=2713 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q69A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	0	
2	MEDIUM	2	4.2%
3	LOW	46	95.8%
0	N.A.	2713	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v402: LIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=48 /-] [Invalid=2713 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q69A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	46	95.8%
2	STRONG	2	4.2%
0	N.A.	2713	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2029 /-] [Invalid=732 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION) (ALBERTA, BRITISH COLUMBIA, MANITOBA, AND QUEBEC ONLY)		
Notes	Q69B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	72.1%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	7	0.3%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	8	0.4%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.2%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	3	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	1	0.0%
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	2	0.1%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	2	0.1%
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	0	
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	5	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	5	0.2%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
133	MONETARY POLICY	3	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY(NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	1	0.0%
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	1	0.0%
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	1	0.0%
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	4	0.2%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	43	2.1%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	5	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	6	0.3%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	5	0.2%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	10	0.5%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	7	0.3%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	2	0.1%
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	9	0.4%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	3	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	3	0.1%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	

v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.0%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	2	0.1%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	8	0.4%
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	28	1.4%
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	3	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	30	1.5%
948	NOTHING	49	2.4%
949	NO,NOT REALLY	252	12.4%
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	7	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	718	

# v403: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	7	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v404: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=190 /-] [Invalid=2571 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q69B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
2	MEDIUM	13	<div><div></div></div> 6.8%
3	LOW	174	<div><div></div></div> 91.6%
0	N.A.	2571	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v405: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=190 /-] [Invalid=2571 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q69B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	178	<div><div></div></div> 93.7%
2	STRONG	12	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
0	N.A.	2571	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2043 /-] [Invalid=718 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Literal question	(CONTENT) IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q69B in the documentation. RESPONSES 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP, 100 TO 119 REFER TO IDEOLOGY, 125 TO 329 REFER TO POLICIES, 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP, 500 TO 559 REFER TO STYLE, 700 TO 893 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES, 900 TO 999 ARE GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1996	<div><div></div></div> 97.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	3	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
30	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
31	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO DIEFENBAKER	0	
75	DALTON CAMP (RUNNING PARTY)	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS (NOT M.P.'S)	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
100	CONSERVATISM	0	
101	LIBERALISM	0	
102	SOCIALISM	0	
103	COMMUNISM	0	
104	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
105	RIGHT WING (FASCISM)	1	0.0%
106	CENTRE	0	
107	LEFT WING	0	
108	TOO SOCIALIST (REFERENCE TO WAFFLE)	0	
109	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
110	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
111	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
112	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
116	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
117	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
118	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
119	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
150	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO PRICE CO	0	
151	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
152	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PRICE CONTROL NO REFERENCE TO WAGE CO	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
178	FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD,BERYL PLUMPTRE	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLIC OUTPUTS	0	
202	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
203	PROMOTES CANADIAN UNITY	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	BILL 22	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
295	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
305	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
311	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
312	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
313	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
314	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
315	TOURISM	0	
319	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
320	DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME	0	
321	SPADINA EXPRESSWAY	0	
322	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
324	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
326	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
328	SALES TAX	0	
329	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
330	PRO FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
331	ANTI FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	0.1%
332	PRO ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS,LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
375	PRO YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
390	PRO MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO QUEBEC	0	
393	ANTI QUEBEC	0	
394	PRO ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
399	ANTI BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO EAST	0	
402	PRO WEST	0	
403	ANTI WEST	0	
407	UMPIRE REFERENCE, TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN,DOING A POOR JOB,ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	2	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,SC	2	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE,REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, "DOWN TO EARTH", "REGULAR GUY"	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	2	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	1	0.0%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	1	0.0%
550	GENERAL PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
559	COALITION GOVERNMENT OR OPPOSITION	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	2	0.1%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
711	REFERENCE TO MRS. TRUDEAU'S ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	

v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER(LONG ENOUGH)TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE,POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
755	SUPPORT OF LIBERAL PARTY	0	
757	VOTES FOR PARTY IN POWER	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
763	DISAPPROVE OF HANDLING OF JONE'S CASE	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.0%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
870	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
888	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	0	
891	DON'T KNOW,HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
892	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS	0	
893	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL,A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD,ALL RIGHT,OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	

# v406: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-CONTENT 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
947	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION	0	
948	NOTHING	0	
949	NO,NOT REALLY	0	
990	POST ELECTION RESPONSE	0	
950	REFUSAL(NO ANSWER)	0	
998	INAPPLICABLE,QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS PROV.	718	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v407: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-ARTICULATENESS 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=47 /-] [Invalid=2714 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	ARTICULATENESS (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q69B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIGH	3	6.4%
2	MEDIUM	3	6.4%
3	LOW	41	87.2%
0	N.A.	2714	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v408: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SC-INTENSITY 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=47 /-] [Invalid=2714 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Literal question	INTENSITY (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q69B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WEAK	40	85.1%
2	STRONG	7	14.9%
0	N.A.	2714	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v409: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PARTIES-PROVINCIAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1228 /-] [Invalid=1533 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q59A. SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT IT DOESN'T MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE WHICH PARTY IS IN POWER IN OTTAWA, WHILE OTHERS THINK THAT IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS? / Q59B. HOW ABOUT IN THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT? DOES IT MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE THERE?		

# v409: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PARTIES-PROVINCIAL			
Notes		Q59A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE	578	<div></div> 47.1%
2	SOME DIFFERENCE	400	<div></div> 32.6%
3	NO DIFFERENCE	245	<div></div> 20.0%
4	DEPENDS	5	<div></div> 0.4%
8	D.K.	1531	
9	N.A.	2	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v410: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM R			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1295 -/] [Invalid=1466 -/]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION? WHAT EXACTLY DO YOU DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)	
Notes		Q76AB in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HOUSEWIFE	410	<div></div> 31.7%
2	RETIRED	99	<div></div> 7.6%
3	STUDENT	52	<div></div> 4.0%
4	UNEMPLOYED	18	<div></div> 1.4%
5	NEVER WORKED	4	<div></div> 0.3%
6	OTHER REASONS	9	<div></div> 0.7%
11	PROFESSIONAL	85	<div></div> 6.6%
12	SEMI PROFESSIONAL	35	<div></div> 2.7%
21	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (LARGE)	31	<div></div> 2.4%
22	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (SMALL)	89	<div></div> 6.9%
30	CLERICAL AND SALES	129	<div></div> 10.0%
41	SKILLED LABOUR	87	<div></div> 6.7%
42	SEMI SKILLED LABOUR	91	<div></div> 7.0%
43	UNSKILLED LABOUR	100	<div></div> 7.7%
50	FARMERS AND ALL FARM OCCUPATIONS	56	<div></div> 4.3%
88	UNCLASSIFIED	1463	
99	N.A.	3	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v411: MANUAL/NON-MANUAL/FARM R			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=703 -/] [Invalid=2058 -/]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION? WHAT EXACTLY DO YOU DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)	
Interviewer's instructions		Q76C. RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS NON-MANUAL, MANUAL OR FARMING.	
Notes		Q76AB in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NON-MANUAL	323	<div></div> 45.9%

# v411: MANUAL/NON-MANUAL/FARM R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	MANUAL	328	<div></div> 46.7%
3	FARMING	52	<div></div> 7.4%
9	N.A.	2058	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v412: EXECUTIVE POSITION? R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=297 /-] [Invalid=2464 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not have a manual occupation.		
Literal question	YOUR JOB AN EXECUTIVE POSITION OR WHAT?		
Notes	Q76D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OWNER	26	<div></div> 8.8%
2	MANAGER	72	<div></div> 24.2%
3	NOT EXECUTIVE	199	<div></div> 67.0%
9	N.A.	2464	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v413: NO. OF EMPLOYEES R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=103 /-] [Invalid=2658 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have non-manual occupations and who are owners or managers.		
Literal question	HOW MANY PEOPLE DOES YOUR COMPANY EMPLOY?		
Notes	Q76E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 EMPLOYEES	6	<div></div> 5.8%
1	1 EMPLOYEES	5	<div></div> 4.9%
2	2 EMPLOYEES	2	<div></div> 1.9%
3	3 EMPLOYEES	3	<div></div> 2.9%
4	4 EMPLOYEES	3	<div></div> 2.9%
5	5 EMPLOYEES	4	<div></div> 3.9%
6	6 EMPLOYEES	1	<div></div> 1.0%
7	7 EMPLOYEES	2	<div></div> 1.9%
8	8 EMPLOYEES	4	<div></div> 3.9%
9	9 EMPLOYEES	0	
10	10 EMPLOYEES	1	<div></div> 1.0%
11	11 EMPLOYEES	1	<div></div> 1.0%
12	12 EMPLOYEES	1	<div></div> 1.0%
13	13 EMPLOYEES	0	
14	14 EMPLOYEES	1	<div></div> 1.0%
15	15 EMPLOYEES	3	<div></div> 2.9%
16	16 EMPLOYEES	0	
17	17 EMPLOYEES	0	
18	18 EMPLOYEES	0	
19	19 EMPLOYEES	0	

v413: NO. OF EMPLOYEES R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
20	20 EMPLOYEES	0	
21	21 EMPLOYEES	0	
22	22 EMPLOYEES	0	
23	23 EMPLOYEES	0	
24	24 EMPLOYEES	0	
25	25 EMPLOYEES	2	1.9%
26	26 EMPLOYEES	0	
27	27 EMPLOYEES	0	
28	28 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
29	29 EMPLOYEES	0	
30	30 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
31	31 EMPLOYEES	0	
32	32 EMPLOYEES	0	
33	33 EMPLOYEES	0	
34	34 EMPLOYEES	0	
35	35 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
36	36 EMPLOYEES	0	
37	37 EMPLOYEES	0	
38	38 EMPLOYEES	0	
39	39 EMPLOYEES	0	
40	40 EMPLOYEES	2	1.9%
41	41 EMPLOYEES	0	
42	42 EMPLOYEES	0	
43	43 EMPLOYEES	0	
44	44 EMPLOYEES	0	
45	45 EMPLOYEES	0	
46	46 EMPLOYEES	0	
47	47 EMPLOYEES	0	
48	48 EMPLOYEES	0	
49	49 EMPLOYEES	0	
50	50 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
61	100 EMPLOYEES	9	8.7%
62	200 EMPLOYEES	7	6.8%
63	300 EMPLOYEES	5	4.9%
64	400 EMPLOYEES	3	2.9%
65	500 EMPLOYEES	5	4.9%
66	600 EMPLOYEES	2	1.9%
67	700 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
68	800 EMPLOYEES	0	
69	900 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
71	1000 EMPLOYEES	7	6.8%
72	2000 EMPLOYEES	4	3.9%
73	3000 EMPLOYEES	2	1.9%
74	4000 EMPLOYEES	1	1.0%
75	5000 EMPLOYEES	2	1.9%

# v413: NO. OF EMPLOYEES R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	6000 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
77	7000 EMPLOYEES	0	
78	8000 EMPLOYEES	0	
79	9000 EMPLOYEES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	8	<div><div></div></div> 7.8%
99	N.A. EMPLOYEES	2658	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v414: NO.WORK UNDER R R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=302 /-] [Invalid=2459 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE WORKING UNDER YOU?		
Notes	Q76F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 EMPLOYEES	159	<div><div></div></div> 52.6%
1	1 EMPLOYEES	16	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
2	2 EMPLOYEES	12	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
3	3 EMPLOYEES	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
4	4 EMPLOYEES	13	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
5	5 EMPLOYEES	14	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%
6	6 EMPLOYEES	10	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
7	7 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
8	8 EMPLOYEES	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
9	9 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
10	10 EMPLOYEES	8	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
11	11 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
12	12 EMPLOYEES	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
13	13 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
14	14 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	15 EMPLOYEES	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
16	16 EMPLOYEES	0	
17	17 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
18	18 EMPLOYEES	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
19	19 EMPLOYEES	0	
20	20 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
21	21 EMPLOYEES	0	
22	22 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
23	23 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
24	24 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
25	25 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
26	26 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
27	27 EMPLOYEES	0	
28	28 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
29	29 EMPLOYEES	0	

# v414: NO.WORK UNDER R R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	30 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
31	31 EMPLOYEES	0	
32	32 EMPLOYEES	0	
33	33 EMPLOYEES	0	
34	34 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
35	35 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
36	36 EMPLOYEES	0	
37	37 EMPLOYEES	0	
38	38 EMPLOYEES	0	
39	39 EMPLOYEES	0	
40	40 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
41	41 EMPLOYEES	0	
42	42 EMPLOYEES	0	
43	43 EMPLOYEES	0	
44	44 EMPLOYEES	0	
45	45 EMPLOYEES	0	
46	46 EMPLOYEES	0	
47	47 EMPLOYEES	0	
48	48 EMPLOYEES	0	
49	49 EMPLOYEES	0	
50	50 EMPLOYEES	3	1.0%
61	100 EMPLOYEES	7	2.3%
62	200 EMPLOYEES	2	0.7%
63	300 EMPLOYEES	2	0.7%
64	400 EMPLOYEES	0	
65	500 EMPLOYEES	0	
66	600 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
67	700 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
68	800 EMPLOYEES	0	
69	900 EMPLOYEES	0	
71	1000 EMPLOYEES	0	
72	2000 EMPLOYEES	0	
73	3000 EMPLOYEES	0	
74	4000 EMPLOYEES	0	
75	5000 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
76	6000 EMPLOYEES	0	
77	7000 EMPLOYEES	0	
78	8000 EMPLOYEES	0	
79	9000 EMPLOYEES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	0	
99	N.A. EMPLOYEES	2459	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v415: TYPE OF BUSINESS R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=303 /-] [Invalid=2458 /-]		

# v415: TYPE OF BUSINESS R			
Universe		Asked only to respondents with non-manual occupations.	
Literal question		WHAT DOES YOUR COMPANY DO?	
Notes		Q76G in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	AGRICULTURE	0	
2	MINING	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
3	CONSTRUCTION	10	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
4	MANUFACTURING (DURABLE GOODS)	21	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
5	MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING (NON-DURABLE GOODS)	22	<div><div></div></div> 7.3%
6	UTILITIES, TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS	21	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
7	WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE	53	<div><div></div></div> 17.5%
8	FINANCE, INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE, ADVERTISING	27	<div><div></div></div> 8.9%
9	REPAIR SERVICES	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
10	PERSONAL SERVICES	12	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
11	ENTERTAINMENT, RECREATION	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
12	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	86	<div><div></div></div> 28.4%
13	ALL GOVERNMENT	40	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
99	N.A.	2458	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v416: SPECIAL TRAINING R			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=134 /-] [Invalid=2627 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.	
Literal question		DID YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR YOUR JOB?	
Post-question		(IF YES) WHAT SORT OF TRAINING?	
Notes		Q76DE in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	0	
1	APPRENTICESHIP	64	<div><div></div></div> 47.8%
2	SPECIAL CLASSES	55	<div><div></div></div> 41.0%
3	OTHER	15	<div><div></div></div> 11.2%
9	N.A.	2627	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v417: SKILLED WORKER R			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=317 /-] [Invalid=2444 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.	
Literal question		DOES YOUR EMPLOYER REGARD YOU AS A SKILLED PERSON?	
Notes		Q76F in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	234	<div><div></div></div> 73.8%
2	NO	83	<div><div></div></div> 26.2%
9	N.A.	2444	

# v417: SKILLED WORKER R			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v418: NO. WORK UNDER R R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=310 /-] [Invalid=2451 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.		
Literal question	HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE WORKING UNDER YOU?		
Notes	Q76G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 EMPLOYEES	221	<div><div></div></div> 71.3%
1	1 EMPLOYEES	17	<div><div></div></div> 5.5%
2	2 EMPLOYEES	22	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
3	3 EMPLOYEES	11	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
4	4 EMPLOYEES	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
5	5 EMPLOYEES	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
6	6 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
7	7 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
8	8 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
9	9 EMPLOYEES	0	
10	10 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
11	11 EMPLOYEES	0	
12	12 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
13	13 EMPLOYEES	0	
14	14 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	15 EMPLOYEES	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
16	16 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
17	17 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
18	18 EMPLOYEES	0	
19	19 EMPLOYEES	0	
20	20 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
21	21 EMPLOYEES	0	
22	22 EMPLOYEES	0	
23	23 EMPLOYEES	0	
24	24 EMPLOYEES	0	
25	25 EMPLOYEES	0	
26	26 EMPLOYEES	0	
27	27 EMPLOYEES	0	
28	28 EMPLOYEES	0	
29	29 EMPLOYEES	0	
30	30 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
31	31 EMPLOYEES	0	
32	32 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
33	33 EMPLOYEES	0	
34	34 EMPLOYEES	0	
35	35 EMPLOYEES	0	
36	36 EMPLOYEES	0	

# v418: NO. WORK UNDER R R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	37 EMPLOYEES	0	
38	38 EMPLOYEES	0	
39	39 EMPLOYEES	0	
40	40 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
41	41 EMPLOYEES	0	
42	42 EMPLOYEES	0	
43	43 EMPLOYEES	0	
44	44 EMPLOYEES	0	
45	45 EMPLOYEES	0	
46	46 EMPLOYEES	0	
47	47 EMPLOYEES	0	
48	48 EMPLOYEES	0	
49	49 EMPLOYEES	0	
50	50 EMPLOYEES	0	
61	100 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
62	200 EMPLOYEES	0	
63	300 EMPLOYEES	0	
64	400 EMPLOYEES	0	
65	500 EMPLOYEES	0	
66	600 EMPLOYEES	0	
67	700 EMPLOYEES	0	
68	800 EMPLOYEES	0	
69	900 EMPLOYEES	0	
71	1000 EMPLOYEES	0	
72	2000 EMPLOYEES	0	
73	3000 EMPLOYEES	0	
74	4000 EMPLOYEES	0	
75	5000 EMPLOYEES	0	
76	6000 EMPLOYEES	0	
77	7000 EMPLOYEES	0	
78	8000 EMPLOYEES	0	
79	9000 EMPLOYEES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	0	
99	N.A. EMPLOYEES	2451	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v419: YEARS EXPERIENCE R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=318 /-] [Invalid=2443 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.		
Literal question	HOW MANY YEARS EXPERIENCE DO YOU HAVE ON THE JOB?		
Notes	Q76H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 YEARS	1	0.3%
1	1 YEARS	40	12.6%

v419: YEARS EXPERIENCE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	2 YEARS	17	5.3%
3	3 YEARS	26	8.2%
4	4 YEARS	13	4.1%
5	5 YEARS	13	4.1%
6	6 YEARS	15	4.7%
7	7 YEARS	11	3.5%
8	8 YEARS	13	4.1%
9	9 YEARS	9	2.8%
10	10 YEARS	21	6.6%
11	11 YEARS	3	0.9%
12	12 YEARS	15	4.7%
13	13 YEARS	5	1.6%
14	14 YEARS	12	3.8%
15	15 YEARS	15	4.7%
16	16 YEARS	3	0.9%
17	17 YEARS	3	0.9%
18	18 YEARS	5	1.6%
19	19 YEARS	3	0.9%
20	20 YEARS	18	5.7%
21	21 YEARS	3	0.9%
22	22 YEARS	1	0.3%
23	23 YEARS	3	0.9%
24	24 YEARS	2	0.6%
25	25 YEARS	6	1.9%
26	26 YEARS	2	0.6%
27	27 YEARS	3	0.9%
28	28 YEARS	4	1.3%
29	29 YEARS	1	0.3%
30	30 YEARS	4	1.3%
31	31 YEARS	1	0.3%
32	32 YEARS	2	0.6%
33	33 YEARS	0	
34	34 YEARS	3	0.9%
35	35 YEARS	4	1.3%
36	36 YEARS	0	
37	37 YEARS	0	
38	38 YEARS	1	0.3%
39	39 YEARS	0	
40	40 YEARS	6	1.9%
41	41 YEARS	0	
42	42 YEARS	1	0.3%
43	43 YEARS	2	0.6%
44	44 YEARS	0	
45	45 YEARS	2	0.6%
46	46 YEARS	2	0.6%

v419: YEARS EXPERIENCE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
47	47 YEARS	1	0.3%
48	48 YEARS	1	0.3%
49	49 YEARS	0	
50	50 YEARS	0	
51	51 YEARS	0	
52	52 YEARS	0	
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	0	
55	55 YEARS	0	
56	56 YEARS	0	
57	57 YEARS	0	
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	0	
60	60 YEARS	0	
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	2	0.6%
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	0	
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS	0	
71	71 YEARS	0	
72	72 YEARS	0	
73	73 YEARS	0	
74	74 YEARS	0	
75	75 YEARS	0	
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	0	
78	78 YEARS	0	
79	79 YEARS	0	
80	80 YEARS	0	
81	81 YEARS	0	
82	82 YEARS	0	
83	83 YEARS	0	
84	84 YEARS	0	
85	85 YEARS	0	
86	86 YEARS	0	
87	87 YEARS	0	
88	88 YEARS	0	
89	89 YEARS	0	
90	90 YEARS	0	
91	91 YEARS	0	

# v419: YEARS EXPERIENCE R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	92 YEARS	0	
93	93 YEARS	0	
94	94 YEARS	0	
95	95 YEARS	0	
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	0	
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	N.A.	2443	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v420: OWN OR MANAGE FARM R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=52 /-] [Invalid=2709 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are farm workers.		
Literal question	DO YOU OWN THE FARM OR MANAGE IT?		
Notes	Q76D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OWNER	45	<div></div> 86.5%
2	MANAGER	2	<div></div> 3.8%
3	OTHER FARM WORKER	5	<div></div> 9.6%
9	N.A.	2709	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v421: YEARS WORKED ON FARM R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10 /-] [Invalid=2751 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are farm workers.		
Literal question	HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN WORKING ON A FARM?		
Notes	Q76E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 YEARS	1	<div></div> 10.0%
1	1 YEARS	0	
2	2 YEARS	1	
3	3 YEARS	1	
4	4 YEARS	3	
5	5 YEARS	0	
6	6 YEARS	0	
7	7 YEARS	0	
8	8 YEARS	0	
9	9 YEARS	0	
10	10 YEARS	0	
11	11 YEARS	0	
12	12 YEARS	0	
13	13 YEARS	0	
14	14 YEARS	1	

v421: YEARS WORKED ON FARM R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
15	15 YEARS	0	
16	16 YEARS	0	
17	17 YEARS	0	
18	18 YEARS	0	
19	19 YEARS	0	
20	20 YEARS	0	
21	21 YEARS	0	
22	22 YEARS	1	10.0%
23	23 YEARS	0	
24	24 YEARS	0	
25	25 YEARS	0	
26	26 YEARS	0	
27	27 YEARS	0	
28	28 YEARS	0	
29	29 YEARS	0	
30	30 YEARS	0	
31	31 YEARS	0	
32	32 YEARS	0	
33	33 YEARS	0	
34	34 YEARS	0	
35	35 YEARS	1	10.0%
36	36 YEARS	0	
37	37 YEARS	0	
38	38 YEARS	0	
39	39 YEARS	0	
40	40 YEARS	0	
41	41 YEARS	0	
42	42 YEARS	0	
43	43 YEARS	0	
44	44 YEARS	0	
45	45 YEARS	0	
46	46 YEARS	0	
47	47 YEARS	1	10.0%
48	48 YEARS	0	
49	49 YEARS	0	
50	50 YEARS	0	
51	51 YEARS	0	
52	52 YEARS	0	
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	0	
55	55 YEARS	0	
56	56 YEARS	0	
57	57 YEARS	0	
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	0	

# v421: YEARS WORKED ON FARM R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
60	60 YEARS	0	
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	0	
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	0	
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS	0	
71	71 YEARS	0	
72	72 YEARS	0	
73	73 YEARS	0	
74	74 YEARS	0	
75	75 YEARS	0	
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	0	
78	78 YEARS	0	
79	79 YEARS	0	
80	80 YEARS	0	
81	81 YEARS	0	
82	82 YEARS	0	
83	83 YEARS	0	
84	84 YEARS	0	
85	85 YEARS	0	
86	86 YEARS	0	
87	87 YEARS	0	
88	88 YEARS	0	
89	89 YEARS	0	
90	90 YEARS	0	
91	91 YEARS	0	
92	92 YEARS	0	
93	93 YEARS	0	
94	94 YEARS	0	
95	95 YEARS	0	
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	0	
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	N.A.	2751	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v422: NO. ACRES ON FARM R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=49 /-] [Invalid=2712 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are farm workers.		

v422: NO. ACRES ON FARM R

Literal question		HOW MANY ACRES IS THE FARM?	
Notes		Q76G in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 ACRES	0	
1	1 ACRES	0	
2	2 ACRES	0	
3	3 ACRES	0	
4	4 ACRES	0	
5	5 ACRES	0	
6	6 ACRES	0	
7	7 ACRES	0	
8	8 ACRES	0	
9	9 ACRES	0	
10	10 ACRES	0	
11	11 ACRES	0	
12	12 ACRES	0	
13	13 ACRES	0	
14	14 ACRES	0	
15	15 ACRES	0	
16	16 ACRES	0	
17	17 ACRES	0	
18	18 ACRES	0	
19	19 ACRES	0	
20	20 ACRES	0	
21	21 ACRES	0	
22	22 ACRES	0	
23	23 ACRES	0	
24	24 ACRES	0	
25	25 ACRES	1	2.0%
26	26 ACRES	0	
27	27 ACRES	0	
28	28 ACRES	0	
29	29 ACRES	0	
30	30 ACRES	0	
31	31 ACRES	0	
32	32 ACRES	0	
33	33 ACRES	0	
34	34 ACRES	0	
35	35 ACRES	0	
36	36 ACRES	0	
37	37 ACRES	0	
38	38 ACRES	0	
39	39 ACRES	0	
40	40 ACRES	1	2.0%
41	41 ACRES	0	
42	42 ACRES	0	

# v422: NO. ACRES ON FARM R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	43 ACRES	0	
44	44 ACRES	0	
45	45 ACRES	0	
46	46 ACRES	0	
47	47 ACRES	0	
48	48 ACRES	0	
49	49 ACRES	0	
50	50 ACRES	0	
61	100 ACRES	7	<div><div></div></div> 14.3%
62	200 ACRES	16	<div><div></div></div> 32.7%
63	300 ACRES	5	<div><div></div></div> 10.2%
64	400 ACRES	1	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
65	500 ACRES	1	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
66	600 ACRES	5	<div><div></div></div> 10.2%
67	700 ACRES	0	
68	800 ACRES	3	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
69	900 ACRES	1	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
71	1000 ACRES	6	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
72	2000 ACRES	1	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
73	3000 ACRES	1	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
74	4000 ACRES	0	
75	5000 ACRES	0	
76	6000 ACRES	0	
77	7000 ACRES	0	
78	8000 ACRES	0	
79	9000 ACRES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE ACRES	0	
99	N.A.	2712	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v423: MAIN PRODUCT OF FARM R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=51 /-] [Invalid=2710 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are farm workers.		
Literal question	WHAT IS THE MAIN PRODUCT?		
Notes	Q76H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SUBSISTENCE	0	
2	SOYBEANS, PEANUTS, LINSEED, ETC.	0	
3	TEXTILE PRODUCTS	0	
4	FRUIT OR VEGETABLE	0	
5	TOBACCO	0	
6	POTATOES	1	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
7	SUGAR BEETS	0	
8	BEEF CATTLE	12	<div><div></div></div> 23.5%

# v423: MAIN PRODUCT OF FARM R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	OTHER LIVESTOCK	2	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
10	DAIRY	9	<div><div></div></div> 17.6%
11	HAY, ALFALFA, ETC.	2	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
12	POULTRY, EGGS	3	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
13	WHEAT	6	<div><div></div></div> 11.8%
14	OTHER GRAINS	12	<div><div></div></div> 23.5%
15	MISCELLANEOUS, UNSPECIFIED, TRUCK FARM, ETC.	4	<div><div></div></div> 7.8%
99	N.A.	2710	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v424: BLISHEN SCORE R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 18.24-9999] [Missing=*/9999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	Q76AB in the documentation. FOUR DIGIT BLISHEN SCORE AND EXTENDED OCCUPATION CODE. THESE SCORES ARE BASED ON 1971 CENSUS DATA. A DISCUSSION OF THE CONSTRUCTION AND USE OF THE BLISHEN OCCUPATION MEASURES MAY BE FOUND IN BERNARD R. BLISHEN, "A SOCIO - ECONOMIC INDEX FOR OCCUPATIONS IN CANADA", CANADIAN REVIEW OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY, IV (1967), PP. 41-53.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18.24		1	0.0%
18.65		7	0.3%
19.23		2	0.1%
20.73		3	0.1%
22.52		1	0.0%
23		13	0.5%
23.25		4	0.1%
23.68		2	0.1%
24		2	0.1%
24.09		1	0.0%
24.21		7	0.3%
24.26		2	0.1%
24.32		4	0.1%
24.97		12	0.4%
25.08		5	0.2%
25.66		1	0.0%
25.9		4	0.1%
25.99		1	0.0%
26.48		1	0.0%
26.55		2	0.1%
26.7		1	0.0%
26.71		1	0.0%
26.81		7	0.3%
26.98		1	0.0%
27.02		3	0.1%
27.07		7	0.3%

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27.08		2	0.1%
27.23		8	0.3%
27.49		3	0.1%
27.62		17	0.6%
27.69		1	0.0%
27.97		5	0.2%
28		1	0.0%
28.01		35	1.3%
28.1		12	0.4%
28.47		1	0.0%
28.72		1	0.0%
28.73		4	0.1%
28.87		2	0.1%
29.44		1	0.0%
29.47		4	0.1%
29.6		3	0.1%
29.67		1	0.0%
29.8		17	0.6%
29.91		2	0.1%
29.92		2	0.1%
30.06		1	0.0%
30.39		2	0.1%
30.48		1	0.0%
30.71		2	0.1%
31.12		1	0.0%
31.18		1	0.0%
31.86		2	0.1%
32.22		2	0.1%
32.26		1	0.0%
32.27		7	0.3%
32.32		3	0.1%
32.46		2	0.1%
32.56		1	0.0%
32.87		7	0.3%
32.88		1	0.0%
33.06		1	0.0%
33.07		1	0.0%
33.31		1	0.0%
34.45		4	0.1%
34.46		1	0.0%
34.78		2	0.1%
35.16		1	0.0%
35.25		10	0.4%
35.7		1	0.0%
36.5		5	0.2%

# v424: BLISHEN SCORE R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36.81		2	0.1%
37.13		1	0.0%
37.28		1	0.0%
37.7		2	0.1%
37.73		1	0.0%
37.74		4	0.1%
37.75		7	0.3%
37.8		1	0.0%
38.16		1	0.0%
38.2		1	0.0%
38.26		3	0.1%
38.29		6	0.2%
38.32		15	0.5%
38.53		3	0.1%
38.66		1	0.0%
38.8		1	0.0%
39		1	0.0%
39.04		3	0.1%
39.07		1	0.0%
39.83		2	0.1%
39.9		1	0.0%
40.09		1	0.0%
40.36		10	0.4%
40.37		1	0.0%
40.38		2	0.1%
40.64		1	0.0%
40.65		4	0.1%
40.83		1	0.0%
41.01		1	0.0%
41.16		1	0.0%
41.18		1	0.0%
41.32		1	0.0%
41.41		4	0.1%
41.48		1	0.0%
41.81		1	0.0%
41.85		5	0.2%
42.01		5	0.2%
42.42		4	0.1%
42.76		1	0.0%
43.21		1	0.0%
43.28		1	0.0%
43.81		3	0.1%
43.88		5	0.2%
44.2		1	0.0%
44.44		1	0.0%

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45.07		2	0.1%
45.11		2	0.1%
45.43		4	0.1%
45.74		2	0.1%
46.08		2	0.1%
46.32		5	0.2%
46.41		13	0.5%
46.53		1	0.0%
46.7		1	0.0%
46.93		2	0.1%
47.01		3	0.1%
47.13		1	0.0%
47.4		1	0.0%
47.41		5	0.2%
47.44		1	0.0%
47.72		13	0.5%
48.31		1	0.0%
48.62		3	0.1%
48.68		1	0.0%
48.72		4	0.1%
49.17		1	0.0%
49.61		3	0.1%
49.73		3	0.1%
50.09		2	0.1%
50.14		1	0.0%
50.39		1	0.0%
50.4		1	0.0%
50.68		12	0.4%
50.94		4	0.1%
51.1		2	0.1%
51.28		11	0.4%
51.65		1	0.0%
52.41		2	0.1%
52.43		6	0.2%
52.44		21	0.8%
52.49		1	0.0%
53.13		2	0.1%
53.14		1	0.0%
53.99		1	0.0%
54.38		1	0.0%
54.61		1	0.0%
55.07		2	0.1%
55.3		2	0.1%
55.39		1	0.0%
55.49		5	0.2%

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
55.53		4	0.1%
55.62		2	0.1%
55.79		3	0.1%
56.43		1	0.0%
56.83		1	0.0%
56.99		1	0.0%
57.15		1	0.0%
57.17		4	0.1%
57.31		1	0.0%
57.75		2	0.1%
58.07		1	0.0%
58.53		1	0.0%
58.94		5	0.2%
59.19		2	0.1%
59.23		1	0.0%
59.65		1	0.0%
59.77		1	0.0%
59.78		2	0.1%
59.79		4	0.1%
60.19		1	0.0%
60.35		1	0.0%
60.77		1	0.0%
61.08		1	0.0%
61.41		2	0.1%
61.61		1	0.0%
61.62		1	0.0%
61.67		1	0.0%
61.84		1	0.0%
61.93		1	0.0%
62.09		2	0.1%
62.82		1	0.0%
63.19		1	0.0%
63.96		6	0.2%
64.41		1	0.0%
65.18		3	0.1%
65.75		1	0.0%
65.76		1	0.0%
65.81		28	1.0%
66.41		1	0.0%
66.78		2	0.1%
66.92		4	0.1%
67.43		14	0.5%
67.88		1	0.0%
68.28		3	0.1%
68.71		3	0.1%

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
68.72		1	0.0%
68.73		3	0.1%
68.74		2	0.1%
69.2		1	0.0%
69.25		2	0.1%
69.64		1	0.0%
70.74		2	0.1%
70.89		1	0.0%
71.77		8	0.3%
71.94		1	0.0%
71.95		1	0.0%
72.1		1	0.0%
72.18		1	0.0%
72.74		2	0.1%
74.24		2	0.1%
74.49		2	0.1%
75.32		5	0.2%
99.99		2056	74.5%
1441	HUNTING,TRAPPING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
1824	FISH CANNING, CURING & PACKING OCCUPS.	0	
1865	FISHERMEN: NET, TRAP & LINE	0	
1923	NEWSBOYS	0	
1936	FORESTRY & LOGGING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
1963	TEXTILE FIBRE PREPAR. OCCUPS.	0	
1980	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRIC.ASSEM.&REPAIR:WOOD PROD.	0	
1994	SHOEMAKING & REPAIR. OCCUPS.	0	
2033	WOOD SANDING OCCUPS.	0	
2058	PRESSING OCCUPS.	0	
2063	MILLINERS,HAT & CAP MAKERS	0	
2073	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:TEXTILE PROCESS.	0	
2173	TEXTILE WEAVING OCCUPS.	0	
2186	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: FAB. ASSEM. & REP. TEXT.,	0	
2205	KNITTING OCCUPS.	0	
2216	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK FABRIC. ASSEM. & REPAIR. WOO	0	
2223	OCCUPS. IN SPORT & RECREATION, N.E.C.	0	
2252	TEXTILE SPINNING & TWISTING OCCUPS.	0	
2275	FISHING, HUNTING, TRAPPING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2286	TIMBER CUTTING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2300	FARMERS	0	
2307	ELEVATOR OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
2323	FABRICAT., ASSEMBL. & REPAIR. OCCUPS.: TEXT., FUR. LEATH. P	0	
2325	SEWING MACHINE OPERATORS, TEXT. & SIMILAR MATERS.	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2341	TEXTILE FINISHING & CALENDERING OCCUPS.	0	
2368	WOOD SAWING & REL, OCCUPS. EXC. SAWMILL	0	
2400	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:EXCAVAT.,GRAD.&PAVING	0	
2409	RAILWAY SECTIONMEN & TRACKMEN	0	
2421	FARM WORKERS	0	
2426	LAUNDERING & DRY CLEANING OCCUPS.	0	
2432	TAILORS & DRESSMAKERS	0	
2439	TEXTILE PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
2440	TEXTILE BLEACHING & DYEING OCCUPS.	0	
2442	TEXTILE WINDING & REELING OCCUPS.	0	
2454	BABYSITTERS	0	
2470	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:WOOD MACHINING	0	
2482	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:FORESTRY & LOGGING	0	
2486	FABRICAT., ASSEMBL. & REPAIR. OCCUPS.: WOOD PRODS., N.E.C.	0	
2497	JANITORS, CHARWORKERS & CLEANERS	0	
2504	FURRIERS	0	
2508	BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2565	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK,OTH.PROCESS	0	
2566	PAVING, SURFACING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2570	PLANING, TURNING, SHAPING & REL. WOOD MACHIN. OCCUPS.	0	
2571	HIDE & PELT PROC. OCCUPS.	0	
2584	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK CLAY, GLASS, STONE PROC. & F	0	
2590	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK FOOD, BEV. & REL. PROC.	0	
2599	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: WOOD PROC. EXC. PULP & PAP	0	
2617	FARM MACHINERY OPERATORS & CUSTOM OPERATORS	0	
2644	FRUIT&VEG.CANNING,PRESERV.&PACKAG. OCCUPS.	0	
2648	BARTENDERS	0	
2650	OCCUPS. IN LODGING & OTH. ACCOMM., N.E.C.	0	
2655	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:SERVICES	0	
2669	OTH. TRANSP. & REL. EQUIP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C	0	
2670	TAXI DRIVERS & CHAUFFEURS	0	
2671	APPAREL & FURNISHINGS, SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2681	CHEFS & COOKS	0	
2698	SAWMILL SAWYERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2701	ROOFING, WATERPROOFING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2702	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK, OTH. CONSTR. TRADES	0	
2707	CHAMBERMAIDS & HOUSEMEN	0	
2708	CABINET & WOOD FURNITURE MAKERS	0	
2722	UPHOLSTERERS	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2723	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK FABRIC. & ASSEM. METAL PROD.	0	
2738	SEPARAT., GRIND., CRUSH. & MIXING OCCUPS.: CLAY, GLASS & STO	0	
2743	OTH. PROCESS. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2744	PATTERNMAK., MARKING & CUTTING OCCUPS.: TEXT., FUR & LEATH.	0	
2745	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:TEXTILE PROCESSING	0	
2749	FOOD & BEV. PREP. & REL. SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2762	LABOURERS, N.E.C.	0	
2769	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REP. TEXTILE, FUR. & LE	0	
2797	WAITERS, HOSTESSES & STEWARDS, FOOD & BEV.	0	
2800	NURSERY & REL. WORKERS	0	
2801	FARM MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
2810	CARPENTERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2815	GUIDES	0	
2847	BAKING, CONFECTIONARY MAKING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2869	CUTTING & SHAPING OCCUPS.: CLAY, GLASS & STONE	0	
2871	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: PROD. FAB. ASSEM & REPAIR.,	0	
2872	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: FAB. ASSEM. I. & EL. ELECT	0	
2873	GUARDS & WATCHMEN	0	
2879	SLEEPING-CAR & BAGGAGE PORTERS & BELLMEN	0	
2883	WOOD MACHINING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2887	PAINTERS, PAPERHANGERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2899	DECK CREW, SHIP	0	
2903	FLOUR & GRAIN MILLING OCCUPS.	0	
2914	CONCRETE FINISHING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2928	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:CLAY,GLASS & STONE MACHINING	0	
2944	METAL MACHINING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
2947	BRICK & STONE MASONS & TILE SETTERS	0	
2957	OTH. SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2958	WOOD PROCESS. OCCUPS. EXC. PULP & PAPERMAKING, N.E.	0	
2960	SERVICE STATION ATTENDANTS	0	
2967	OTH. FARMING, HORTICULT. & ANIMAL HUSBANDRY OCCUPS. N.E.C.	0	
2979	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORKK FAB. ASSEM. REP. RUB. PLAS.	0	
2980	TRUCK DRIVERS	0	
2988	CAPTAINS & OTHER OFFICERS, FISHING VESSELS	0	
2990	ENGINE & BOILER ROOM CREW, SHIP	0	
2991	EXCAVATING, GRADING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2992	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:MATER. HANDLING	0	
2998	HOTEL CLERKS	0	
2999	ATTENDANTS, SPORT & RECREATION	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3006	PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3008	MESSENGERS	0	
3038	ABRADING AND POLISHING OCCUPS.: CLAY, GLASS & STON N.E.C.	0	
3039	LOG HOISTING, SORTING, MOVING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3040	PAINTING & DECORATING OCCUPS. EXC. CONSTRUC.	0	
3048	PLASTERERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3071	RAILWAY TRANSP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3100	MILK PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
3112	MOULDING OCCUPS. RUBB.,PLAST.&REL. PROD.	0	
3115	PACKAGING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3118	SLAUGHTERING & MEAT CUTTING, CANNING, CURING & PACKING OCCUP	0	
3134	FORMING OCCUPS:CLAY,GLASS & STONE	0	
3139	FABRICAT. ASSEMBL. & REPAIR OCCUPS.: RUBB., PLAST. & REL. P	0	
3145	OTH. CONSTRUC. TRADES OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3146	CRUSHING & GRIND. OCCUPS. CHEM. & REL. MATERIALS	0	
3162	GLAZIERS	0	
3169	METALWORKING-MACHINE OPERATORS,N.E.C.	0	
3186	FORESTRY CONSERV. OCCUPS.	0	
3196	CUTTING & FINISHING OCCUPS.: RUBB., PLAST. & REL. PRODS.	0	
3199	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIP. OPERATORS, N.E.C.	0	
3208	STREET VENDORS & DOOR-TO-DOOR SALESMEN	0	
3220	CLAY, GLASS & STONE PROCESS. FORMING & REL. OCCUPS. N.E.C.	0	
3221	CLAY, GLASS & STONE & REL. MATER. MACHIN. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3222	OTH. PROD. FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR. OCCUPS., N.E.	0	
3226	FOOD, BEV. & REL. PROCESS. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3227	NURSING AIDES & ORDERLIES	0	
3232	BUS DRIVERS	0	
3246	LONGSHOREMEN, STEVEDORES & FREIGHT HANDLERS	0	
3248	PLYWOOD MAKING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3256	MATERIALS HANDLING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3257	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,WOOD PROCESS.EXC.PULP&PAPERMAKING	0	
3258	JEWELLERY & SILVERWARE FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR OCCUPS.	0	
3272	MOULDING,COREMAKING & METAL CASTING OCCUPS.	0	
3280	EXCAVATING, GRADING, PAVING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3287	MOTOR VEHICLE MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
3288	DRIVER-SALESMEN	0	
3306	FURNACEMEN&KILNMEN:CLAY,GLASS & STONE	0	
3307	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: EL. POW.: LIGHT. & WIR. CO	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3308	FILING, GRINDING, BUFFING, CLEAN. & POLISH. OCCUPS. N.E.C.	0	
3311	COATING & CALENDERING OCCUPS.: CHEM. & REL. MATER.	0	
3327	IND.FARM CONST..&OTH.MECH.EQUIP.&MACH.FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OC	0	
3331	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK MINING & QUARRY. INC. OIL &	0	
3344	MARINE CRAFT FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR. OCCUPS.	0	
3347	BLASTING OCCUPS.	0	
3368	PLATING, METAL SPRAYING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3381	BONDING & CEMENTING OCCUPS.: RUBB., PLAST. & REL. PRODS.	0	
3394	FORGING OCCUPS.	0	
3410	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK CHEM. PETR. RUB. PLAS. & REL	0	
3414	OTH. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3425	OTH. FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OCCUPS. METAL PRODS., N.E.C	0	
3428	TOBACCO PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
3445	SHIPPING & RECEIVING CLERKS	0	
3446	MINING&QUARRYING:CUTTING,HANDLING&LOADING OCCUPS.	0	
3459	ENGINE & REL. EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3467	WOOD TREATING OCCUPS.	0	
3472	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:PRINT.&REL.,N.E.C.	0	
3478	MOTOR VEHICLE FABRICAT.&ASSEMB. OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3488	INSULATING OCCUPS. CONSTRUCTION	0	
3489	FABRICAT., ASSEMBL. I. & R. OCCUPS.: ELECTRIC. ELECTRON. &	0	
3491	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:METAL PROCESS.	0	
3516	METAL PROCESS. & REL. OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3525	WELDING & FLAME CUTTING OCCUPS.	0	
3530	WEIGHERS	0	
3536	PAPER PRODUCT FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OCCUPS.	0	
3541	SUGAR PROCESS. & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3546	WATER TRANSP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3553	ELECTRICAL EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUPS.	0	
3561	OTH. ROCK & SOIL-DRILLING OCCUPS.	0	
3566	OCCUPS. IN RELIGION, N.E.C.	0	
3570	SUPERVISORS: OCCUPS. IN LODGING & OTH. ACCOM.	0	
3594	STRUCTURAL METAL ERECTORS	0	
3595	FOREMAN:OTH. FARMING,HORTICULT.&ANIMAL HUSBANDRY OC	0	
3633	METAL SHAPING&FORMING OCCUPS.EXC.MACHINING,N.E.C.	0	
3639	ROASTING, COOKING & DRYING OCCUPS., CHEMICALS & REL MATERS.	0	
3650	NURSING ASSISTANTS	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3677	MIXING&BLENDING OCCUPS.,CHEMICALS&REL.MATER.	0	
3681	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:PULP&PAPERMAKING	0	
3699	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:PROCESSING,N.E.C.	0	
3713	PRINTING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3728	SUPERVISORS: FOOD & BEV. PREP. & REL. SERVICE OCCU	0	
3770	PIPEFITTING, PLUMBING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3773	SHEET METAL WORKERS	0	
3774	MACHINE TOOL OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
3775	MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN EXC. ELECTRICAL, N.E.C.	0	
3780	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:MINERAL ORE TREAT.	0	
3793	MOTORMEN & DINKEYMEN,EXC. RAIL TRANSP.	0	
3799	HOISTING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3805	CRUSHING & GRIND. OCCUPS. MINERAL ORES	0	
3812	DANCERS & CHOREOGRAPHERS	0	
3816	FOREMAN:FORESTRY & LOGGING OCCUPS.	0	
3820	NURSING,THERAPY & REL. ASSIST.OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3823	METAL EXTRUDING & DRAWING OCCUPS.	0	
3826	TELEPHONE OPERATORS	0	
3828	PRECIS. INSTRUM. & REL. EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OCCUPS.,	0	
3829	SUPERVISORS: OTHER SERVICE OCCUPS.	0	
3832	SALES CLERKS, COMMODITIES	0	
3852	REFEREES & REL. OFFICIALS	0	
3853	STOCK CLERKS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3861	ELECTRONIC EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEMB. OCCUPS.	0	
3866	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:PRODUCT FABRICAT.ASSEM.&REPAIR.,NE	0	
3880	ENGRAVERS, ETCHERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3885	BOOKBINDERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3900	PAINTERS, SCULPTORS & REL. ARTISTS	0	
3904	FOREMAN:EXCAVATING,GRADING,PAVING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3906	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FOOD,BEV.&REL. PROCESS.	0	
3907	MANAGERS: HOTEL, MOTEL & OTH. ACCOMM.	0	
3910	METAL HEAT TREATING OCCUPS.	0	
3915	RAIL TRANSP. EQUIP. MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
3928	LOG INSPECT. GRAD. SCALING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3941	METAL SMELT.CONVERTING&REFINING FURNACEMEN	0	
3983	MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING & DISTRIB. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3990	MOTOR TRANSPORT OPERATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3997	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:MACHINING,N.E.C.	0	
3999	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:CLAY,GLASS & STONE PROCESS.&FORMIN	0	
4005	WATCH & CLOCK REPAIRMEN	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4009	SUPERVISORS: APPAREL & FURNISHINGS SERVICE OCCUPS.	0	
4030	FOREMAN:WOOD PROCESS.OCCUPS.EXC.PULP&PAPERMAKING	0	
4036	TELLERS & CASHIERS	0	
4037	FOREMAN:WOOD MACHING OCCUPS.	0	
4038	OTH. OCCUPS. IN ARCHITEC. & ENGINEERING, N.E.C.	0	
4051	OCCUPS. IN PERFORMING & AUDIO-VISUAL ARTS, N.E.C.	0	
4064	METAL SHAPING&FORMING OCCUPS.EXEC.MACHINING,N.E.C.	0	
4065	RECEPTIONISTS & INFO. CLERKS	0	
4070	MINING&QUARRYING INCL.OIL&GASFIELD OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4083	BEVERAGE PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4101	PROTECT. SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4106	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR.RUBB., PLAST. &	0	
4107	FOREMAN:MOTOR TRANSP, OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
4114	ROTARY WELLDRILLING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
4116	HOSTESSES & STEWARDS, EXC. FOOD & BEV.	0	
4118	BOILMAKERS, PLATERS & STRUCTURAL METAL WORKERS	0	
4121	METAL ROLLING OCCUPS.	0	
4132	AIR TRANSPORT OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4141	SALES OCCUPS.: COMMODITIES, N.E.C.	0	
4142	PULP & PAPERMAKING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4147	INDUS.FARM&CONSTRUC.MACHINERY MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
4148	STATIONARY ENGINE & UTIL. EQUIP. OPERATING & REL. OCCUPS., N	0	
4166	PRINTING PRESS OCCUPS.	0	
4181	AIRCRAFT FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4183	FOREMAN:FABRICAT. ASSEM.&REPAIR.OCCUPS.:WOOD PRODUC	0	
4185	MAIL CARRIERS	0	
4193	ENGINEERING OFFICERS, SHIP	0	
4201	MACHINISTS & MACHINE TOOL SETTING-UP OCCUPS.	0	
4214	MELTING & ROASTING OCCUPS.: MINERAL ORES	0	
4233	FILTERING, STRAINING & SEPARATING OCCUPS.: CHEM. & REL. MATE	0	
4242	FOREMAN:OTH. CONSTRUCTION TRADES OCCUPS.	0	
4259	MINERAL ORE TREATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4276	RECEP., INFO., MAIL & MESSAGE DISTRIB. OCCUPS., N.E	0	
4285	FOREMAN:FABRICAT,&ASSEM. & REPAIR.OCCUPS.:TEXT.FUR. LEATH. P	0	
4304	RADIO & T.V. SERVICE REPAIRMEN	0	
4321	OTH. RANKS, ARMED FORCES	0	
4327	MOTION PICTURE PROJECTIONISTS	0	
4328	MUSICIANS	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4381	SALESMEN & SALESPERSONS, COMMODITIES, N.E.C.	0	
4388	ELEC. & REL. EQUIP. I. & R. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4399	FOREMAN:MATERIALS HANDLING & REL.OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4400	MIXING,SEPARATING,FILTERING&REL.OCCUPS.,MINERAL ORE	0	
4411	OTHER SALES OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4420	OTH. CRAFTS & EQUIP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4429	OFFICE MACHINE OPERATORS	0	
4433	CELLULOSE PULP PREPARING OCCUPS.	0	
4434	TECHNIC. IN LIBRARY, MUSEUM & ARCHIVAL SCIS.	0	
4440	RAILWAY TRANSP. OPERATING SUPPORT OCCUPS.	0	
4444	FOREMAN: CLAY, GLASS & STONE & REL. MATER. MACHINING OCCUPS.	0	
4448	SUBWAY & STREET RAILWAY OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
4459	OCCUPS. IN LIBRARY, MUSEUM & ARCHIVAL SCIS., N.E.C.	0	
4471	I.T.G. & S. OCCUPS.: EQUIP. REPAIR EXC. ELECTRICAL	0	
4472	OTH. OCCUPS. IN MEDICINE & HEALTH, N.E.C.	0	
4478	FOREMAN:TEXTILE PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4483	PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4501	DECK OFFICERS	0	
4507	TYPESETTERS & COMPOSITORS	0	
4511	FOREMAN:MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN EXC. ELECTRICAL	0	
4527	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:METAL MACHINING	0	
4543	TYPISTS & CLERK TYPISTS	0	
4544	STEREOTYPERS & ELECTROTYPERS	0	
4557	LIBRARY & FILE CLERKS	0	
4562	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRIC.ASSEM.METAL PROD.,N.E.C.	0	
4570	CHEM. PETROL. RUBB. PLAST. & REL. MATER. PROCESS. OCCUPS., N	0	
4574	POLICEMEN & INVESTIGATORS, PRIV.	0	
4595	OCCUPS. IN FINE&COMMERC. ART.PHOTOG.&REL.FIELDS,N.E	0	
4608	FOREMAN:FOOD,BEV. & REL. PROCESS.OCCUPS.	0	
4632	SUPERVISORS & FOREMEN, N.E.C.	0	
4641	GEN. OFFICE CLERKS	0	
4646	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:METAL SHAPING&FORMING,EXC.MACH.	0	
4648	LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS & FIREMEN	0	
4653	NUNS & BROTHERS (W),N.O.R.	0	
4670	FOREMAN:OTH. PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4677	FOREMAN:OTH.MACHINING & REL. OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4682	COACHES, TRAINERS, INSTRUCTORS & MGRS.: SPORT & REC	0	
4693	CONSTRUCTION ELECTRIC. & REPAIRMEN	0	
4701	PAPERMAKING & FINISHING OCCUPS.	0	
4704	FOREMAN:CLAY,GLASS & STONE PROCESS. FORMING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4713	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4736	PATTERNMAKERS & MOULDMAKERS, N.E.C.	0	
4740	FOREMAN:METAL SHAPING & FORMING OCCUPS.EXC. MACH.	0	
4741	SUPERVISORS: OTHER SALES OCCUPS.	0	
4772	SUPERVISORS: SALES OCCUPS., COMMODITIES	0	
4792	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:MINERAL ORE TREATING	0	
4800	CONDUCTORS & BRAKEMEN, RAILWAY	0	
4809	FOREMAN:PRODUCT FABRICAT.ASSEM.&REPAIR.OCCUPS.,N.E.	0	
4812	MAIL & POSTAL CLERKS	0	
4829	EL. POW. LIGHT. & WIRE COMMUN. EQUIP. EREC. I. & R. OCCUPS.	0	
4831	DENTAL HYGIENISTS, ASSIST. & TECHNIC.	0	
4845	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:METAL PROCESSING	0	
4849	WOOD PATTERNMAKING OCCUPS.	0	
4862	ELECTRICAL POWER LINEMAN & REL OCCUPS.	0	
4868	AD. & ILLUSTRATING ARTISTS	0	
4872	OTH. CLERICAL & REL. OCCUPS., N.D.C.	0	
4886	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRICAT.ASSEM.I.&R. EL. ELECTRON. & REL.	0	
4891	ATHLETES	0	
4903	OCCUPS. IN PHYSICAL SCIS., N.E.C.	0	
4913	FOREMAN:FABRICAT.ASSEM.REPAIR.OCCUPS.RUBB.,PLAS OTH. REL	0	
4915	OCCUPS. IN WELFARE & COMMUN. SERVICES, N.E.C.	0	
4917	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,CONSTRUCT.,EXC.ELECTRICAL (INSPECTING,TEST	0	
4918	POSTMASTERS	0	
4936	ACTORS	0	
4952	PHOTOGRAPHERS & CAMERAMEN	0	
4961	INSURANCE, BANK & OTH. FINANCE CLERKS	0	
4973	SUPERVISORS: MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING & DISTRIB. OCCUP	0	
4977	COLLECTORS & COLLECTION AGENTS	0	
4978	NURSES-IN-TRAINING	0	
4983	DISPENSING OPTICIANS	0	
4998	PHOTOENGRAVERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5009	REAL ESTATE SALESMEN	0	
5014	FOREMAN: MINING & QUARRY OCCUPS. INCL. OIL & GAS	0	
5017	BUS. & COMMERC. MACHINE MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
5027	BUS. & COMMERC. MACHINES FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUP N.E.C.	0	
5032	MINISTERS OF RELIGION	0	
5039	PRINTERS, ENGRAVERS EXC. PHOTOENGRAVERS	0	
5040	FOREMAN:RAILWAY TRANSPORT OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
5049	PRODUCTION CLERKS	0	
5068	BOOKKEEPERS & ACCOUNTING CLERKS	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5094	BOOKKEEPING, ACCT.-RECORDING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5103	TELEGRAPH OPERATORS	0	
5110	FIRE FIGHTING OCCUPS.	0	
5128	NURSES,GRAD.EXC. SUPERVISORS	0	
5137	FUNERAL DIRECTORS,EMBALMERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5140	FOREMAN:METAL PROCESS. & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5156	STATS. CLERKS	0	
5165	AIRCRAFT MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
5210	UNIV. TEACHING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5229	OCCUPS. IN LIFE SCIENCES, N.E.C.	0	
5230	FOREMAN:METAL MACHINING OCCUPS.	0	
5241	FOREMAN:PULP & PAPERMAKING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5243	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:CHEM.,PETROL.,RUBB.,PLAST.,&REL. MATER. PRO	0	
5244	SECRETARIES & STENOS.	0	
5245	SALES OCCUPS.: SERVICES, N.E.C.	0	
5249	TOOL & DIE MAKING OPERATIONS	0	
5255	OCCUPS. IN LAW & JURISPRUD., N.E.C.	0	
5303	PRODUCT & INTERIOR DESIGNERS	0	
5306	FOREMAN:PRINTING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5313	ADJUSTORS, CLAIM	0	
5314	TEACHERS OF EXCEP. STUDENTS, N.E.C.	0	
5352	PHYSIOTHERAPISTS, OCCUPS. & OTH. THERAPISTS	0	
5362	FOREMAN:STATIONARY ENGINE&UTIL EQUIP.OPER.&REL.OCC.	0	
5399	OCCUPS. IN SOCIAL WORK & REL. FIELDS, N.E.C.	0	
5402	ELECTRON. & REL. COMMUN. EQUIP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5403	FOREMAN:MINERAL ORE TREATING OCCUPS.	0	
5409	SURVEYORS	0	
5435	INSPECTORS & REGULATORY OFFICERS NON-GOVT.	0	
5438	FOREMAN FAB.&ASSEMBL.OCCUPS.METAL PRODUCTS,N.E.C.	0	
5461	LIBRARY, FILE & CORR. CLERKS & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5467	FOREMAN:OTH.TRANSP.&REL.EQUIP.OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
5492	POWER STATION OPERATORS	0	
5507	TRAVEL CLERKS, TICKET, STATION & FREIGHT AGENTS	0	
5530	LIFE SCIENCES TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNIC.	0	
5539	OTH. TEACHING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5542	FINE ARTS SCHOOL TEACHERS	0	
5549	BUYERS, WHOLESALE & RETAIL TRADE	0	
5553	ELEM. & SEC. SCH. TEACHING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5557	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,PULP & PAPERMAKING	0	
5562	MANAGEMENT OCCUPS., CONSTRUC. OPERATIONS	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5579	E.D.P. EQUIP. OPERATORS (ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING	0	
5599	FOREMAN:FABRICAT.ASSEM. I.&R.OCCUPS.EL.ELECTRON. REL. EQUIP.	0	
5613	FOREMAN:EL.POW.LIGHT. & WIRE COMMUN.EQUIP.EREC. I. & R. OCCU	0	
5643	INSTRUCTORS & TRAINING OFFICERS, N.E.C.	0	
5653	RADIO & T.V. BROADCASTING EQUIP. OPERATORS	0	
5672	SUPERVISORS: RECEP., INFO., MAIL & MESSAGE DISTRIB OCCUPS.	0	
5683	MEDICAL LAB. TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNIC.	0	
5687	SUPERVISORS: STENO. & TYPING OCCUPS.	0	
5690	MEMBERS OF LEGIS. BODIES	0	
5699	PERSONNEL CLERKS	0	
5705	SUPERVISORS: NURSING OCCUPS.	0	
5715	HEALTH DIAGNOSING&TREATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
5717	FOREMEN CHEMS., PETROL., RUBBER, PLAST. & REL. MAT PROC. OCC	0	
5725	OCCUPS. IN MATH. STATS., SYSTEMS ANAL. & REL. FIELD N.E.C.	0	
5731	ADVERTISING SALESMEN	0	
5747	COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS	0	
5749	DISTIL., SUBLIM. & CARBONIZ. OCCUPS., CHEMICALS & REL. MATE	0	
5775	INSURANCE SALESMEN & AGENTS	0	
5795	PRECIS. INSTRUM. MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
5796	OTH. OCCUPS. IN SOC. SCIS. & REL. FIELDS, N.E.C.	0	
5807	SERVICES MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
5853	RADIO & T.V. ANNOUNCERS	0	
5871	RADIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNICIANS	0	
5889	SOUND RECORDING & REPRODUCTION EQUIP. OPERATORS	0	
5894	OFFICIALS & ADMINISTRATORS UNIQUE TO GOVT., N.E.C.	0	
5919	FOREMAN:OTH.CRAFTS&EQUIP.OPERATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
5923	AIR TRANSPORT OPERATING SUPPORT OCCUPS.	0	
5939	WIRE COMMUN. & REL. EQUIP. I. & R. OCCUPS.	0	
5965	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:EL.POW. LIGHT. & WIR COMMUN. EQUIP. EREC.	0	
5977	SALESMEN & TRADERS, SECURITIES	0	
5978	INSPECTORS & REGULATORY OFFICERS GOVT.	0	
5979	ELECTRONIC & REL. EQUIP. INSTALL. & REPAIR OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
6019	POLICEMEN & DETECTIVES, GOVT.	0	
6035	PHYSICAL SCIS. TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNICIANS	0	
6050	SOCIOLOGISTS, ANTHROPOLOGISTS & REL. SOC. SCIENTIST	0	
6077	PURCH. OFFICERS & BUYERS, EXC. WHOLESALE & RETAIL TRADE	0	

v424: BLISHEN SCORE R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6091	OCCUPS. IN SOCIAL SCIENCES, N.E.C.	0	
6092	BUSINESS SERVICE SALESMEN	0	
6108	MANAGEMENT OCCUPS., TRANSPORT & COMMUNICATIONS OPER	0	
6120	AGRICULTURISTS & REL. SCIENTISTS	0	
6141	SUPERVISORS: OTH. CLERICAL & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
6148	SUPERVISORS: BOOKKEEPING, ACCT.-RECORDING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
6161	SOCIAL WORKERS	0	
6162	SUPERVISORS: SALES OCCUPS., SERVICES	0	
6167	TRANSLATORS & INTERPRETERS	0	
6184	LIBRARIANS & ARCHIVISTS	0	
6189	FOREMEN: AIR TRANSPORT OP. OCCUPS.	0	
6193	PURCHASING MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6209	DRAUGHTSMEN	0	
6215	SUPERVISORS: OCCUPS. IN LAB., MUSEUM & ARCHIV. SCI	0	
6224	PSYCHOLOGISTS	0	
6253	ARCHITEC. & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNICIANS	0	
6281	WRITERS & EDITORS	0	
6282	PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6319	PERSONNEL & INDUS. RELATIONS MGMNT. OCCUPS.	0	
6396	MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, N.E.C.	0	
6417	SUPERVISORS: LIBR., FILE & CORR. CLERKS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
6441	DIETICIANS & NUTRITIONISTS	0	
6449	TECHNICAL SALESMEN & REL. ADVISORS	0	
6476	OCCUPS. REL. TO MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATION, N.E.C.	0	
6518	SALES & AD. MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6567	FOREMAN:ELECTR. & REL. COMMUN. EQUIP. OP. OCCUPS.,N	0	
6575	PERSONNEL & REL. OFFICERS	0	
6576	BIOLOGISTS & REL. SCIENTISTS	0	
6581	ELEM. & KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS	0	
6616	COMMUN. COLLEGE & VOCATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS	0	
6621	OCCUPATIONS IN WRITING, N.E.C.	0	
6641	CHEMISTS	0	
6678	GEN.MGRS. & OTH. SENIOR OFFICIALS	0	
6692	MANAGEMENT OCCUPS., SOC. SCIENCES & REL. FIELDS	0	
6699	MATHEMATICIANS, STATISTICIANS & ACTUARIES	0	
6707	PRODUCERS & DIRECTORS, PERFORMING & AUDIO-VISUAL AR	0	
6711	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERS	0	
6723	SUPERVISORS: OTH. OCCUPS. IN ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING	0	
6743	ACCOUNTANTS, AUDITORS & FINANCIAL OFFICERS	0	
6758	MECHANICAL ENGINEERS	0	

# v424: BLISHEN SCORE R			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6788	PCLOTS, NAVIGATORS & FLIGHT ENGINEERS	0	
6817	COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, ARMED FORCES	0	
6828	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6871	SYSTEMS ANALYSTS & COMPUT. PROGRAMMERS & REL. OCCUP	0	
6872	MINING ENGINEERS	0	
6873	SUPERVISORS: OFFICE MACHINE & E.D.P. EQUIP. OPER.	0	
6874	GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS	0	
6879	PHYSICISTS	0	
6897	ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS, N.E.C.	0	
6920	GEOLOGISTS	0	
6925	CIVIL ENGINEERS	0	
6926	POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, N.E.C.	0	
6964	ECONOMISTS	0	
6973	PETROLEUM ENGINEERS	0	
7048	ADMINISTRATORS, MEDICINE & HEALTH	0	
7074	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS	0	
7089	CHEMICAL ENGINEERS	0	
7127	OSTEOPATHS & CHIROPRACTORS	0	
7177	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	0	
7194	EDUCATIONAL & VOCATIONAL COUNSELLORS	0	
7195	ARCHITECTS	0	
7202	METALLURGICAL ENGINEERS	0	
7210	JUDGES & MAGISTRATES	0	
7218	PHARMACISTS	0	
7230	UNIV. TEACHERS	0	
7274	LAWYERS & NOTARIES	0	
7283	METEROLOGISTS	0	
7342	VETERINARIANS	0	
7424	PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS	0	
7431	OPTOMETRISTS	0	
7449	MANAGERS, SCI. & ENGINEERING	0	
7471	NUCLEAR ENGINEERS	0	
7472	DENTISTS	0	
7532	ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHING AND REL. FIELDS	0	
9999	N.A.	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v425: MARITAL STATUS R			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1294 /-] [Invalid=1467 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ARE YOU MARRIED, WIDOWED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR ARE YOU SINGLE?		
Notes	Q77 in the documentation.		

v425: MARITAL STATUS R

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MARRIED	1002	77.4%
2	WIDOWED	65	5.0%
3	SEPARATED	17	1.3%
4	DIVORCED	13	1.0%
5	SINGLE	197	15.2%
9	N.A.	1467	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v426: STREAM CODE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=771 /-] [Invalid=1990 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Notes	Q10D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	OTHER	0	
2	RESPONDENT'S FORMER OCCUPATION	77	10.0%
3	RESPONDENT'S REGULAR OCCUPATION	17	2.2%
4	OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S HUSBAND	533	69.1%
5	OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S FORMER HUSBAND	77	10.0%
6	OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S FATHER	67	8.7%
7	OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S WIFE	0	
8	OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S MOTHER	0	
9	N.A.	1990	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v427: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM SPOUSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2216 /-] [Invalid=545 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
Notes	Q78AB in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HOUSEWIFE	0	
2	RETIRED	0	
3	STUDENT	0	
4	UNEMPLOYED	0	
5	NEVER WORKED	2	0.1%
6	OTHER REASONS	0	
11	PROFESSIONAL	55	2.5%
12	SEMI PROFESSIONAL	24	1.1%
21	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (LARGE)	41	1.9%
22	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (SMALL)	108	4.9%
30	CLERICAL AND SALES	73	3.3%
41	SKILLED LABOUR	128	5.8%

# v427: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM SPOUSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	SEMI SKILLED LABOUR	134	<div><div></div></div> 6.0%
43	UNSKILLED LABOUR	95	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
50	FARMERS AND ALL FARM OCCUPATIONS	93	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
88	UNCLASSIFIED	1463	<div><div></div></div> 66.0%
99	N.A.	545	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v428: MANUAL/NON-MANUAL/FARM SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=746 /-] [Invalid=2015 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Post-question	Q78C. RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS NON-MANUAL, MANUAL, OR FARMING.		
Notes	Q78AB, Q78C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NON-MANUAL	243	<div><div></div></div> 32.6%
2	MANUAL	412	<div><div></div></div> 55.2%
3	FARMING	91	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
9	N.A.	2015	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v429: EXECUTIVE POSITION SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=225 /-] [Invalid=2536 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a non-manual occupation.		
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q78D. IS (WAS) HIS JOB AN EXECUTIVE POSITION OR WHAT?		
Notes	Q78AB, Q78D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OWNER	47	<div><div></div></div> 20.9%
2	MANAGER	64	<div><div></div></div> 28.4%
3	NOT EXECUTIVE	114	<div><div></div></div> 50.7%
9	N.A.	2536	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v430: NO. OF EMPLOYEES SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=94 /-] [Invalid=2667 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a non-manual occupation, and who are owners or managers.		
Literal question	HOW MANY PEOPLE DOES (DID) HIS COMPANY EMPLOY?		
Notes	Q78E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 EMPLOYEES	6	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%

v430: NO. OF EMPLOYEES SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	1 EMPLOYEES	4	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
2	2 EMPLOYEES	6	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%
3	3 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
4	4 EMPLOYEES	3	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
5	5 EMPLOYEES	4	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
6	6 EMPLOYEES	3	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
7	7 EMPLOYEES	3	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
8	8 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
9	9 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
10	10 EMPLOYEES	4	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
11	11 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
12	12 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
13	13 EMPLOYEES	0	
14	14 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
15	15 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
16	16 EMPLOYEES	0	
17	17 EMPLOYEES	0	
18	18 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
19	19 EMPLOYEES	0	
20	20 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
21	21 EMPLOYEES	0	
22	22 EMPLOYEES	0	
23	23 EMPLOYEES	0	
24	24 EMPLOYEES	0	
25	25 EMPLOYEES	0	
26	26 EMPLOYEES	0	
27	27 EMPLOYEES	0	
28	28 EMPLOYEES	0	
29	29 EMPLOYEES	0	
30	30 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
31	31 EMPLOYEES	0	
32	32 EMPLOYEES	0	
33	33 EMPLOYEES	0	
34	34 EMPLOYEES	0	
35	35 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
36	36 EMPLOYEES	0	
37	37 EMPLOYEES	0	
38	38 EMPLOYEES	0	
39	39 EMPLOYEES	0	
40	40 EMPLOYEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
41	41 EMPLOYEES	0	
42	42 EMPLOYEES	0	
43	43 EMPLOYEES	0	
44	44 EMPLOYEES	0	
45	45 EMPLOYEES	0	

v430: NO. OF EMPLOYEES SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	46 EMPLOYEES	0	
47	47 EMPLOYEES	0	
48	48 EMPLOYEES	0	
49	49 EMPLOYEES	0	
50	50 EMPLOYEES	0	
61	100 EMPLOYEES	9	9.6%
62	200 EMPLOYEES	4	4.3%
63	300 EMPLOYEES	0	
64	400 EMPLOYEES	1	1.1%
65	500 EMPLOYEES	2	2.1%
66	600 EMPLOYEES	0	
67	700 EMPLOYEES	0	
68	800 EMPLOYEES	1	1.1%
69	900 EMPLOYEES	0	
71	1000 EMPLOYEES	5	5.3%
72	2000 EMPLOYEES	4	4.3%
73	3000 EMPLOYEES	3	3.2%
74	4000 EMPLOYEES	0	
75	5000 EMPLOYEES	0	
76	6000 EMPLOYEES	0	
77	7000 EMPLOYEES	1	1.1%
78	8000 EMPLOYEES	0	
79	9000 EMPLOYEES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	3	3.2%
99	N.A. EMPLOYEES	2667	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v431: NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=200 /-] [Invalid=2561 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER HIM?
Notes	Q78F in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 EMPLOYEES	72	36.0%
1	1 EMPLOYEES	17	8.5%
2	2 EMPLOYEES	10	5.0%
3	3 EMPLOYEES	8	4.0%
4	4 EMPLOYEES	9	4.5%
5	5 EMPLOYEES	4	2.0%
6	6 EMPLOYEES	7	3.5%
7	7 EMPLOYEES	4	2.0%
8	8 EMPLOYEES	3	1.5%
9	9 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
10	10 EMPLOYEES	11	5.5%

v431: NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	11 EMPLOYEES	2	1.0%
12	12 EMPLOYEES	10	5.0%
13	13 EMPLOYEES	0	
14	14 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
15	15 EMPLOYEES	4	2.0%
16	16 EMPLOYEES	0	
17	17 EMPLOYEES	0	
18	18 EMPLOYEES	0	
19	19 EMPLOYEES	0	
20	20 EMPLOYEES	6	3.0%
21	21 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
22	22 EMPLOYEES	0	
23	23 EMPLOYEES	0	
24	24 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
25	25 EMPLOYEES	2	1.0%
26	26 EMPLOYEES	0	
27	27 EMPLOYEES	0	
28	28 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
29	29 EMPLOYEES	0	
30	30 EMPLOYEES	4	2.0%
31	31 EMPLOYEES	0	
32	32 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
33	33 EMPLOYEES	0	
34	34 EMPLOYEES	0	
35	35 EMPLOYEES	0	
36	36 EMPLOYEES	0	
37	37 EMPLOYEES	0	
38	38 EMPLOYEES	0	
39	39 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
40	40 EMPLOYEES	3	1.5%
41	41 EMPLOYEES	0	
42	42 EMPLOYEES	0	
43	43 EMPLOYEES	0	
44	44 EMPLOYEES	0	
45	45 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
46	46 EMPLOYEES	0	
47	47 EMPLOYEES	0	
48	48 EMPLOYEES	0	
49	49 EMPLOYEES	0	
50	50 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
61	100 EMPLOYEES	7	3.5%
62	200 EMPLOYEES	3	1.5%
63	300 EMPLOYEES	1	0.5%
64	400 EMPLOYEES	2	1.0%
65	500 EMPLOYEES	2	1.0%

# v431: NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	600 EMPLOYEES	0	
67	700 EMPLOYEES	0	
68	800 EMPLOYEES	0	
69	900 EMPLOYEES	0	
71	1000 EMPLOYEES	0	
72	2000 EMPLOYEES	0	
73	3000 EMPLOYEES	0	
74	4000 EMPLOYEES	0	
75	5000 EMPLOYEES	0	
76	6000 EMPLOYEES	0	
77	7000 EMPLOYEES	0	
78	8000 EMPLOYEES	0	
79	9000 EMPLOYEES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	0	
99	N.A. EMPLOYEES	2561	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v432: TYPE OF BUSINESS SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=233 /-] [Invalid=2528 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a non-manual occupation.		
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q78G. WHAT DOES (DID) HIS COMPANY DO?		
Notes	Q78AB, Q78G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	AGRICULTURE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
2	MINING	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
3	CONSTRUCTION	17	<div><div></div></div> 7.3%
4	MANUFACTURING (DURABLE GOODS)	23	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
5	MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING (NON-DURABLE GOODS)	16	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
6	UTILITIES, TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS	21	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
7	WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE	32	<div><div></div></div> 13.7%
8	FINANCE, INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE, ADVERTISING	24	<div><div></div></div> 10.3%
9	REPAIR SERVICES	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
10	PERSONAL SERVICES	13	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
11	ENTERTAINMENT, RECREATION	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
12	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	50	<div><div></div></div> 21.5%
13	ALL GOVERNMENT	24	<div><div></div></div> 10.3%
99	N.A.	2528	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v433: SPECIAL TRAINING SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=178 /-] [Invalid=2583 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.		

# v433: SPECIAL TRAINING SPOUSE			
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q78DE. DID HE HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR HIS JOB?		
Post-question	(IF YES) WHAT SORT OF TRAINING?		
Notes	Q78AB, Q78DE in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	0	
1	APPRENTICESHIP	78	<div><div></div></div> 43.8%
2	SPECIAL CLASSES	70	<div><div></div></div> 39.3%
3	OTHER	30	<div><div></div></div> 16.9%
9	N.A.	2583	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v434: SKILLED WORKER SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=388 /-] [Invalid=2373 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.		
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q78F. DOES (DID) HIS EMPLOYER REGARD HIM AS A SKILLED PERSON?		
Notes	Q78AB, Q78F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	282	<div><div></div></div> 72.7%
2	NO	106	<div><div></div></div> 27.3%
9	N.A.	2373	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v435: NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=356 /-] [Invalid=2405 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.		
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q78G. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER HIM?		
Notes	Q78G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 EMPLOYEES	250	<div><div></div></div> 70.2%
1	1 EMPLOYEES	17	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
2	2 EMPLOYEES	10	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
3	3 EMPLOYEES	16	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
4	4 EMPLOYEES	14	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
5	5 EMPLOYEES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
6	6 EMPLOYEES	11	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
7	7 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
8	8 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
9	9 EMPLOYEES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%

v435: NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	10 EMPLOYEES	7	2.0%
11	11 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
12	12 EMPLOYEES	3	0.8%
13	13 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
14	14 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
15	15 EMPLOYEES	2	0.6%
16	16 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
17	17 EMPLOYEES	0	
18	18 EMPLOYEES	0	
19	19 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
20	20 EMPLOYEES	4	1.1%
21	21 EMPLOYEES	0	
22	22 EMPLOYEES	0	
23	23 EMPLOYEES	0	
24	24 EMPLOYEES	0	
25	25 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
26	26 EMPLOYEES	0	
27	27 EMPLOYEES	0	
28	28 EMPLOYEES	0	
29	29 EMPLOYEES	0	
30	30 EMPLOYEES	0	
31	31 EMPLOYEES	0	
32	32 EMPLOYEES	0	
33	33 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
34	34 EMPLOYEES	0	
35	35 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
36	36 EMPLOYEES	0	
37	37 EMPLOYEES	0	
38	38 EMPLOYEES	0	
39	39 EMPLOYEES	0	
40	40 EMPLOYEES	0	
41	41 EMPLOYEES	0	
42	42 EMPLOYEES	0	
43	43 EMPLOYEES	0	
44	44 EMPLOYEES	0	
45	45 EMPLOYEES	0	
46	46 EMPLOYEES	0	
47	47 EMPLOYEES	0	
48	48 EMPLOYEES	0	
49	49 EMPLOYEES	0	
50	50 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
61	100 EMPLOYEES	0	
62	200 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
63	300 EMPLOYEES	0	
64	400 EMPLOYEES	0	

v435: NO. WORK UNDER SP SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
65	500 EMPLOYEES	0	
66	600 EMPLOYEES	0	
67	700 EMPLOYEES	0	
68	800 EMPLOYEES	0	
69	900 EMPLOYEES	0	
71	1000 EMPLOYEES	1	0.3%
72	2000 EMPLOYEES	0	
73	3000 EMPLOYEES	0	
74	4000 EMPLOYEES	0	
75	5000 EMPLOYEES	0	
76	6000 EMPLOYEES	0	
77	7000 EMPLOYEES	0	
78	8000 EMPLOYEES	0	
79	9000 EMPLOYEES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES	0	
99	N.A. EMPLOYEES	2405	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v436: YEARS EXPERIENCE SPOUSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=381 /-] [Invalid=2380 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
Literal question	Q78H. HOW MANY YEARS EXPERIENCE DOES (DID) HE HAVE ON THE JOB?
Notes	Q78AB, Q78H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 YEARS	0	
1	1 YEARS	22	5.8%
2	2 YEARS	13	3.4%
3	3 YEARS	10	2.6%
4	4 YEARS	9	2.4%
5	5 YEARS	15	3.9%
6	6 YEARS	12	3.1%
7	7 YEARS	10	2.6%
8	8 YEARS	7	1.8%
9	9 YEARS	7	1.8%
10	10 YEARS	35	9.2%
11	11 YEARS	5	1.3%
12	12 YEARS	10	2.6%
13	13 YEARS	4	1.0%
14	14 YEARS	4	1.0%
15	15 YEARS	21	5.5%
16	16 YEARS	3	0.8%
17	17 YEARS	4	1.0%

v436: YEARS EXPERIENCE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 YEARS	8	2.1%
19	19 YEARS	5	1.3%
20	20 YEARS	39	10.2%
21	21 YEARS	2	0.5%
22	22 YEARS	14	3.7%
23	23 YEARS	10	2.6%
24	24 YEARS	1	0.3%
25	25 YEARS	14	3.7%
26	26 YEARS	5	1.3%
27	27 YEARS	3	0.8%
28	28 YEARS	5	1.3%
29	29 YEARS	3	0.8%
30	30 YEARS	30	7.9%
31	31 YEARS	2	0.5%
32	32 YEARS	4	1.0%
33	33 YEARS	2	0.5%
34	34 YEARS	2	0.5%
35	35 YEARS	7	1.8%
36	36 YEARS	2	0.5%
37	37 YEARS	2	0.5%
38	38 YEARS	0	
39	39 YEARS	2	0.5%
40	40 YEARS	12	3.1%
41	41 YEARS	2	0.5%
42	42 YEARS	1	0.3%
43	43 YEARS	2	0.5%
44	44 YEARS	1	0.3%
45	45 YEARS	2	0.5%
46	46 YEARS	1	0.3%
47	47 YEARS	0	
48	48 YEARS	1	0.3%
49	49 YEARS	1	0.3%
50	50 YEARS	5	1.3%
51	51 YEARS	0	
52	52 YEARS	0	
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	0	
55	55 YEARS	0	
56	56 YEARS	0	
57	57 YEARS	0	
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	0	
60	60 YEARS	0	
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	0	

v436: YEARS EXPERIENCE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	0	
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS	0	
71	71 YEARS	0	
72	72 YEARS	0	
73	73 YEARS	0	
74	74 YEARS	0	
75	75 YEARS	0	
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	0	
78	78 YEARS	0	
79	79 YEARS	0	
80	80 YEARS	0	
81	81 YEARS	0	
82	82 YEARS	0	
83	83 YEARS	0	
84	84 YEARS	0	
85	85 YEARS	0	
86	86 YEARS	0	
87	87 YEARS	0	
88	88 YEARS	0	
89	89 YEARS	0	
90	90 YEARS	0	
91	91 YEARS	0	
92	92 YEARS	0	
93	93 YEARS	0	
94	94 YEARS	0	
95	95 YEARS	0	
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	0	
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	N.A.	2380	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v437: OWN OR MANAGE FARM SPOUSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=90 /-] [Invalid=2671 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a farm occupation.
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
Literal question	Q78D. DOES (DID) HE OWN THE FARM OR MANAGE IT?

# v437: OWN OR MANAGE FARM SPOUSE			
Notes		Q78AB, Q78D in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OWNER	81	<div><div></div></div> 90.0%
2	MANAGER	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
3	OTHER FARM WORKER	7	<div><div></div></div> 7.8%
9	N.A.	2671	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v438: YEARS WORKED ON FARM SPOUSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=25 /-] [Invalid=2736 /-]	
Universe		Asked only to respondents with a farming occupation.	
Pre-question		Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)	
Literal question		Q78E. (IF FARM WORKER) HOW MANY YEARS HAS (HAD) HE BEEN WORKING ON A FARM?	
Notes		Q78AB, Q78E in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
1	1 YEARS	0	
2	2 YEARS	0	
3	3 YEARS	0	
4	4 YEARS	0	
5	5 YEARS	0	
6	6 YEARS	0	
7	7 YEARS	0	
8	8 YEARS	0	
9	9 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
10	10 YEARS	0	
11	11 YEARS	0	
12	12 YEARS	0	
13	13 YEARS	0	
14	14 YEARS	0	
15	15 YEARS	0	
16	16 YEARS	0	
17	17 YEARS	0	
18	18 YEARS	0	
19	19 YEARS	0	
20	20 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
21	21 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
22	22 YEARS	0	
23	23 YEARS	0	
24	24 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
25	25 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
26	26 YEARS	0	
27	27 YEARS	0	
28	28 YEARS	0	

v438: YEARS WORKED ON FARM SPOUSE









Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	29 YEARS	0	
30	30 YEARS	2	8.0%
31	31 YEARS	0	
32	32 YEARS	0	
33	33 YEARS	1	4.0%
34	34 YEARS	0	
35	35 YEARS	1	4.0%
36	36 YEARS	0	
37	37 YEARS	0	
38	38 YEARS	1	4.0%
39	39 YEARS	0	
40	40 YEARS	4	16.0%
41	41 YEARS	0	
42	42 YEARS	0	
43	43 YEARS	0	
44	44 YEARS	1	4.0%
45	45 YEARS	0	
46	46 YEARS	0	
47	47 YEARS	0	
48	48 YEARS	0	
49	49 YEARS	0	
50	50 YEARS	1	4.0%
51	51 YEARS	0	
52	52 YEARS	1	4.0%
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	0	
55	55 YEARS	1	4.0%
56	56 YEARS	0	
57	57 YEARS	0	
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	1	4.0%
60	60 YEARS	2	8.0%
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	0	
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	0	
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS	1	4.0%
71	71 YEARS	0	
72	72 YEARS	0	
73	73 YEARS	0	

# v438: YEARS WORKED ON FARM SPOUSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
74	74 YEARS	0	
75	75 YEARS	0	
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	0	
78	78 YEARS	0	
79	79 YEARS	0	
80	80 YEARS	0	
81	81 YEARS	0	
82	82 YEARS	0	
83	83 YEARS	0	
84	84 YEARS	0	
85	85 YEARS	0	
86	86 YEARS	0	
87	87 YEARS	0	
88	88 YEARS	0	
89	89 YEARS	0	
90	90 YEARS	0	
91	91 YEARS	0	
92	92 YEARS	0	
93	93 YEARS	0	
94	94 YEARS	0	
95	95 YEARS	0	
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	0	
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	N.A.	2736	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v439: NO. ACRES ON FARM SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=78 /-] [Invalid=2683 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a farming occupation.		
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q78G. HOW MANY ACRES IS (WAS) THE FARM?		
Notes	Q78AB, Q78G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 ACRES	0	
1	1 ACRES	0	
2	2 ACRES	1	<div><div></div>1.3%</div>
3	3 ACRES	1	<div><div></div>1.3%</div>
4	4 ACRES	0	
5	5 ACRES	2	<div><div></div>2.6%</div>
6	6 ACRES	0	
7	7 ACRES	0	

v439: NO. ACRES ON FARM SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	8 ACRES	0	
9	9 ACRES	0	
10	10 ACRES	0	
11	11 ACRES	0	
12	12 ACRES	0	
13	13 ACRES	0	
14	14 ACRES	0	
15	15 ACRES	0	
16	16 ACRES	0	
17	17 ACRES	0	
18	18 ACRES	0	
19	19 ACRES	0	
20	20 ACRES	0	
21	21 ACRES	0	
22	22 ACRES	0	
23	23 ACRES	0	
24	24 ACRES	0	
25	25 ACRES	0	
26	26 ACRES	0	
27	27 ACRES	0	
28	28 ACRES	0	
29	29 ACRES	0	
30	30 ACRES	0	
31	31 ACRES	0	
32	32 ACRES	0	
33	33 ACRES	0	
34	34 ACRES	0	
35	35 ACRES	0	
36	36 ACRES	0	
37	37 ACRES	0	
38	38 ACRES	0	
39	39 ACRES	0	
40	40 ACRES	0	
41	41 ACRES	0	
42	42 ACRES	0	
43	43 ACRES	0	
44	44 ACRES	0	
45	45 ACRES	0	
46	46 ACRES	0	
47	47 ACRES	0	
48	48 ACRES	0	
49	49 ACRES	0	
50	50 ACRES	0	
61	100 ACRES	15	<div></div> 19.2%
62	200 ACRES	18	<div></div> 23.1%










v439: NO. ACRES ON FARM SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	300 ACRES	12	 15.4%
64	400 ACRES	3	 3.8%
65	500 ACRES	7	 9.0%
66	600 ACRES	1	 1.3%
67	700 ACRES	0	
68	800 ACRES	3	 3.8%
69	900 ACRES	0	
71	1000 ACRES	11	 14.1%
72	2000 ACRES	3	 3.8%
73	3000 ACRES	1	 1.3%
74	4000 ACRES	0	
75	5000 ACRES	0	
76	6000 ACRES	0	
77	7000 ACRES	0	
78	8000 ACRES	0	
79	9000 ACRES	0	
80	10000 OR MORE ACRES	0	
99	N.A.	2683	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v440: MAIN PRODUCT OF FARM SPOUSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=86 /-] [Invalid=2675 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a farming occupation.
Pre-question	Q78AB. WHAT IS (WAS) THE OCCUPATION OF (PERSON SELECTED)? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
Literal question	Q78H. WHAT IS (WAS) THE MAIN PRODUCT?
Notes	Q78AB, Q78H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SUBSISTENCE	0	
2	SOYBEANS, PEANUTS, LINSEED, ETC.	0	
3	TEXTILE PRODUCTS	0	
4	FRUIT OR VEGETABLE	1	 1.2%
5	TOBACCO	0	
6	POTATOES	3	 3.5%
7	SUGAR BEETS	0	
8	BEEF CATTLE	7	 8.1%
9	OTHER LIVESTOCK	4	 4.7%
10	DAIRY	15	 17.4%
11	HAY, ALFALFA, ETC.	2	 2.3%
12	POULTRY, EGGS	0	
13	WHEAT	14	 16.3%
14	OTHER GRAINS	18	 20.9%
15	MISCELLANEOUS, UNSPECIFIED, TRUCK FARM, ETC.	22	 25.6%
99	N.A.	2675	

# v440: MAIN PRODUCT OF FARM SPOUSE			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 18.24-9999] [Missing=*/9999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	Q78AB in the documentation. FOUR DIGIT BLISHEN SCORE AND EXTENDED OCCUPATION CODE. THESE SCORES ARE BASED ON 1971 CENSUS DATA. A DISCUSSION OF THE CONSTRUCTION AND USE OF THE BLISHEN OCCUPATION MEASURES MAY BE FOUND IN BERNARD R. BLISHEN, "A SOCIO - ECONOMIC INDEX FOR OCCUPATIONS IN CANADA", CANADIAN REVIEW OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY, IV (1967), PP. 41-53.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18.24		2	0.1%
18.65		12	0.4%
19.36		5	0.2%
21.86		1	0.0%
22.16		1	0.0%
22.75		1	0.0%
23		27	1.0%
23.68		1	0.0%
24		4	0.1%
24.09		2	0.1%
24.21		6	0.2%
24.32		1	0.0%
24.39		1	0.0%
24.7		1	0.0%
24.82		2	0.1%
24.97		17	0.6%
25.04		1	0.0%
25.08		1	0.0%
25.65		1	0.0%
25.7		1	0.0%
25.9		9	0.3%
25.99		1	0.0%
26.48		5	0.2%
26.69		4	0.1%
26.7		2	0.1%
26.81		7	0.3%
26.98		5	0.2%
27.02		10	0.4%
27.07		2	0.1%
27.08		1	0.0%
27.22		1	0.0%
27.23		4	0.1%
27.49		1	0.0%
27.62		12	0.4%
27.69		1	0.0%

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
28.01		58	2.1%
28.1		19	0.7%
28.47		1	0.0%
28.73		4	0.1%
28.87		7	0.3%
28.99		1	0.0%
29.03		1	0.0%
29.14		3	0.1%
29.47		2	0.1%
29.6		4	0.1%
29.67		2	0.1%
29.79		1	0.0%
29.8		18	0.7%
29.88		2	0.1%
29.91		2	0.1%
30.39		2	0.1%
30.4		1	0.0%
30.48		2	0.1%
30.71		1	0.0%
31.15		1	0.0%
31.18		1	0.0%
31.45		1	0.0%
31.86		3	0.1%
31.99		2	0.1%
32.22		3	0.1%
32.32		1	0.0%
32.46		1	0.0%
32.56		1	0.0%
32.87		10	0.4%
32.88		3	0.1%
33.07		1	0.0%
33.31		5	0.2%
33.44		1	0.0%
33.47		1	0.0%
34.1		2	0.1%
34.45		11	0.4%
34.46		7	0.3%
34.59		1	0.0%
34.78		3	0.1%
34.91		4	0.1%
35.16		1	0.0%
35.25		3	0.1%
35.7		2	0.1%
36.33		1	0.0%
36.81		1	0.0%

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37.28		9	0.3%
37.7		7	0.3%
37.73		3	0.1%
37.74		9	0.3%
37.75		21	0.8%
38.29		4	0.1%
38.32		6	0.2%
38.53		1	0.0%
39		1	0.0%
39.04		1	0.0%
39.06		3	0.1%
39.15		1	0.0%
40.09		2	0.1%
40.3		1	0.0%
40.36		1	0.0%
40.51		1	0.0%
40.64		2	0.1%
41.01		2	0.1%
41.07		2	0.1%
41.14		1	0.0%
41.41		5	0.2%
41.42		2	0.1%
41.47		1	0.0%
41.48		4	0.1%
41.83		2	0.1%
41.85		2	0.1%
42.01		4	0.1%
42.42		4	0.1%
42.76		1	0.0%
43.04		3	0.1%
43.21		2	0.1%
43.27		1	0.0%
43.81		10	0.4%
43.88		3	0.1%
44.11		3	0.1%
44.2		4	0.1%
44.4		3	0.1%
44.71		1	0.0%
44.78		1	0.0%
45.01		1	0.0%
45.11		2	0.1%
45.7		1	0.0%
46.08		3	0.1%
46.32		10	0.4%
46.41		1	0.0%

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46.46		2	0.1%
46.48		4	0.1%
46.7		2	0.1%
46.82		1	0.0%
46.93		6	0.2%
47.01		2	0.1%
47.13		3	0.1%
47.4		2	0.1%
47.41		2	0.1%
47.72		11	0.4%
47.92		1	0.0%
48		2	0.1%
48.09		1	0.0%
48.12		1	0.0%
48.29		1	0.0%
48.45		1	0.0%
48.49		1	0.0%
48.62		3	0.1%
48.68		1	0.0%
48.72		2	0.1%
48.86		1	0.0%
49.13		1	0.0%
49.15		1	0.0%
49.17		1	0.0%
49.52		1	0.0%
49.61		1	0.0%
49.73		2	0.1%
49.98		1	0.0%
50.09		6	0.2%
50.32		1	0.0%
50.4		2	0.1%
50.68		2	0.1%
50.94		1	0.0%
51.03		1	0.0%
51.1		5	0.2%
51.28		1	0.0%
51.37		1	0.0%
51.4		1	0.0%
51.65		2	0.1%
52.3		1	0.0%
52.41		1	0.0%
52.43		1	0.0%
52.44		2	0.1%
52.45		1	0.0%
52.49		3	0.1%

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52.55		3	0.1%
53.13		2	0.1%
54.02		1	0.0%
54.35		1	0.0%
54.38		4	0.1%
54.67		1	0.0%
54.92		2	0.1%
55.39		1	0.0%
55.49		4	0.1%
55.53		1	0.0%
55.62		6	0.2%
56.13		1	0.0%
56.83		1	0.0%
57.17		2	0.1%
57.75		6	0.2%
58.07		1	0.0%
58.94		1	0.0%
59.78		4	0.1%
59.79		5	0.2%
60.19		3	0.1%
60.35		1	0.0%
60.77		1	0.0%
61.08		5	0.2%
61.48		1	0.0%
61.61		3	0.1%
61.62		2	0.1%
61.89		1	0.0%
62.09		2	0.1%
63.96		7	0.3%
64.41		1	0.0%
64.49		1	0.0%
65.18		4	0.1%
65.75		2	0.1%
65.76		1	0.0%
65.81		11	0.4%
66.16		1	0.0%
66.41		2	0.1%
66.78		2	0.1%
66.92		2	0.1%
67.43		5	0.2%
67.58		1	0.0%
67.88		1	0.0%
68.17		1	0.0%
68.28		7	0.3%
68.71		3	0.1%

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
68.72		1	0.0%
68.73		1	0.0%
68.74		1	0.0%
69.2		2	0.1%
69.25		2	0.1%
70.48		1	0.0%
70.74		2	0.1%
71.77		5	0.2%
71.95		2	0.1%
72.02		2	0.1%
72.18		3	0.1%
72.3		4	0.1%
72.74		2	0.1%
73.42		1	0.0%
74.24		2	0.1%
74.49		1	0.0%
74.72		2	0.1%
75.32		2	0.1%
99.99		2010	72.8%
1441	HUNTING,TRAPPING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
1824	FISH CANNING, CURING & PACKING OCCUPS.	0	
1865	FISHERMEN: NET, TRAP & LINE	0	
1923	NEWSBOYS	0	
1936	FORESTRY & LOGGING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
1963	TEXTILE FIBRE PREPAR. OCCUPS.	0	
1980	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRIC.ASSEM.&REPAIR:WOOD PROD.	0	
1994	SHOEMAKING & REPAIR. OCCUPS.	0	
2033	WOOD SANDING OCCUPS.	0	
2058	PRESSING OCCUPS.	0	
2063	MILLINERS,HAT & CAP MAKERS	0	
2073	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:TEXTILE PROCESS.	0	
2173	TEXTILE WEAVING OCCUPS.	0	
2186	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: FAB. ASSEM. & REP. TEXT.,	0	
2205	KNITTING OCCUPS.	0	
2216	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK FABRIC. ASSEM. & REPAIR. WOO	0	
2223	OCCUPS. IN SPORT & RECREATION, N.E.C.	0	
2252	TEXTILE SPINNING & TWISTING OCCUPS.	0	
2275	FISHING, HUNTING, TRAPPING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2286	TIMBER CUTTING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2300	FARMERS	0	
2307	ELEVATOR OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
2323	FABRICAT., ASSEMBL. & REPAIR. OCCUPS.: TEXT., FUR. LEATH. P	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2325	SEWING MACHINE OPERATORS, TEXT. & SIMILAR MATERS.	0	
2341	TEXTILE FINISHING & CALENDERING OCCUPS.	0	
2368	WOOD SAWING & REL, OCCUPS. EXC. SAWMILL	0	
2400	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:EXCAVAT.,GRAD.&PAVING	0	
2409	RAILWAY SECTIONMEN & TRACKMEN	0	
2421	FARM WORKERS	0	
2426	LAUNDERING & DRY CLEANING OCCUPS.	0	
2432	TAILORS & DRESSMAKERS	0	
2439	TEXTILE PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
2440	TEXTILE BLEACHING & DYEING OCCUPS.	0	
2442	TEXTILE WINDING & REELING OCCUPS.	0	
2454	BABYSITTERS	0	
2470	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:WOOD MACHINING	0	
2482	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:FORESTRY & LOGGING	0	
2486	FABRICAT., ASSEMBL. & REPAIR. OCCUPS.: WOOD PRODS., N.E.C.	0	
2497	JANITORS, CHARWORKERS & CLEANERS	0	
2504	FURRIERS	0	
2508	BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2565	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK,OTH.PROCESS	0	
2566	PAVING, SURFACING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2570	PLANING, TURNING, SHAPING & REL. WOOD MACHIN. OCCUPS.	0	
2571	HIDE & PELT PROC. OCCUPS.	0	
2584	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK CLAY, GLASS, STONE PROC. & F	0	
2590	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK FOOD, BEV. & REL. PROC.	0	
2599	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: WOOD PROC. EXC. PULP & PAP	0	
2617	FARM MACHINERY OPERATORS & CUSTOM OPERATORS	0	
2644	FRUIT&VEG.CANNING,PRESERV.&PACKAG. OCCUPS.	0	
2648	BARTENDERS	0	
2650	OCCUPS. IN LODGING & OTH. ACCOMM., N.E.C.	0	
2655	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:SERVICES	0	
2669	OTH. TRANSP. & REL. EQUIP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C	0	
2670	TAXI DRIVERS & CHAUFFEURS	0	
2671	APPAREL & FURNISHINGS, SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2681	CHEFS & COOKS	0	
2698	SAWMILL SAWYERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2701	ROOFING, WATERPROOFING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2702	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK, OTH. CONSTR. TRADES	0	
2707	CHAMBERMAIDS & HOUSEMEN	0	
2708	CABINET & WOOD FURNITURE MAKERS	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2722	UPHOLSTERERS	0	
2723	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK FABRIC. & ASSEM. METAL PROD.	0	
2738	SEPARAT., GRIND., CRUSH. & MIXING OCCUPS.: CLAY, GLASS & STO	0	
2743	OTH. PROCESS. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2744	PATTERNMAK., MARKING & CUTTING OCCUPS.: TEXT., FUR & LEATH.	0	
2745	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:TEXTILE PROCESSING	0	
2749	FOOD & BEV. PREP. & REL. SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2762	LABOURERS, N.E.C.	0	
2769	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REP. TEXTILE, FUR. & LE	0	
2797	WAITERS, HOSTESSES & STEWARDS, FOOD & BEV.	0	
2800	NURSERY & REL. WORKERS	0	
2801	FARM MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
2810	CARPENTERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2815	GUIDES	0	
2847	BAKING, CONFECTIONARY MAKING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2869	CUTTING & SHAPING OCCUPS.: CLAY, GLASS & STONE	0	
2871	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: PROD. FAB. ASSEM & REPAIR.,	0	
2872	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: FAB. ASSEM. I. & EL. ELECT	0	
2873	GUARDS & WATCHMEN	0	
2879	SLEEPING-CAR & BAGGAGE PORTERS & BELLMEN	0	
2883	WOOD MACHINING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2887	PAINTERS, PAPERHANGERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2899	DECK CREW, SHIP	0	
2903	FLOUR & GRAIN MILLING OCCUPS.	0	
2914	CONCRETE FINISHING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2928	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:CLAY,GLASS & STONE MACHINING	0	
2944	METAL MACHINING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
2947	BRICK & STONE MASONS & TILE SETTERS	0	
2957	OTH. SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
2958	WOOD PROCESS. OCCUPS. EXC. PULP & PAPERMAKING, N.E.	0	
2960	SERVICE STATION ATTENDANTS	0	
2967	OTH. FARMING, HORTICULT. & ANIMAL HUSBANDRY OCCUPS. N.E.C.	0	
2979	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORKK FAB. ASSEM. REP. RUB. PLAS.	0	
2980	TRUCK DRIVERS	0	
2988	CAPTAINS & OTHER OFFICERS, FISHING VESSELS	0	
2990	ENGINE & BOILER ROOM CREW, SHIP	0	
2991	EXCAVATING, GRADING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
2992	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:MATER. HANDLING	0	
2998	HOTEL CLERKS	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2999	ATTENDANTS, SPORT & RECREATION	0	
3006	PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3008	MESSENGERS	0	
3038	ABRADING AND POLISHING OCCUPS.: CLAY, GLASS & STON N.E.C.	0	
3039	LOG HOISTING, SORTING, MOVING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3040	PAINTING & DECORATING OCCUPS. EXC. CONSTRUC.	0	
3048	PLASTERERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3071	RAILWAY TRANSP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3100	MILK PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
3112	MOULDING OCCUPS. RUBB.,PLAST.&REL. PROD.	0	
3115	PACKAGING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3118	SLAUGHTERING & MEAT CUTTING, CANNING, CURING & PACKING OCCUP	0	
3134	FORMING OCCUPS:CLAY,GLASS & STONE	0	
3139	FABRICAT. ASSEMBL. & REPAIR OCCUPS.: RUBB., PLAST. & REL. P	0	
3145	OTH. CONSTRUC. TRADES OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3146	CRUSHING & GRIND. OCCUPS. CHEM. & REL. MATERIALS	0	
3162	GLAZIERS	0	
3169	METALWORKING-MACHINE OPERATORS,N.E.C.	0	
3186	FORESTRY CONSERV. OCCUPS.	0	
3196	CUTTING & FINISHING OCCUPS.: RUBB., PLAST. & REL. PRODS.	0	
3199	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIP. OPERATORS, N.E.C.	0	
3208	STREET VENDORS & DOOR-TO-DOOR SALESMEN	0	
3220	CLAY, GLASS & STONE PROCESS. FORMING & REL. OCCUPS. N.E.C.	0	
3221	CLAY, GLASS & STONE & REL. MATER. MACHIN. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3222	OTH. PROD. FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR. OCCUPS., N.E.	0	
3226	FOOD, BEV. & REL. PROCESS. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3227	NURSING AIDES & ORDERLIES	0	
3232	BUS DRIVERS	0	
3246	LONGSHOREMEN, STEVEDORES & FREIGHT HANDLERS	0	
3248	PLYWOOD MAKING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3256	MATERIALS HANDLING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3257	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,WOOD PROCESS.EXC.PULP&PAPERMAKING	0	
3258	JEWELLERY & SILVERWARE FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR OCCUPS.	0	
3272	MOULDING,COREMAKING & METAL CASTING OCCUPS.	0	
3280	EXCAVATING, GRADING, PAVING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3287	MOTOR VEHICLE MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
3288	DRIVER-SALESMEN	0	
3306	FURNACEMEN&KILNMEN:CLAY,GLASS & STONE	0	
3307	OCCUPS.: LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK: EL. POW.: LIGHT. & WIR. CO	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3308	FILING, GRINDING, BUFFING, CLEAN. & POLISH. OCCUPS. N.E.C.	0	
3311	COATING & CALENDERING OCCUPS.: CHEM. & REL. MATER.	0	
3327	IND.FARM CONST..&OTH.MECH.EQUIP.&MACH.FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OC	0	
3331	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK MINING & QUARRY. INC. OIL &	0	
3344	MARINE CRAFT FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR. OCCUPS.	0	
3347	BLASTING OCCUPS.	0	
3368	PLATING, METAL SPRAYING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3381	BONDING & CEMENTING OCCUPS.: RUBB., PLAST. & REL. PRODS.	0	
3394	FORGING OCCUPS.	0	
3410	OCCUPS. LAB. & OTH. ELEM. WORK CHEM. PETR. RUB. PLAS. & REL	0	
3414	OTH. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3425	OTH. FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OCCUPS. METAL PRODS., N.E.C	0	
3428	TOBACCO PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
3445	SHIPPING & RECEIVING CLERKS	0	
3446	MINING&QUARRYING:CUTTING,HANDLING&LOADING OCCUPS.	0	
3459	ENGINE & REL. EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3467	WOOD TREATING OCCUPS.	0	
3472	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:PRINT.&REL.,N.E.C.	0	
3478	MOTOR VEHICLE FABRICAT.&ASSEMB. OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3488	INSULATING OCCUPS. CONSTRUCTION	0	
3489	FABRICAT., ASSEMBL. I. & R. OCCUPS.: ELECTRIC. ELECTRON. &	0	
3491	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:METAL PROCESS.	0	
3516	METAL PROCESS. & REL. OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3525	WELDING & FLAME CUTTING OCCUPS.	0	
3530	WEIGHERS	0	
3536	PAPER PRODUCT FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OCCUPS.	0	
3541	SUGAR PROCESS. & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3546	WATER TRANSP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3553	ELECTRICAL EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUPS.	0	
3561	OTH. ROCK & SOIL-DRILLING OCCUPS.	0	
3566	OCCUPS. IN RELIGION, N.E.C.	0	
3570	SUPERVISORS: OCCUPS. IN LODGING & OTH. ACCOM.	0	
3594	STRUCTURAL METAL ERECTORS	0	
3595	FOREMAN:OTH. FARMING,HORTICULT.&ANIMAL HUSBANDRY OC	0	
3633	METAL SHAPING&FORMING OCCUPS.EXC.MACHINING,N.E.C.	0	
3639	ROASTING, COOKING & DRYING OCCUPS., CHEMICALS & REL MATERS.	0	
3650	NURSING ASSISTANTS	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3677	MIXING&BLENDING OCCUPS.,CHEMICALS&REL.MATER.	0	
3681	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:PULP&PAPERMAKING	0	
3699	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:PROCESSING,N.E.C.	0	
3713	PRINTING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3728	SUPERVISORS: FOOD & BEV. PREP. & REL. SERVICE OCCU	0	
3770	PIPEFITTING, PLUMBING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3773	SHEET METAL WORKERS	0	
3774	MACHINE TOOL OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
3775	MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN EXC. ELECTRICAL, N.E.C.	0	
3780	OCCUPS. IN LAB.&OTH.ELEM.WORK:MINERAL ORE TREAT.	0	
3793	MOTORMEN & DINKEYMEN,EXC. RAIL TRANSP.	0	
3799	HOISTING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3805	CRUSHING & GRIND. OCCUPS. MINERAL ORES	0	
3812	DANCERS & CHOREOGRAPHERS	0	
3816	FOREMAN:FORESTRY & LOGGING OCCUPS.	0	
3820	NURSING,THERAPY & REL. ASSIST.OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3823	METAL EXTRUDING & DRAWING OCCUPS.	0	
3826	TELEPHONE OPERATORS	0	
3828	PRECIS. INSTRUM. & REL. EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEM. OCCUPS.,	0	
3829	SUPERVISORS: OTHER SERVICE OCCUPS.	0	
3832	SALES CLERKS, COMMODITIES	0	
3852	REFEREES & REL. OFFICIALS	0	
3853	STOCK CLERKS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3861	ELECTRONIC EQUIP. FABRICAT. & ASSEMB. OCCUPS.	0	
3866	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:PRODUCT FABRICAT.ASSEM.&REPAIR.,NE	0	
3880	ENGRAVERS, ETCHERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3885	BOOKBINDERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3900	PAINTERS, SCULPTORS & REL. ARTISTS	0	
3904	FOREMAN:EXCAVATING,GRADING,PAVING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3906	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FOOD,BEV.&REL. PROCESS.	0	
3907	MANAGERS: HOTEL, MOTEL & OTH. ACCOMM.	0	
3910	METAL HEAT TREATING OCCUPS.	0	
3915	RAIL TRANSP. EQUIP. MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
3928	LOG INSPECT. GRAD. SCALING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
3941	METAL SMELT.CONVERTING&REFINING FURNACEMEN	0	
3983	MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING & DISTRIB. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
3990	MOTOR TRANSPORT OPERATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
3997	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:MACHINING,N.E.C.	0	
3999	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:CLAY,GLASS & STONE PROCESS.&FORMIN	0	
4005	WATCH & CLOCK REPAIRMEN	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4009	SUPERVISORS: APPAREL & FURNISHINGS SERVICE OCCUPS.	0	
4030	FOREMAN:WOOD PROCESS.OCCUPS.EXC.PULP&PAPERMAKING	0	
4036	TELLERS & CASHIERS	0	
4037	FOREMAN:WOOD MACHING OCCUPS.	0	
4038	OTH. OCCUPS. IN ARCHITEC. & ENGINEERING, N.E.C.	0	
4051	OCCUPS. IN PERFORMING & AUDIO-VISUAL ARTS, N.E.C.	0	
4064	METAL SHAPING&FORMING OCCUPS.EXEC.MACHINING,N.E.C.	0	
4065	RECEPTIONISTS & INFO. CLERKS	0	
4070	MINING&QUARRYING INCL.OIL&GASFIELD OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4083	BEVERAGE PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4101	PROTECT. SERVICE OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4106	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRICAT. ASSEM. & REPAIR.RUBB., PLAST. &	0	
4107	FOREMAN:MOTOR TRANSP, OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
4114	ROTARY WELLDRILLING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
4116	HOSTESSES & STEWARDS, EXC. FOOD & BEV.	0	
4118	BOILMAKERS, PLATERS & STRUCTURAL METAL WORKERS	0	
4121	METAL ROLLING OCCUPS.	0	
4132	AIR TRANSPORT OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4141	SALES OCCUPS.: COMMODITIES, N.E.C.	0	
4142	PULP & PAPERMAKING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4147	INDUS.FARM&CONSTRUC.MACHINERY MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
4148	STATIONARY ENGINE & UTIL. EQUIP. OPERATING & REL. OCCUPS., N	0	
4166	PRINTING PRESS OCCUPS.	0	
4181	AIRCRAFT FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4183	FOREMAN:FABRICAT. ASSEM.&REPAIR.OCCUPS.:WOOD PRODUC	0	
4185	MAIL CARRIERS	0	
4193	ENGINEERING OFFICERS, SHIP	0	
4201	MACHINISTS & MACHINE TOOL SETTING-UP OCCUPS.	0	
4214	MELTING & ROASTING OCCUPS.: MINERAL ORES	0	
4233	FILTERING, STRAINING & SEPARATING OCCUPS.: CHEM. & REL. MATE	0	
4242	FOREMAN:OTH. CONSTRUCTION TRADES OCCUPS.	0	
4259	MINERAL ORE TREATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4276	RECEP., INFO., MAIL & MESSAGE DISTRIB. OCCUPS., N.E	0	
4285	FOREMAN:FABRICAT,&ASSEM. & REPAIR.OCCUPS.:TEXT.FUR. LEATH. P	0	
4304	RADIO & T.V. SERVICE REPAIRMEN	0	
4321	OTH. RANKS, ARMED FORCES	0	
4327	MOTION PICTURE PROJECTIONISTS	0	
4328	MUSICIANS	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4381	SALESMEN & SALESPERSONS, COMMODITIES, N.E.C.	0	
4388	ELEC. & REL. EQUIP. I. & R. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4399	FOREMAN:MATERIALS HANDLING & REL.OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4400	MIXING,SEPARATING,FILTERING&REL.OCCUPS.,MINERAL ORE	0	
4411	OTHER SALES OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4420	OTH. CRAFTS & EQUIP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
4429	OFFICE MACHINE OPERATORS	0	
4433	CELLULOSE PULP PREPARING OCCUPS.	0	
4434	TECHNIC. IN LIBRARY, MUSEUM & ARCHIVAL SCIS.	0	
4440	RAILWAY TRANSP. OPERATING SUPPORT OCCUPS.	0	
4444	FOREMAN: CLAY, GLASS & STONE & REL. MATER. MACHINING OCCUPS	0	
4448	SUBWAY & STREET RAILWAY OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
4459	OCCUPS. IN LIBRARY, MUSEUM & ARCHIVAL SCIS., N.E.C.	0	
4471	I.T.G. & S. OCCUPS.: EQUIP. REPAIR EXC. ELECTRICAL	0	
4472	OTH. OCCUPS. IN MEDICINE & HEALTH, N.E.C.	0	
4478	FOREMAN:TEXTILE PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4483	PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4501	DECK OFFICERS	0	
4507	TYPESETTERS & COMPOSITORS	0	
4511	FOREMAN:MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN EXC. ELECTRICAL	0	
4527	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:METAL MACHINING	0	
4543	TYPISTS & CLERK TYPISTS	0	
4544	STEREOTYPERS & ELECTROTYPERS	0	
4557	LIBRARY & FILE CLERKS	0	
4562	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRIC.ASSEM.METAL PROD.,N.E.C.	0	
4570	CHEM. PETROL. RUBB. PLAST. & REL. MATER. PROCESS. OCCUPS., N	0	
4574	POLICEMEN & INVESTIGATORS, PRIV.	0	
4595	OCCUPS. IN FINE&COMMERC. ART.PHOTOG.&REL.FIELDS,N.E	0	
4608	FOREMAN:FOOD,BEV. & REL. PROCESS.OCCUPS.	0	
4632	SUPERVISORS & FOREMEN, N.E.C.	0	
4641	GEN. OFFICE CLERKS	0	
4646	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:METAL SHAPING&FORMING,EXC.MACH.	0	
4648	LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS & FIREMEN	0	
4653	NUNS & BROTHERS (W),N.O.R.	0	
4670	FOREMAN:OTH. PROCESS. OCCUPS.	0	
4677	FOREMAN:OTH.MACHINING & REL. OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4682	COACHES, TRAINERS, INSTRUCTORS & MGRS.: SPORT & REC	0	
4693	CONSTRUCTION ELECTRIC. & REPAIRMEN	0	
4701	PAPERMAKING & FINISHING OCCUPS.	0	
4704	FOREMAN:CLAY,GLASS & STONE PROCESS. FORMING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4713	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
4736	PATTERNMAKERS & MOULDMAKERS, N.E.C.	0	
4740	FOREMAN:METAL SHAPING & FORMING OCCUPS.EXC. MACH.	0	
4741	SUPERVISORS: OTHER SALES OCCUPS.	0	
4772	SUPERVISORS: SALES OCCUPS., COMMODITIES	0	
4792	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:MINERAL ORE TREATING	0	
4800	CONDUCTORS & BRAKEMEN, RAILWAY	0	
4809	FOREMAN:PRODUCT FABRICAT.ASSEM.&REPAIR.OCCUPS.,N.E.	0	
4812	MAIL & POSTAL CLERKS	0	
4829	EL. POW. LIGHT. & WIRE COMMUN. EQUIP. EREC. I. & R. OCCUPS.	0	
4831	DENTAL HYGIENISTS, ASSIST. & TECHNIC.	0	
4845	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:METAL PROCESSING	0	
4849	WOOD PATTERNMAKING OCCUPS.	0	
4862	ELECTRICAL POWER LINEMAN & REL OCCUPS.	0	
4868	AD. & ILLUSTRATING ARTISTS	0	
4872	OTH. CLERICAL & REL. OCCUPS., N.D.C.	0	
4886	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:FABRICAT.ASSEM.I.&R. EL. ELECTRON. & REL.	0	
4891	ATHLETES	0	
4903	OCCUPS. IN PHYSICAL SCIS., N.E.C.	0	
4913	FOREMAN:FABRICAT.ASSEM.REPAIR.OCCUPS.RUBB.,PLAS OTH. REL	0	
4915	OCCUPS. IN WELFARE & COMMUN. SERVICES, N.E.C.	0	
4917	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,CONSTRUCT.,EXC.ELECTRICAL (INSPECTING,TEST	0	
4918	POSTMASTERS	0	
4936	ACTORS	0	
4952	PHOTOGRAPHERS & CAMERAMEN	0	
4961	INSURANCE, BANK & OTH. FINANCE CLERKS	0	
4973	SUPERVISORS: MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING & DISTRIB. OCCUP	0	
4977	COLLECTORS & COLLECTION AGENTS	0	
4978	NURSES-IN-TRAINING	0	
4983	DISPENSING OPTICIANS	0	
4998	PHOTOENGRAVERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5009	REAL ESTATE SALESMEN	0	
5014	FOREMAN: MINING & QUARRY OCCUPS. INCL. OIL & GAS	0	
5017	BUS. & COMMERC. MACHINE MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
5027	BUS. & COMMERC. MACHINES FABRICAT. & ASSEMBL. OCCUP N.E.C.	0	
5032	MINISTERS OF RELIGION	0	
5039	PRINTERS, ENGRAVERS EXC. PHOTOENGRAVERS	0	
5040	FOREMAN:RAILWAY TRANSPORT OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
5049	PRODUCTION CLERKS	0	
5068	BOOKKEEPERS & ACCOUNTING CLERKS	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5094	BOOKKEEPING, ACCT.-RECORDING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5103	TELEGRAPH OPERATORS	0	
5110	FIRE FIGHTING OCCUPS.	0	
5128	NURSES,GRAD.EXC. SUPERVISORS	0	
5137	FUNERAL DIRECTORS,EMBALMERS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5140	FOREMAN:METAL PROCESS. & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5156	STATS. CLERKS	0	
5165	AIRCRAFT MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
5210	UNIV. TEACHING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5229	OCCUPS. IN LIFE SCIENCES, N.E.C.	0	
5230	FOREMAN:METAL MACHINING OCCUPS.	0	
5241	FOREMAN:PULP & PAPERMAKING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5243	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:CHEM.,PETROL.,RUBB.,PLAST.,&REL. MATER. PRO	0	
5244	SECRETARIES & STENOS.	0	
5245	SALES OCCUPS.: SERVICES, N.E.C.	0	
5249	TOOL & DIE MAKING OPERATIONS	0	
5255	OCCUPS. IN LAW & JURISPRUD., N.E.C.	0	
5303	PRODUCT & INTERIOR DESIGNERS	0	
5306	FOREMAN:PRINTING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
5313	ADJUSTORS, CLAIM	0	
5314	TEACHERS OF EXCEP. STUDENTS, N.E.C.	0	
5352	PHYSIOTHERAPISTS, OCCUPS. & OTH. THERAPISTS	0	
5362	FOREMAN:STATIONARY ENGINE&UTIL EQUIP.OPER.&REL.OCC.	0	
5399	OCCUPS. IN SOCIAL WORK & REL. FIELDS, N.E.C.	0	
5402	ELECTRON. & REL. COMMUN. EQUIP. OPERATING OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5403	FOREMAN:MINERAL ORE TREATING OCCUPS.	0	
5409	SURVEYORS	0	
5435	INSPECTORS & REGULATORY OFFICERS NON-GOVT.	0	
5438	FOREMAN FAB.&ASSEMBL.OCCUPS.METAL PRODUCTS,N.E.C.	0	
5461	LIBRARY, FILE & CORR. CLERKS & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5467	FOREMAN:OTH.TRANSP.&REL.EQUIP.OPERATING OCCUPS.	0	
5492	POWER STATION OPERATORS	0	
5507	TRAVEL CLERKS, TICKET, STATION & FREIGHT AGENTS	0	
5530	LIFE SCIENCES TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNIC.	0	
5539	OTH. TEACHING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5542	FINE ARTS SCHOOL TEACHERS	0	
5549	BUYERS, WHOLESALE & RETAIL TRADE	0	
5553	ELEM. & SEC. SCH. TEACHING & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
5557	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.,PULP & PAPERMAKING	0	
5562	MANAGEMENT OCCUPS., CONSTRUC. OPERATIONS	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5579	E.D.P. EQUIP. OPERATORS (ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING	0	
5599	FOREMAN:FABRICAT.ASSEM. I.&R.OCCUPS.EL.ELECTRON. REL. EQUIP.	0	
5613	FOREMAN:EL.POW.LIGHT. & WIRE COMMUN.EQUIP.EREC. I. & R. OCCU	0	
5643	INSTRUCTORS & TRAINING OFFICERS, N.E.C.	0	
5653	RADIO & T.V. BROADCASTING EQUIP. OPERATORS	0	
5672	SUPERVISORS: RECEP., INFO., MAIL & MESSAGE DISTRIB OCCUPS.	0	
5683	MEDICAL LAB. TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNIC.	0	
5687	SUPERVISORS: STENO. & TYPING OCCUPS.	0	
5690	MEMBERS OF LEGIS. BODIES	0	
5699	PERSONNEL CLERKS	0	
5705	SUPERVISORS: NURSING OCCUPS.	0	
5715	HEALTH DIAGNOSING&TREATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
5717	FOREMEN CHEMS., PETROL., RUBBER, PLAST. & REL. MAT PROC. OCC	0	
5725	OCCUPS. IN MATH. STATS., SYSTEMS ANAL. & REL. FIELD N.E.C.	0	
5731	ADVERTISING SALESMEN	0	
5747	COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS	0	
5749	DISTIL., SUBLIM. & CARBONIZ. OCCUPS., CHEMICALS & REL. MATE	0	
5775	INSURANCE SALESMEN & AGENTS	0	
5795	PRECIS. INSTRUM. MECHANICS & REPAIRMEN	0	
5796	OTH. OCCUPS. IN SOC. SCIS. & REL. FIELDS, N.E.C.	0	
5807	SERVICES MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
5853	RADIO & T.V. ANNOUNCERS	0	
5871	RADIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNICIANS	0	
5889	SOUND RECORDING & REPRODUCTION EQUIP. OPERATORS	0	
5894	OFFICIALS & ADMINISTRATORS UNIQUE TO GOVT., N.E.C.	0	
5919	FOREMAN:OTH.CRAFTS&EQUIP.OPERATING OCCUPS.,N.E.C.	0	
5923	AIR TRANSPORT OPERATING SUPPORT OCCUPS.	0	
5939	WIRE COMMUN. & REL. EQUIP. I. & R. OCCUPS.	0	
5965	I.T.G.&S.OCCUPS.:EL.POW. LIGHT. & WIR COMMUN. EQUIP. EREC.	0	
5977	SALESMEN & TRADERS, SECURITIES	0	
5978	INSPECTORS & REGULATORY OFFICERS GOVT.	0	
5979	ELECTRONIC & REL. EQUIP. INSTALL. & REPAIR OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
6019	POLICEMEN & DETECTIVES, GOVT.	0	
6035	PHYSICAL SCIS. TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNICIANS	0	
6050	SOCIOLOGISTS, ANTHROPOLOGISTS & REL. SOC. SCIENTIST	0	
6077	PURCH. OFFICERS & BUYERS, EXC. WHOLESALE & RETAIL TRADE	0	

v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6091	OCCUPS. IN SOCIAL SCIENCES, N.E.C.	0	
6092	BUSINESS SERVICE SALESMEN	0	
6108	MANAGEMENT OCCUPS., TRANSPORT & COMMUNICATIONS OPER	0	
6120	AGRICULTURISTS & REL. SCIENTISTS	0	
6141	SUPERVISORS: OTH. CLERICAL & REL. OCCUPS., N.E.C.	0	
6148	SUPERVISORS: BOOKKEEPING, ACCT.-RECORDING & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
6161	SOCIAL WORKERS	0	
6162	SUPERVISORS: SALES OCCUPS., SERVICES	0	
6167	TRANSLATORS & INTERPRETERS	0	
6184	LIBRARIANS & ARCHIVISTS	0	
6189	FOREMEN: AIR TRANSPORT OP. OCCUPS.	0	
6193	PURCHASING MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6209	DRAUGHTSMEN	0	
6215	SUPERVISORS: OCCUPS. IN LAB., MUSEUM & ARCHIV. SCI	0	
6224	PSYCHOLOGISTS	0	
6253	ARCHITEC. & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGISTS & TECHNICIANS	0	
6281	WRITERS & EDITORS	0	
6282	PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6319	PERSONNEL & INDUS. RELATIONS MGMNT. OCCUPS.	0	
6396	MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, N.E.C.	0	
6417	SUPERVISORS: LIBR., FILE & CORR. CLERKS & REL. OCCUPS.	0	
6441	DIETICIANS & NUTRITIONISTS	0	
6449	TECHNICAL SALESMEN & REL. ADVISORS	0	
6476	OCCUPS. REL. TO MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATION, N.E.C.	0	
6518	SALES & AD. MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6567	FOREMAN:ELECTR. & REL. COMMUN. EQUIP. OP. OCCUPS.,N	0	
6575	PERSONNEL & REL. OFFICERS	0	
6576	BIOLOGISTS & REL. SCIENTISTS	0	
6581	ELEM. & KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS	0	
6616	COMMUN. COLLEGE & VOCATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS	0	
6621	OCCUPATIONS IN WRITING, N.E.C.	0	
6641	CHEMISTS	0	
6678	GEN.MGRS. & OTH. SENIOR OFFICIALS	0	
6692	MANAGEMENT OCCUPS., SOC. SCIENCES & REL. FIELDS	0	
6699	MATHEMATICIANS, STATISTICIANS & ACTUARIES	0	
6707	PRODUCERS & DIRECTORS, PERFORMING & AUDIO-VISUAL AR	0	
6711	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERS	0	
6723	SUPERVISORS: OTH. OCCUPS. IN ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING	0	
6743	ACCOUNTANTS, AUDITORS & FINANCIAL OFFICERS	0	
6758	MECHANICAL ENGINEERS	0	

# v441: BLISHEN SCORE SPOUSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6788	PCLOTS, NAVIGATORS & FLIGHT ENGINEERS	0	
6817	COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, ARMED FORCES	0	
6828	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OCCUPS.	0	
6871	SYSTEMS ANALYSTS & COMPUT. PROGRAMMERS & REL. OCCUP	0	
6872	MINING ENGINEERS	0	
6873	SUPERVISORS: OFFICE MACHINE & E.D.P. EQUIP. OPER.	0	
6874	GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS	0	
6879	PHYSICISTS	0	
6897	ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS, N.E.C.	0	
6920	GEOLOGISTS	0	
6925	CIVIL ENGINEERS	0	
6926	POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, N.E.C.	0	
6964	ECONOMISTS	0	
6973	PETROLEUM ENGINEERS	0	
7048	ADMINISTRATORS, MEDICINE & HEALTH	0	
7074	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS	0	
7089	CHEMICAL ENGINEERS	0	
7127	OSTEOPATHS & CHIROPRACTORS	0	
7177	SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS	0	
7194	EDUCATIONAL & VOCATIONAL COUNSELLORS	0	
7195	ARCHITECTS	0	
7202	METALLURGICAL ENGINEERS	0	
7210	JUDGES & MAGISTRATES	0	
7218	PHARMACISTS	0	
7230	UNIV. TEACHERS	0	
7274	LAWYERS & NOTARIES	0	
7283	METEROLOGISTS	0	
7342	VETERINARIANS	0	
7424	PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS	0	
7431	OPTOMETRISTS	0	
7449	MANAGERS, SCI. & ENGINEERING	0	
7471	NUCLEAR ENGINEERS	0	
7472	DENTISTS	0	
7532	ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHING AND REL. FIELDS	0	
9999	N.A.	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v442: YEARS SCHOOL ATTENDED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1295 /-] [Invalid=1466 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOL DID YOU ATTEND?		
Notes	Q79A in the documentation.		

v442: YEARS SCHOOL ATTENDED

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	0 YEARS	9	0.7%
1	1 YEARS	3	0.2%
2	2 YEARS	7	0.5%
3	3 YEARS	13	1.0%
4	4 YEARS	28	2.2%
5	5 YEARS	33	2.5%
6	6 YEARS	43	3.3%
7	7 YEARS	68	5.3%
8	8 YEARS	142	11.0%
9	9 YEARS	109	8.4%
10	10 YEARS	159	12.3%
11	11 YEARS	150	11.6%
12	12 YEARS	232	17.9%
13	13 YEARS	103	8.0%
14	14 YEARS	60	4.6%
15	15 YEARS	43	3.3%
16	16 YEARS	24	1.9%
17	17 YEARS	33	2.5%
18	18 YEARS	13	1.0%
19	19 YEARS	8	0.6%
20	20 YEARS	7	0.5%
21	21 YEARS	5	0.4%
22	22 YEARS	1	0.1%
23	23 YEARS	0	
24	24 YEARS	0	
25	25 YEARS	0	
26	26 YEARS	1	0.1%
27	27 YEARS	1	0.1%
28	28 YEARS	0	
29	29 YEARS	0	
30	30 YEARS	0	
31	31 YEARS	0	
32	32 YEARS	0	
33	33 YEARS	0	
34	34 YEARS	0	
35	35 YEARS	0	
36	36 YEARS	0	
37	37 YEARS	0	
38	38 YEARS	0	
39	39 YEARS	0	
40	40 YEARS	0	
41	41 YEARS	0	
42	42 YEARS	0	
43	43 YEARS	0	
44	44 YEARS	0	

v442: YEARS SCHOOL ATTENDED

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	45 YEARS	0	
46	46 YEARS	0	
47	47 YEARS	0	
48	48 YEARS	0	
49	49 YEARS	0	
50	50 YEARS	0	
51	51 YEARS	0	
52	52 YEARS	0	
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	0	
55	55 YEARS	0	
56	56 YEARS	0	
57	57 YEARS	0	
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	0	
60	60 YEARS	0	
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	0	
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	0	
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS	0	
71	71 YEARS	0	
72	72 YEARS	0	
73	73 YEARS	0	
74	74 YEARS	0	
75	75 YEARS	0	
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	0	
78	78 YEARS	0	
79	79 YEARS	0	
80	80 YEARS	0	
81	81 YEARS	0	
82	82 YEARS	0	
83	83 YEARS	0	
84	84 YEARS	0	
85	85 YEARS	0	
86	86 YEARS	0	
87	87 YEARS	0	
88	88 YEARS	0	
89	89 YEARS	0	

# v442: YEARS SCHOOL ATTENDED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	90 YEARS	0	
91	91 YEARS	0	
92	92 YEARS	0	
93	93 YEARS	0	
94	94 YEARS	0	
95	95 YEARS	0	
96	96 YEARS	0	
97	97 YEARS	0	
98	98 YEARS	0	
99	N.A.	1466	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v443: HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1281 /-] [Invalid=1480 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT IS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL YOU REACHED?		
Notes	Q79B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		7	0.5%
1	GRADE 1	4	0.3%
2	GRADE 2	7	0.5%
3	GRADE 3	11	0.9%
4	GRADE 4	29	2.3%
5	GRADE 5	30	2.3%
6	GRADE 6	48	3.7%
7	GRADE 7	62	4.8%
8	GRADE 8	158	12.3%
9	GRADE 9	104	8.1%
10	GRADE 10	168	13.1%
11	GRADE 11	159	12.4%
12	GRADE 12	274	21.4%
13	GRADE 13	70	5.5%
25	ALL POST SECONDARY	150	11.7%
99	N.A.	1480	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v444: HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2749 /-] [Invalid=12 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOU COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL?		
Notes	Q79C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	565	20.6%

# v444: HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	NO	721	<div></div> 26.2%
8	D.K.	1463	<div></div> 53.2%
9	N.A.	12	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v445: POST SECONDARY EDUCATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=602 /-] [Invalid=2159 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with more than 11 years of schooling.		
Literal question	DID YOU EVER ATTEND UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, OR SOME OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL?		
Notes	Q79D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	372	<div></div> 61.8%
2	NO	230	<div></div> 38.2%
8	D.K.	1463	
9	N.A.	696	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v446: DEGREE OBTAINED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=409 /-] [Invalid=2352 /-]		
Universe	Q79E asked only to respondents who attended college, university, or another post-secondary school.		
Pre-question	Q79D. DID YOU EVER ATTEND UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, OR SOME OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL?		
Literal question	Q79E. DID YOU OBTAIN A DEGREE OR DEGREES?		
Notes	Q79D, Q79E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	225	<div></div> 55.0%
2	NO	184	<div></div> 45.0%
8	D.K.	1464	
9	N.A.	888	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v447: R THINKS OF SOCIAL CLASS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1255 /-] [Invalid=1506 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ONE HEARS A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES. DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS?		
Notes	Q87A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	587	<div></div> 46.8%
2	NO	668	<div></div> 53.2%
8	D.K.	1506	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v448: SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=584 /-] [Invalid=2177 /-]
Universe	Q87B asked only to respondents who think of themselves as belonging to a social class.
Pre-question	Q87A. ONE HEARS A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES. DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS?
Literal question	Q87B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?
Notes	Q87A, Q87B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER CLASS	5	0.9%
2	UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS	67	11.5%
3	MIDDLE CLASS	330	56.5%
4	WORKING CLASS	171	29.3%
5	LOWER CLASS	11	1.9%
8	D.K.	1466	
9	N.A.	711	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v449: SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS-PROBE	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2126 /-] [Invalid=635 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who don't know, or do not think they belong to a social class.
Pre-question	Q87A. ONE HEARS A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES. DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS?
Literal question	Q87C. (IF NO OR D.K. IN Q87A) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS,OR LOWER CLASS?
Notes	Q87A, Q87C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER CLASS	1	0.0%
2	UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS	43	2.0%
3	MIDDLE CLASS	301	14.2%
4	WORKING CLASS	280	13.2%
5	LOWER CLASS	26	1.2%
7	REFUSED	1475	69.4%
8	D.K.	48	
9	N.A.	587	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v450: FEEL CLOSE TO CLASS	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1152 /-] [Invalid=1609 /-]
Universe	Ask only to respondents who chose a social class for Q87B or Q87C.
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THEY HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH OTHER PEOPLE OF THEIR OWN CLASS, BUT OTHERS DON'T FEEL THIS WAY SO MUCH. HOW ABOUT YOU? WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL PRETTY CLOSE TO OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN ABOVE) PEOPLE, OR THAT YOU DON'T FEEL MUCH CLOSER TO THEM THAN YOU DO TO PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES?
Notes	Q87D in the documentation.

v450: FEEL CLOSE TO CLASS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PRETTY CLOSE TO OWN CLASS	665	<div></div> 57.7%
2	NOT CLOSER TO OWN CLASS	487	<div></div> 42.3%
8	D.K.	1546	
9	N.A.	63	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v451: CONFLICT BETWEEN CLASSES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1237 /-] [Invalid=1524 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ON THE WHOLE, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS BOUND TO BE SOME CONFLICT BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES, OR DO YOU THINK THEY CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER WITHOUT ANY CONFLICT?		
Notes	Q87E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BOUND TO BE CONFLICT	640	<div><div></div></div> 51.7%
2	CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER	597	<div><div></div></div> 48.3%
8	D.K.	1524	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v452: RELIGION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1297 /-] [Invalid=1464 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION?		
Notes	Q88A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	52	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
1	ROMAN CATHOLIC	574	<div><div></div></div> 44.3%
2	UNITED CHURCH	275	<div><div></div></div> 21.2%
3	ANGLICAN	161	<div><div></div></div> 12.4%
4	PRESBYTERIAN	48	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
5	BAPTIST	53	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
6	LUTHERAN	35	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
7	UKRAINIAN (GREEK) CATHOLIC	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
8	GREEK ORTHODOX	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
9	JEWISH	16	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
10	PENTACOSTAL	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
11	SALVATION ARMY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
12	JEHOVAH WITNESS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
13	MENNONITE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
14	BRETHREN (UNSPECIFIED)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
15	NO REGULAR CHURCH	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
16	EVANGELICAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
17	CHRISTIAN REFORMED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
18	CHRISTIAN	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
19	LATTER DAY SAINTS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
20	CHURCH OF CHRIST, CHURCH OF GOD	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
21	PROTESTANT (UNSPECIFIED)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
22	CHRISTIAN SCIENCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
23	SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST	0	
24	CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
25	OTHER SPECIFIC PROTESTANT	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%

# v452: RELIGION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
26	BUDDHIST, SIHK, MOSLEM	2	0.2%
27	OTHER VAGUE ANSWERS	2	0.2%
88	REFUSED, NO ANSWER	1464	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v453: FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTEND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1241 /-] [Invalid=1520 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ABOUT HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO TO CHURCH (SYNAGOGUE)? AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK, TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH, ONCE A MONTH, A FEW TIMES A YEAR OR LESS, NEVER?		
Notes	Q88B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ONCE A WEEK	453	36.5%
2	TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH	122	9.8%
3	ONCE A MONTH	85	6.8%
4	FEW TIMES A YEAR OR LESS	436	35.1%
5	NEVER	145	11.7%
8	D.K.	1467	
9	N.A.	53	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v454: SUBJECTIVE RELIGIOUSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1233 /-] [Invalid=1528 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON, A FAIRLY RELIGIOUS PERSON, OR A NOT VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON?		
Notes	Q88C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY RELIGIOUS	227	18.4%
2	FAIRLY RELIGIOUS	674	54.7%
3	NOT VERY RELIGIOUS	332	26.9%
8	D.K.	1475	
9	N.A.	53	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v455: COUNTRY OF BIRTH			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN WHAT COUNTRY WERE YOU BORN?		
Notes	Q89A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CANADA	1119	40.5%










# v455: COUNTRY OF BIRTH			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	BRITISH ISLES	55	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
3	FRANCE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	GERMANY	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
5	HUNGARY	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	ITALY	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
7	NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
8	POLAND	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
9	RUSSIA	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
10	OTHER EUROPEAN	34	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
11	UNITED STATES	23	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
12	ALL OTHER	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
99		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v456: YEAR CAME TO CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/88/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=175 /-] [Invalid=2586 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who were not born in Canada.		
Literal question	IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU COME TO LIVE IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q89B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	1900 OR EARLIER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
1	1901	0	
2	1902	0	
3	1903	0	
4	1904	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
5	1905	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
6	1906	0	
7	1907	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
8	1908	0	
9	1909	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
10	1910	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
11	1911	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
12	1912	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
13	1913	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
14	1914	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
15	1915	0	
16	1916	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
17	1917	0	
18	1918	0	
19	1919	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
20	1920	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
21	1921	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
22	1922	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
23	1923	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%

v456: YEAR CAME TO CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	1924	3	<div></div> 1.7%
25	1925	3	<div></div> 1.7%
26	1926	0	
27	1927	4	<div></div> 2.3%
28	1928	5	<div></div> 2.9%
29	1929	2	<div></div> 1.1%
30	1930	1	<div></div> 0.6%
31	1931	1	<div></div> 0.6%
32	1932	0	
33	1933	1	<div></div> 0.6%
34	1934	0	
35	1935	0	
36	1936	0	
37	1937	0	
38	1938	0	
39	1939	0	
40	1940	1	<div></div> 0.6%
41	1941	1	<div></div> 0.6%
42	1942	0	
43	1943	1	<div></div> 0.6%
44	1944	0	
45	1945	0	
46	1946	2	<div></div> 1.1%
47	1947	4	<div></div> 2.3%
48	1948	6	<div></div> 3.4%
49	1949	7	<div></div> 4.0%
50	1950	4	<div></div> 2.3%
51	1951	7	<div></div> 4.0%
52	1952	8	<div></div> 4.6%
53	1953	5	<div></div> 2.9%
54	1954	6	<div></div> 3.4%
55	1955	3	<div></div> 1.7%
56	1956	11	<div></div> 6.3%
57	1957	16	<div></div> 9.1%
58	1958	6	<div></div> 3.4%
59	1959	7	<div></div> 4.0%
60	1960	5	<div></div> 2.9%
61	1961	1	<div></div> 0.6%
62	1962	1	<div></div> 0.6%
63	1963	3	<div></div> 1.7%
64	1964	3	<div></div> 1.7%
65	1965	5	<div></div> 2.9%
66	1966	5	<div></div> 2.9%
67	1967	6	<div></div> 3.4%
68	1968	0	

# v456: YEAR CAME TO CANADA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
69	1969	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
70	1970	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
71	1971	0	
72	1972	0	
73	1973	0	
88	DON'T REMEMBER, NOT STATED	1467	
99	N.A.	1119	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v457: HOW LONG LIVED IN PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1298 /-] [Invalid=1463 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MUCH OF YOUR LIFE HAVE YOU LIVED IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q89C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ALL OF YOUR LIFE	843	<div><div></div></div> 64.9%
2	MOST OF IT	271	<div><div></div></div> 20.9%
3	SOME OF IT	177	<div><div></div></div> 13.6%
4	ONLY A YEAR OR SO	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	D.K.	1463	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v458: LIVED IN OTHER PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Notes	Q89D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	328	<div><div></div></div> 11.9%
2	NO	970	<div><div></div></div> 35.1%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v459: LIVED IN NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NEWFOUNDLAND	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%

# v459: LIVED IN NEWFOUNDLAND			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1284	<div><div></div></div> 46.5%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v460: LIVED IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1290	<div><div></div></div> 46.7%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v461: LIVED IN NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NOVA SCOTIA	27	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1271	<div><div></div></div> 46.0%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v462: LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NEW BRUNSWICK	31	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1267	<div><div></div></div> 45.9%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v463: LIVED IN QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		

# v463: LIVED IN QUEBEC			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUEBEC	71	 2.6%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1227	 44.4%
9		1463	 53.0%
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v464: LIVED IN ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ONTARIO	111	 4.0%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1187	 43.0%
9		1463	 53.0%
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v465: LIVED IN MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MANITOBA	54	 2.0%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1244	 45.1%
9		1463	 53.0%
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v466: LIVED IN SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,		
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?		
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.		

# v466: LIVED IN SASKATCHEWAN				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	SASKATCHEWAN	65	<div><div></div></div>	2.4%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1233	<div><div></div></div>	44.7%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div>	53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v467: LIVED IN ALBERTA				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,			
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?			
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?			
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	ALBERTA	49	<div><div></div></div>	1.8%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1249	<div><div></div></div>	45.2%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div>	53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v468: LIVED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	Q89E asked only to respondents who have lived in another province,			
Pre-question	Q89D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?			
Literal question	Q89E. WHICH ONE(S)?			
Notes	Q89D, Q89E in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	BRITISH COLUMBIA	42	<div><div></div></div>	1.5%
2	NEVER LIVED IN PROVINCE	1256	<div><div></div></div>	45.5%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div>	53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v469: ETHNICITY				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-88] [Missing=*/88]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1233 /-] [Invalid=1528 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT ETHNIC OR CULTURAL GROUP YOUR ANCESTORS WHO FIRST CAME TO NORTH AMERICA BELONGED TO? (ON THE MALE SIDE)			
Notes	Q90 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	CZECHOSLOVAKIAN, SLOVAKIAN	6	<div><div></div></div>	0.5%
2	CHINESE, JAPANESE, OTHER ORIENTAL	5	<div><div></div></div>	0.4%
3	ENGLISH	276	<div><div></div></div>	22.4%
4	FINNISH, ESTONIAN	4	<div><div></div></div>	0.3%
5	FRENCH	290	<div><div></div></div>	23.5%

# v469: ETHNICITY				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
6	GERMAN, AUSTRIAN	81	<div></div>	6.6%
7	GREEK, MALTESE	5	<div></div>	0.4%
8	HUNGARIAN	10	<div></div>	0.8%
9	IRISH	133	<div></div>	10.8%
10	ITALIAN	18	<div></div>	1.5%
11	JEWISH, HEBREW	11	<div></div>	0.9%
12	LATVIAN, LITHUANIAN	5	<div></div>	0.4%
13	NETHERLAND (DUTCH), BELGIAN	30	<div></div>	2.4%
14	POLISH	21	<div></div>	1.7%
15	SCANDINAVIAN (DANISH, ICELANDIC, NORWEGIAN, SWEDISH)	34	<div></div>	2.8%
16	SCOTTISH	158	<div></div>	12.8%
17	RUSSIAN	9	<div></div>	0.7%
18	UKRAINIAN	40	<div></div>	3.2%
19	YUGOSLAVIAN	7	<div></div>	0.6%
20	WELSH	11	<div></div>	0.9%
21	NATIVE INDIAN OR ESKIMO	11	<div></div>	0.9%
22	SPAIN, PORTUGAL	4	<div></div>	0.3%
23	WEST INDIAN	1	<div></div>	0.1%
24	AFRICAN	2	<div></div>	0.2%
25	OTHER EUROPEAN (ONE COUNTRY)	3	<div></div>	0.2%
26	OTHER ASIAN (ONE COUNTRY)	9	<div></div>	0.7%
27	ENGLISH AND FRENCH, BRITISH ISLES AND FRENCH	10	<div></div>	0.8%
28	BRITISH ISLES, ENGLISH, IRISH, SCOTTISH, WELSH, MIXTURES	24	<div></div>	1.9%
29	BRITISH ISLES AND ONE OR MORE OTHER EUROPEAN (NOT FRENCH)	10	<div></div>	0.8%
30	FRENCH AND OTHER (NOT BRITISH ISLES)	3	<div></div>	0.2%
31	ALL OTHER COMBINATIONS	2	<div></div>	0.2%
88	D.K.	1528		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v470: LANGUAGE SPOKEN AS CHILD				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	WHAT LANGUAGE DID YOU FIRST LEARN AS A CHILD THAT YOU STILL SPEAK OR UNDERSTAND?			
Notes	Q91 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	ENGLISH	794	<div></div>	28.8%
2	FRENCH	345	<div></div>	12.5%
3	OTHER	146	<div></div>	5.3%
4	ENGLISH AND FRENCH	8	<div></div>	0.3%
5	ENGLISH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	3	<div></div>	0.1%
6	FRENCH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	1	<div></div>	0.0%
7	ENGLISH AND FRENCH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	0		

# v470: LANGUAGE SPOKEN AS CHILD			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	ALL OTHER COMBINATIONS	1	0.0%
9		1463	<div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v471: LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USUALLY SPEAK AT HOME?		
Notes	Q91B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ENGLISH ONLY	873	<div></div> 31.6%
2	FRENCH ONLY	305	<div></div> 11.0%
3	ENGLISH AND FRENCH EQUALLY	44	<div></div> 1.6%
4	ENGLISH AND OTHER EQUALLY (SPECIFIED)	57	<div></div> 2.1%
5	OTHER ONLY (SPECIFIED)	16	<div></div> 0.6%
6	ENGLISH AND FRENCH AND OTHER EQUALLY	2	0.1%
7	FRENCH AND OTHER EQUALLY	1	0.0%
9		1463	<div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v472: SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DO YOU SPEAK ANY OTHER LANGUAGES THAN THOSE YOU HAVE JUST MENTIONED?		
Post-question	(IF YES) WHICH ONES?		
Notes	Q91CD in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	DOES NOT SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGE	1014	<div></div> 36.7%
1	ENGLISH	143	<div></div> 5.2%
2	FRENCH	52	<div></div> 1.9%
3	ENGLISH AND FRENCH	3	0.1%
4	OTHER (SPECIFIED)	40	<div></div> 1.4%
5	ENGLISH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	9	<div></div> 0.3%
6	FRENCH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	19	<div></div> 0.7%
7	TWO OR MORE OTHER LANGUAGES (NOT ENGLISH OR FRENCH)	18	<div></div> 0.7%
9		1463	<div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v473: GREW UP CITY,FARM,ETC.			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v473: GREW UP CITY,FARM,ETC.			
Literal question	Q92A. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, WHERE DID YOU LIVE--MOSTLY IN A CITY OR SUBURB, MOSTLY IN A VILLAGE OR SMALL TOWN, OR MOSTLY ON A FARM?		
Notes	Q92A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	LIVED EVERYWHERE, MOVED AROUND A LOT	2	0.1%
1	CITY	390	<div><div></div></div> 14.1%
2	SUBURB	85	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
3	VILLAGE, SMALL TOWN	449	<div><div></div></div> 16.3%
4	FARM	365	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
5	CITY AND FARM	3	0.1%
6	SUBURB AND FARM	0	
7	VILLAGE AND FARM	2	0.1%
8	CITY AND VILLAGE	2	0.1%
9	CITY AND SUBURB	1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v474: GREW UP NEAR LARGE CITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=899 /-] [Invalid=1862 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WAS THE (SUBURB, TOWN, VILLAGE, FARM) THAT YOU LIVED IN NEAR A LARGE CITY, OR NOT VERY NEAR?		
Notes	Q92B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT STATED, SOME WERE AND SOME WERE NOT	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
1	NEAR	351	<div><div></div></div> 39.0%
2	NOT NEAR	543	<div><div></div></div> 60.4%
8	D.K.	9	
9	N.A.	1853	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v475: TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2752 /-] [Invalid=9 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DO YOU BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?		
Post-question	(IF YES) WHICH ONE?		
Notes	Q93AB in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO	1027	<div><div></div></div> 37.3%
1	D.K. WHICH ONE	1473	<div><div></div></div> 53.5%
2	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA (U.S.W.A.)	6	0.2%
3	UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WOR	11	0.4%
4	UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA	7	0.3%

# v475: TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOU	6	0.2%
6	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS	7	0.3%
7	OTHER SPECIFIC INTERNATIONAL	37	1.3%
8	INTERNATIONAL UNSPECIFIED (C.I.O.)	5	0.2%
9	CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (C.U.P.E.)	16	0.6%
10	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SERVICES	22	0.8%
11	QUEBEC TEACHER'S CORPORATION	7	0.3%
12	FEDERATION DES TRAVAILLEURS DU QUEBEC (F.T.Q.)	3	0.1%
13	OTHER SPECIFIC NATIONAL	38	1.4%
14	OTHER NATIONAL UNSPECIFIED	4	0.1%
15	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (CIVIL SERVICE, PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANC	20	0.7%
16	TEACHER'S FEDERATION OR ASSOCIATION (ALL LEVELS)	23	0.8%
17	OTHER PROFESSIONAL FEDERATIONS OR ASSOCIATIONS (U.P.A.)	12	0.4%
18	FARMERS OR AGRICULTURAL GROUPS	6	0.2%
19	LABOUR UNION UNSPECIFIED	4	0.1%
20	OTHER VAGUE ANSWERS (UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER INTERNATIO	18	0.7%
88	D.K.	9	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v476: FAMILY UNION MEMBERSHIP			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1271 /-] [Invalid=1490 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DOES ANY MEMBER OF YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY (BESIDES YOURSELF) BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?		
Notes	Q93C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	393	30.9%
2	NO	878	69.1%
8	D.K.	1490	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v477: RESPONDENT AGE IN YEARS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1297 /-] [Invalid=1464 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?		
Notes	Q94 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 YEARS OLD	27	2.1%
19	19 YEARS OLD	37	2.9%
20	20 YEARS OLD	30	2.3%

v477: RESPONDENT AGE IN YEARS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	21 YEARS OLD	25	1.9%
22	22 YEARS OLD	23	1.8%
23	23 YEARS OLD	24	1.9%
24	24 YEARS OLD	25	1.9%
25	25 YEARS OLD	31	2.4%
26	26 YEARS OLD	22	1.7%
27	27 YEARS OLD	27	2.1%
28	28 YEARS OLD	35	2.7%
29	29 YEARS OLD	18	1.4%
30	30 YEARS OLD	30	2.3%
31	31 YEARS OLD	27	2.1%
32	32 YEARS OLD	22	1.7%
33	33 YEARS OLD	21	1.6%
34	34 YEARS OLD	23	1.8%
35	35 YEARS OLD	26	2.0%
36	36 YEARS OLD	20	1.5%
37	37 YEARS OLD	26	2.0%
38	38 YEARS OLD	24	1.9%
39	39 YEARS OLD	22	1.7%
40	40 YEARS OLD	32	2.5%
41	41 YEARS OLD	21	1.6%
42	42 YEARS OLD	22	1.7%
43	43 YEARS OLD	29	2.2%
44	44 YEARS OLD	18	1.4%
45	45 YEARS OLD	23	1.8%
46	46 YEARS OLD	27	2.1%
47	47 YEARS OLD	36	2.8%
48	48 YEARS OLD	39	3.0%
49	49 YEARS OLD	25	1.9%
50	50 YEARS OLD	29	2.2%
51	51 YEARS OLD	26	2.0%
52	52 YEARS OLD	24	1.9%
53	53 YEARS OLD	21	1.6%
54	54 YEARS OLD	26	2.0%
55	55 YEARS OLD	23	1.8%
56	56 YEARS OLD	21	1.6%
57	57 YEARS OLD	20	1.5%
58	58 YEARS OLD	16	1.2%
59	59 YEARS OLD	18	1.4%
60	60 YEARS OLD	21	1.6%
61	61 YEARS OLD	20	1.5%
62	62 YEARS OLD	17	1.3%
63	63 YEARS OLD	20	1.5%
64	64 YEARS OLD	20	1.5%
65	65 YEARS OLD	14	1.1%

v477: RESPONDENT AGE IN YEARS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	66 YEARS OLD	15	1.2%
67	67 YEARS OLD	16	1.2%
68	68 YEARS OLD	9	0.7%
69	69 YEARS OLD	9	0.7%
70	70 YEARS OLD	14	1.1%
71	71 YEARS OLD	4	0.3%
72	72 YEARS OLD	8	0.6%
73	73 YEARS OLD	9	0.7%
74	74 YEARS OLD	5	0.4%
75	75 YEARS OLD	10	0.8%
76	76 YEARS OLD	3	0.2%
77	77 YEARS OLD	4	0.3%
78	78 YEARS OLD	1	0.1%
79	79 YEARS OLD	2	0.2%
80	80 YEARS OLD	1	0.1%
81	81 YEARS OLD	2	0.2%
82	82 YEARS OLD	3	0.2%
83	83 YEARS OLD	2	0.2%
84	84 YEARS OLD	1	0.1%
85	85 YEARS OLD	4	0.3%
86	86 YEARS OLD	1	0.1%
87	87 YEARS OLD	0	
88	88 YEARS OLD	1	0.1%
89	89 YEARS OLD	0	
90	90 YEARS OLD	0	
91	91 YEARS OLD	0	
92	92 YEARS OLD	0	
93	93 YEARS OLD	0	
94	94 YEARS OLD	0	
95	95 YEARS OLD	0	
96	96 YEARS OLD	0	
97	97 YEARS OLD	0	
98	98 YEARS OLD	0	
99	99 OR OVER	0	
0	REFUSED (NO ESTIMATE)	1464	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v478: FAMILY INCOME

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1269 /-] [Invalid=1492 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	IN WHICH OF THESE GROUPS DOES THE APPROXIMATE INCOME OF THE FAMILY FALL--THAT IS, THE INCOME OR EARNINGS OF ALL THE FAMILY MEMBERS LIVING HERE ADDED TOGETHER?
Notes	Q95 in the documentation.

# v478: FAMILY INCOME			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LESS THAN \$3000 PER YEAR	98	<div><div></div></div> 7.7%
2	\$3000 - \$4999 PER YEAR	119	<div><div></div></div> 9.4%
3	\$5000 - \$7499 PER YEAR	180	<div><div></div></div> 14.2%
4	\$7500 - \$9999 PER YEAR	174	<div><div></div></div> 13.7%
5	\$10000 - \$14999 PER YEAR	294	<div><div></div></div> 23.2%
6	\$15000 - \$16999 PER YEAR	126	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
7	\$17000 - \$19999 PER YEAR	100	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
8	\$20000 OR MORE PER YEAR	178	<div><div></div></div> 14.0%
0	D.K. (NO ESTIMATE)	1483	
9	REFUSED (NO ESTIMATE)	9	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v479: RESPONDENT SEX			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	SEX		
Notes	Q97 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MALE	598	<div><div></div></div> 21.7%
2	FEMALE	700	<div><div></div></div> 25.4%
9		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v480: COMMUNITY SIZE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	COMMUNITY SIZE		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
1	OVER 500000 (CITY CORE)	132	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
2	OVER 500000 (ADJACENT SUBURB)	94	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
3	OVER 500000 (DISTANT SUBURB)	105	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
4	100000 - 500000	181	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
5	30000 - 100000	114	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
6	10000 - 30000	73	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
7	1000 - 10000	172	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
8	RURAL NON-FARM	314	<div><div></div></div> 11.4%
9	FARM	113	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1001: ICPSR STUDY NUMBER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-0] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

# v1001: ICPSR STUDY NUMBER			
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		STUDY NUMBER CONSTANT	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2761	100.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1002: ICPSR EDITION NUMBER			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 2-2] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		EDITION NUMBER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2		2761	100.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1003: ICPSR PART NUMBER			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-1] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		PART NUMBER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		2761	100.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1004: 1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9273] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=5004.946 /-] [StdDev=2301.294 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (UNIQUE FOUR DIGIT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER FOR EACH RESPONDENT. FIRST DIGIT INDICATES PROVINCE)	
# v1012: 1979 HALF SAMPLE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		HALF SAMPLE NUMBER. ALL RESPONDENTS FALL INTO ONE OF TWO RANDOM HALF SAMPLES. THIS VARIABLE MUST BE USED AS A FILTER FOR ANY ITEM INCLUDED ONLY IN A HALF SAMPLE WHERE QUESTIONS REPEATED IN OTHER PANEL WAVES, THE SAME HALF SAMPLE WAS USED.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	0.7%
1	HALF SAMPLE ONE	1390	50.3%
2	HALF SAMPLE TWO	1353	49.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1013: RESPONDENT SAMPLE TYPE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	

# v1013: RESPONDENT SAMPLE TYPE			
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		RESPONDENT TYPE THIS VARIABLE INDICATES THE SAMPLING LIST FROM WHICH THE RESPONDENT'S NAME WAS DRAWN.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
1	1974-1979 PANEL RESPONDENT	1295	<div><div></div></div> 46.9%
2	1979 CROSS-SECTION RESPONDENT	1300	<div><div></div></div> 47.1%
3	1979 YOUTH SUPPLEMENT (AGES 18-23)	149	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1019: DATE OF INTERVIEW			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-25] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		Q116 in the documentation. DATE OF INTERVIEW.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
1	JULY 7, 1979, OR EARLIER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
2	JULY 8 TO 14, 1979	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
3	JULY 15 TO 21, 1979	43	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
4	JULY 22 TO 28, 1979	93	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
5	JULY 29 TO AUG. 4, 1979	243	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
6	AUG. 5 TO 11, 1979	389	<div><div></div></div> 14.1%
7	AUG. 12 TO 18, 1979	367	<div><div></div></div> 13.3%
8	AUG. 19 TO 25, 1979	305	<div><div></div></div> 11.0%
9	AUG. 26 TO SEPT. 1, 1979	233	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
10	SEPT. 2 TO 8, 1979	200	<div><div></div></div> 7.2%
11	SEPT. 9 TO 15, 1979	142	<div><div></div></div> 5.1%
12	SEPT. 16 TO 22, 1979	144	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
13	SEPT. 23 TO 29, 1979	117	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
14	SEPT. 30 TO OCT. 6, 1979	88	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
15	OCT. 7 TO 13, 1979	88	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
16	OCT. 14 TO 20, 1979	64	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
17	OCT. 21 TO 27, 1979	58	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
18	OCT. 28 TO NOV. 3, 1979	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
19	NOV. 4 TO 10, 1979	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
20	NOV. 11 TO 17, 1979	35	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
21	NOV. 18 TO 20, 1979	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
22	NOV. 21 TO 24, 1979	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
23	NOV. 25 TO DEC. 1, 1979	33	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
24	DEC. 2 TO 8, 1979	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
25	DEC. 9 TO 15, 1979	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1020: LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	

# v1020: LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW			
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	Q115 in the documentation. LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	0.7%
1	ENGLISH	2014	72.9%
2	FRENCH	720	26.1%
3	OTHER, WITH HELP OF INTERPRETER	9	0.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1538: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9248] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2277.19 /-] [StdDev=2900.281 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1974 RESPONDENT NUMBER. 1974-1979 PANEL CASES ONLY; ALL OTHER CASES ARE CODED 0000.		
# v1006: 1979 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.8] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.967 /-] [StdDev=0.32 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	WEIGHTING SECTION <FOR COMPLETE WEIGHTING INFORMATION SEE CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE NO. 4000 TO 4038> 1979 CROSS-SECTION WEIGHTS NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 2670. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v1007: 1979 FILTER:1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1979 CROSS-SECTION FILTER.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1979 CROSS-SECTION	17	0.6%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1979 CROSS-SECTION	2744	99.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1008: 1979 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.83] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.165 /-] [StdDev=0.412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1979 MARITIME CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 455. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v1009: 1979 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.75] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.207 /-] [StdDev=0.445 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1009: 1979 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Notes	1979 ATLANTIC PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 573. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v1010: 1979 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.61] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	PRAIRIE PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 448. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2325	<div></div> 84.2%
0.88		117	<div></div> 4.2%
0.94		108	<div></div> 3.9%
1.11		184	<div></div> 6.7%
1.28		10	<div></div> 0.4%
1.36		5	<div></div> 0.2%
1.61		12	<div></div> 0.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1011: 1979 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.59] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1979 WESTERN PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 726. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2052	<div></div> 74.3%
0.88		117	<div></div> 4.2%
0.94		108	<div></div> 3.9%
1		257	<div></div> 9.3%
1.1		184	<div></div> 6.7%
1.28		10	<div></div> 0.4%
1.36		5	<div></div> 0.2%
1.45		16	<div></div> 0.6%
1.59		12	<div></div> 0.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1005: 1979 PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 /-] [Invalid=17 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	PROVINCE		

v1005: 1979 PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEWFOUNDLAND	113	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
1	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	108	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
2	NOVA SCOTIA	191	<div><div></div></div> 7.0%
3	NEW BRUNSWICK	148	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
4	QUEBEC	734	<div><div></div></div> 26.7%
5	ONTARIO	741	<div><div></div></div> 27.0%
6	MANITOBA	127	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%
7	SASKATCHEWAN	113	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
8	ALBERTA	196	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
9	BRITISH COLUMBIA	273	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
99	NO INTERVIEW	17	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1014: 1974 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-908] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Notes	1974 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER. POLL NUMBERS ARE SHOWN IN PARENTHESES. NON-PANEL CASES ARE CODED 000.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NON-PANEL CASES	1463	<div><div></div></div> 53.0%
1	BONAVISTA-TRINITY-CONCEPTION (085, 128, 173, 182)	20	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
2	GANDER TWILLINGATE (025, 128, 173, 192)	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	HUMBER-ST. GEORGE'S-ST. BARBE (006, 060, 141, 173)	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
4	ST. JOHN'S EAST (007, 012, 134, 163, 179)	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
101	CARDIGAN (013, 036, 044, 051)	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
102	EGMONT (003, 023, 044, 068)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
103	HILLSBOROUGH (011, 018, 038, 042, 056, 081)	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
104	MALPEQUE (005, 037, 054)	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
201	ANNAPOLIS VALLEY (023, 046, 056, 103, 165)	20	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
202	CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS-CANSO (011, 036, 097, 107, 176)	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
203	CENTRAL NOVA (051, 081, 088, 151, 173)	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
204	CUMBERLAND-COLCHESTER NORTH (011, 020, 083, 117, 143)	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
205	DARTMOUTH-HALIFAX EAST (015, 058, 131, 135, 240)	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
206	HALIFAX-EAST HANTS (021, 039, 055, 080, 121)	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
301	FUNDY-ROYAL (021, 022, 053, 057, 073, 177)	20	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
302	MADAWASKA-VICTORIA (021, 028, 065, 096, 099)	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
303	RESTIGOUCHE (019, 045, 065, 112, 118, 134)	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
304	SAINT JOHN-LANCASTER (065, 066, 073, 087, 109, 127)	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
401	ARGENTEUIL-DEUX-MONTAGNES (030, 123, 152, 162)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
402	CHICOUTIMI (037, 084, 085, 149)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
403	FRONTENAC (051, 061, 148, 165)	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
404	GASPE (032, 085, 124, 129)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
405	HULL (043, 051, 180, 281)	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%

v1014: 1974 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
406	LAPOINTE (058, 091, 095, 101)	11	0.4%
407	LAPRAIRIE (033, 149, 222, 236, 288)	13	0.5%
408	LEVIS (074, 131, 167, 182)	8	0.3%
409	LONGUEUIL (024, 035, 047, 062, 147)	6	0.2%
410	LOTBINIERE (087, 110, 161, 221)	16	0.6%
411	AHUNTSIC (125, 177, 203, 219)	12	0.4%
412	MONTREAL-BOURASSA (077, 089, 147, 286)	6	0.2%
413	DOLLARD (130, 193, 200, 274)	9	0.3%
414	GAMELIN (066, 095, 137, 150)	9	0.3%
415	LACHINE (003, 046, 064, 202)	8	0.3%
416	LAFONTAINE (073, 097, 098, 119)	8	0.3%
417	MAISONNEUVE-ROSEMONT (001, 143, 160, 207)	10	0.4%
418	MOUNT ROYAL (004, 014, 114, 178)	5	0.2%
419	PORTNEUF (033, 084, 096, 171, 197)	17	0.6%
420	QUEBEC EAST (095, 096, 164, 189)	10	0.4%
421	RICHMOND (049, 094, 144, 152)	19	0.7%
422	ROBERVAL (007, 050, 089, 111)	8	0.3%
423	SAINT-HYACINTHE (073, 108, 117, 118)	15	0.5%
424	SAINT-MAURICE (094, 098, 104, 165)	16	0.6%
425	SHERBROOKE (123, 157, 202, 237)	8	0.3%
426	TERREBONNE (110, 125, 218, 267, 335)	10	0.4%
427	TROIS-RIVIERES-METROPOLITAIN (035, 048, 138, 190)	17	0.6%
428	VAUDREUIL (065, 081, 090, 157, 185)	11	0.4%
501	ALGOMA (037, 055, 102, 133)	15	0.5%
502	BRANT (036, 109, 239, 240)	13	0.5%
503	FORT WILLIAM (044, 072, 083, 126)	11	0.4%
504	HALTON (026, 057, 089, 138, 239)	16	0.6%
505	HAMILTON EAST (004, 008, 053, 085)	9	0.3%
506	HASTINGS (068, 080, 125, 161)	16	0.6%
507	HURON-MIDDLESEX (081, 093, 099, 107)	15	0.5%
508	KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS (013, 085, 165, 250)	13	0.5%
509	KITCHENER (100, 143, 176, 217)	8	0.3%
510	LAMBTON-KENT (002, 043, 097, 169)	13	0.5%
511	MIDDLESEX (008, 042, 178, 267)	8	0.3%
512	NORTHUMBERLAND-DURHAM (005, 024, 061, 122)	13	0.5%
513	ONTARIO (044, 127, 178, 193)	18	0.7%
514	OTTAWA WEST (025, 136, 141, 190, 210)	8	0.3%
515	PEEL-DUFFERIN-SIMCOE (045, 074, 140, 209, 222)	15	0.5%
516	MISSISSAUGA (079, 215, 242, 246, 253)	13	0.5%
517	SARNIA-LAMBTON (045, 090, 133, 150)	8	0.3%
518	SIMCOE-NORTH (010, 083, 119, 161)	10	0.4%
519	BROADVIEW (007, 012, 085, 087)	8	0.3%
520	DON VALLEY (121, 166, 281, 312)	8	0.3%
521	TORONTO LAKESHORE (071, 124, 153, 187)	13	0.5%
522	ROSEDALE (032, 105, 182, 183)	5	0.2%

# v1014: 1974 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
523	ST. PAULS (020, 142, 150, 168)	13	0.5%
524	YORK CENTRE (140, 160, 167, 283, 359)	5	0.2%
525	YORK-SCARBOROUGH (047, 207, 255, 286, 506)	11	0.4%
526	YORK-WEST (007, 149, 156, 167)	10	0.4%
527	WELLINGTON-GREY-DUFFERIN-WATERLOO (117, 137, 142, 147)	14	0.5%
528	WINDSOR-WALKERVILLE (078, 117, 126, 145)	17	0.6%
601	BRANDON-SOURIS (015, 026, 065, 121, 165)	17	0.6%
602	MARQUETTE (051, 094, 124, 160)	21	0.8%
603	WINNIPEG NORTH (056, 078, 105, 192, 204)	19	0.7%
604	WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE (027, 074, 136, 176, 197)	12	0.4%
701	BATTLEFORD-KINDERSLEY (002, 042, 067, 084)	19	0.7%
702	MOOSE JAW (042, 096, 129, 175)	16	0.6%
703	REGINA EAST (004, 040, 093, 116, 200)	18	0.7%
704	SASKATOON-HUMBOLDT (001, 088, 207, 274)	18	0.7%
801	BATTLE RIVER (013, 038, 120, 147, 165)	13	0.5%
802	CALGARY SOUTH (027, 029, 177, 203, 281)	17	0.6%
803	EDMONTON CENTRE (036, 120, 128, 209)	8	0.3%
804	MEDICINE HAT (082, 110, 158, 187, 213)	16	0.6%
805	PALLISER (004, 047, 101, 119, 182, 187)	13	0.5%
806	WETASKIWIN (030, 041, 055, 076, 186)	21	0.8%
901	BURNABY-RICHMOND-DELTA (004, 024, 065, 090, 128, 208)	23	0.8%
902	BURNABY-SEYMOUR (002, 030, 097, 225, 229)	15	0.5%
903	FRASER VALLEY WEST (014, 065, 090, 126, 153, 220)	19	0.7%
904	OKANAGAN-KOOTENAY (020, 055, 112, 170, 192)	13	0.5%
905	SURREY-WHITE ROCK (026, 064, 114, 130, 189)	12	0.4%
906	VANCOUVER KINGSWAY (030, 039, 063, 126, 155)	7	0.3%
907	VANCOUVER QUADRA (004, 018, 047, 126, 198)	13	0.5%
908	VICTORIA (119, 141, 174, 188, 199)	7	0.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1015: 1974 POLL NUMBER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-506] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1974 POLL NUMBER. ACTUAL 1974 POLL NUMBERS CODED. SEE REF. NO 1014 FOR THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CONSTITUENCY AND POLL NUMBERS.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1463	53.0%
1	POLL NUMBER 1	2	0.1%
2	POLL NUMBER 2	14	0.5%
3	POLL NUMBER 3	3	0.1%
4	POLL NUMBER 4	14	0.5%
5	POLL NUMBER 5	8	0.3%
6	POLL NUMBER 6	6	0.2%
7	POLL NUMBER 7	7	0.3%

v1015: 1974 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	POLL NUMBER 8	6	0.2%
10	POLL NUMBER 10	3	0.1%
11	POLL NUMBER 11	11	0.4%
12	POLL NUMBER 12	3	0.1%
13	POLL NUMBER 13	6	0.2%
14	POLL NUMBER 14	5	0.2%
15	POLL NUMBER 15	8	0.3%
18	POLL NUMBER 18	9	0.3%
19	POLL NUMBER 19	5	0.2%
20	POLL NUMBER 20	7	0.3%
21	POLL NUMBER 21	15	0.5%
22	POLL NUMBER 22	5	0.2%
23	POLL NUMBER 23	7	0.3%
24	POLL NUMBER 24	6	0.2%
25	POLL NUMBER 25	4	0.1%
26	POLL NUMBER 26	11	0.4%
27	POLL NUMBER 27	8	0.3%
28	POLL NUMBER 28	3	0.1%
29	POLL NUMBER 29	3	0.1%
30	POLL NUMBER 30	13	0.5%
32	POLL NUMBER 32	5	0.2%
33	POLL NUMBER 33	5	0.2%
35	POLL NUMBER 35	8	0.3%
36	POLL NUMBER 36	13	0.5%
37	POLL NUMBER 37	11	0.4%
38	POLL NUMBER 38	7	0.3%
39	POLL NUMBER 39	4	0.1%
40	POLL NUMBER 40	5	0.2%
41	POLL NUMBER 41	2	0.1%
42	POLL NUMBER 42	17	0.6%
43	POLL NUMBER 43	7	0.3%
44	POLL NUMBER 44	18	0.7%
45	POLL NUMBER 45	7	0.3%
46	POLL NUMBER 46	3	0.1%
47	POLL NUMBER 47	6	0.2%
48	POLL NUMBER 48	4	0.1%
49	POLL NUMBER 49	5	0.2%
50	POLL NUMBER 50	2	0.1%
51	POLL NUMBER 51	18	0.7%
53	POLL NUMBER 53	7	0.3%
54	POLL NUMBER 54	2	0.1%
55	POLL NUMBER 55	19	0.7%
56	POLL NUMBER 56	13	0.5%
57	POLL NUMBER 57	6	0.2%
58	POLL NUMBER 58	5	0.2%

v1015: 1974 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
60	POLL NUMBER 60	6	0.2%
61	POLL NUMBER 61	6	0.2%
62	POLL NUMBER 62	0	
63	POLL NUMBER 63	5	0.2%
64	POLL NUMBER 64	3	0.1%
65	POLL NUMBER 65	19	0.7%
66	POLL NUMBER 66	7	0.3%
67	POLL NUMBER 67	2	0.1%
68	POLL NUMBER 68	4	0.1%
71	POLL NUMBER 71	2	0.1%
72	POLL NUMBER 72	3	0.1%
73	POLL NUMBER 73	8	0.3%
74	POLL NUMBER 74	9	0.3%
76	POLL NUMBER 76	5	0.2%
77	POLL NUMBER 77	1	0.0%
78	POLL NUMBER 78	9	0.3%
79	POLL NUMBER 79	1	0.0%
80	POLL NUMBER 80	9	0.3%
81	POLL NUMBER 81	9	0.3%
82	POLL NUMBER 82	5	0.2%
83	POLL NUMBER 83	13	0.5%
84	POLL NUMBER 84	14	0.5%
85	POLL NUMBER 85	14	0.5%
87	POLL NUMBER 87	11	0.4%
88	POLL NUMBER 88	8	0.3%
89	POLL NUMBER 89	5	0.2%
90	POLL NUMBER 90	17	0.6%
91	POLL NUMBER 91	3	0.1%
92		1	0.0%
93	POLL NUMBER 93	8	0.3%
94	POLL NUMBER 94	15	0.5%
95	POLL NUMBER 95	5	0.2%
96	POLL NUMBER 96	10	0.4%
97	POLL NUMBER 97	15	0.5%
98	POLL NUMBER 98	6	0.2%
99	POLL NUMBER 99	8	0.3%
100	POLL NUMBER 100	4	0.1%
101	POLL NUMBER 101	7	0.3%
102	POLL NUMBER 102	3	0.1%
103	POLL NUMBER 103	3	0.1%
104	POLL NUMBER 104	5	0.2%
105	POLL NUMBER 105	2	0.1%
107	POLL NUMBER 107	9	0.3%
108	POLL NUMBER 108	3	0.1%
109	POLL NUMBER 109	6	0.2%

v1015: 1974 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
110	POLL NUMBER 110	10	0.4%
111	POLL NUMBER 111	5	0.2%
112	POLL NUMBER 112	8	0.3%
114	POLL NUMBER 114	4	0.1%
116	POLL NUMBER 116	3	0.1%
117	POLL NUMBER 117	19	0.7%
118	POLL NUMBER 118	11	0.4%
119	POLL NUMBER 119	7	0.3%
120	POLL NUMBER 120	4	0.1%
121	POLL NUMBER 121	6	0.2%
122	POLL NUMBER 122	4	0.1%
123	POLL NUMBER 123	5	0.2%
124	POLL NUMBER 124	11	0.4%
125	POLL NUMBER 125	5	0.2%
126	POLL NUMBER 126	16	0.6%
127	POLL NUMBER 127	7	0.3%
128	POLL NUMBER 128	12	0.4%
129	POLL NUMBER 129	8	0.3%
130	POLL NUMBER 130	4	0.1%
131	POLL NUMBER 131	8	0.3%
133	POLL NUMBER 133	7	0.3%
134	POLL NUMBER 134	7	0.3%
135	POLL NUMBER 135	2	0.1%
136	POLL NUMBER 136	1	0.0%
137	POLL NUMBER 137	5	0.2%
138	POLL NUMBER 138	6	0.2%
140	POLL NUMBER 140	7	0.3%
141	POLL NUMBER 141	4	0.1%
142	POLL NUMBER 142	8	0.3%
143	POLL NUMBER 143	8	0.3%
144	POLL NUMBER 144	5	0.2%
145	POLL NUMBER 145	3	0.1%
147	POLL NUMBER 147	8	0.3%
148	POLL NUMBER 148	6	0.2%
149	POLL NUMBER 149	7	0.3%
150	POLL NUMBER 150	6	0.2%
151	POLL NUMBER 151	2	0.1%
152	POLL NUMBER 152	6	0.2%
153	POLL NUMBER 153	6	0.2%
155	POLL NUMBER 155	0	
156	POLL NUMBER 156	6	0.2%
157	POLL NUMBER 157	4	0.1%
158	POLL NUMBER 158	2	0.1%
160	POLL NUMBER 160	10	0.4%
161	POLL NUMBER 161	12	0.4%

v1015: 1974 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
162	POLL NUMBER 162	4	0.1%
163	POLL NUMBER 163	5	0.2%
164	POLL NUMBER 164	5	0.2%
165	POLL NUMBER 165	20	0.7%
166	POLL NUMBER 166	4	0.1%
167	POLL NUMBER 167	3	0.1%
168	POLL NUMBER 168	2	0.1%
169	POLL NUMBER 169	1	0.0%
170	POLL NUMBER 170	1	0.0%
171	POLL NUMBER 171	2	0.1%
173	POLL NUMBER 173	18	0.7%
174	POLL NUMBER 174	3	0.1%
175	POLL NUMBER 175	3	0.1%
176	POLL NUMBER 176	11	0.4%
177	POLL NUMBER 177	7	0.3%
178	POLL NUMBER 178	9	0.3%
179	POLL NUMBER 179	3	0.1%
180	POLL NUMBER 180	3	0.1%
182	POLL NUMBER 182	8	0.3%
183	POLL NUMBER 183	3	0.1%
185	POLL NUMBER 185	3	0.1%
186	POLL NUMBER 186	4	0.1%
187	POLL NUMBER 187	9	0.3%
188	POLL NUMBER 188	0	
189	POLL NUMBER 189	5	0.2%
190	POLL NUMBER 190	6	0.2%
192	POLL NUMBER 192	9	0.3%
193	POLL NUMBER 193	8	0.3%
197	POLL NUMBER 197	6	0.2%
198	POLL NUMBER 198	4	0.1%
199	POLL NUMBER 199	2	0.1%
200	POLL NUMBER 200	4	0.1%
202	POLL NUMBER 202	4	0.1%
203	POLL NUMBER 203	7	0.3%
204	POLL NUMBER 204	6	0.2%
207	POLL NUMBER 207	11	0.4%
208	POLL NUMBER 208	2	0.1%
209	POLL NUMBER 209	2	0.1%
210	POLL NUMBER 210	3	0.1%
213	POLL NUMBER 213	1	0.0%
215	POLL NUMBER 215	1	0.0%
217	POLL NUMBER 217	1	0.0%
218	POLL NUMBER 218	5	0.2%
219	POLL NUMBER 219	4	0.1%
220	POLL NUMBER 220	3	0.1%

# v1015: 1974 POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
221	POLL NUMBER 221	4	0.1%
222	POLL NUMBER 222	6	0.2%
225	POLL NUMBER 225	0	
229	POLL NUMBER 229	0	
236	POLL NUMBER 236	4	0.1%
237	POLL NUMBER 237	1	0.0%
239	POLL NUMBER 239	7	0.3%
240	POLL NUMBER 240	8	0.3%
242	POLL NUMBER 242	3	0.1%
246	POLL NUMBER 246	5	0.2%
250	POLL NUMBER 250	6	0.2%
253	POLL NUMBER 253	3	0.1%
255	POLL NUMBER 255	4	0.1%
267	POLL NUMBER 267	2	0.1%
274	POLL NUMBER 274	6	0.2%
281	POLL NUMBER 281	9	0.3%
283	POLL NUMBER 283	0	
286	POLL NUMBER 286	3	0.1%
288	POLL NUMBER 288	4	0.1%
312	POLL NUMBER 312	0	
335	POLL NUMBER 335	2	0.1%
359	POLL NUMBER 359	0	
506	POLL NUMBER 506	2	0.1%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1016: 1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-912] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER. POLL NUMBERS ARE SHOWN IN PARENTHESES. A LIST OF CONSTITUENCY AND POLL NUMBER CORESPONDENCE FOR 1974 AND 1979 IS AVAILABLE FROM THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW; RESPONDENT MOVED FROM ONE PROVINCE TO AN	80	2.9%
1	BONAVISTA-TRINITY-CONCEPTION (086, 132, 178, 190)	26	0.9%
2	GANDER TWILLINGATE (028, 137, 187, 210)	27	1.0%
3	HUMBER-PORT-AU-PORT-ST. BARBE (006, 073, 143, 179)	25	0.9%
4	ST. JOHN'S EAST (005, 014, 160, 189, 205)	33	1.2%
101	CARDIGAN (013, 037, 045, 052, 082)	28	1.0%
102	EGMONT (003, 024, 044, 068)	25	0.9%
103	HILLSBOROUGH (012, 023, 035, 036, 046, 047, 052, 054)	32	1.2%
104	MALPEQUE (006, 007, 039, 056, 062, 077)	22	0.8%
201	ANNAPOLIS VALLEY-HANTS (069, 097, 112, 171)	25	0.9%
202	CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS-CANSO (013, 142, 148, 195, 217)	32	1.2%
203	CENTRAL NOVA (060, 094, 101, 146, 168)	32	1.2%

v1016: 1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
204	CUMBERLAND-COLCHESTER (011, 020, 087, 120, 146, 143)	31	1.1%
205	DARTMOUTH-HALIFAX EAST (010, 011, 054, 055, 057, 131, 136, 2	30	1.1%
206	HALIFAX (152)	7	0.3%
207	HALIFAX WEST (062, 123, 153, 174)	26	0.9%
208	SOUTH NOVA (039)	6	0.2%
301	FUNDY-ROYAL (024, 025, 051, 059, 063)	32	1.2%
302	MADAWASKA-VICTORIA (020, 055, 076, 113, 116)	33	1.2%
303	RESTIGOUCHE (024, 063, 079, 080, 081, 139, 149)	38	1.4%
304	SAINT JOHN (051, 052, 058, 059, 071, 095, 096, 097, 098, 10	44	1.6%
401	ARGENTEUIL (040)	6	0.2%
402	CHICOUTIMI (004, 005, 058, 059, 159)	25	0.9%
403	FRONTENAC (012, 044, 150, 174)	27	1.0%
404	GASPE (041, 097, 139, 146)	25	0.9%
405	HULL (040, 049, 085, 233)	24	0.9%
406	JONQUIERE (050, 051, 076, 077, 078, 086, 091)	24	0.9%
407	LAPRAIRIE (038, 188, 189, 190)	12	0.4%
408	LEVIS (075, 152, 219, 235)	24	0.9%
409	LONGUEUIL (017, 018, 066, 131, 133, 135, 220, 222, 224)	21	0.8%
410	LOTBINIERE (089, 090, 113, 114, 115, 169, 231)	25	0.9%
411	SAINT DENIS (089, 090, 113, 114, 115, 169, 231)	13	0.5%
412	BOURASSA (096, 100, 227, 228, 229)	11	0.4%
413	DOLLARD (093, 134, 173)	19	0.7%
414	GAMELIN (005, 080, 108, 111, 180, 191)	29	1.1%
415	LACHINE (112, 175)	12	0.4%
416	SAINTE-MAIRE (HACHELAGA) (007, 045, 046)	18	0.7%
417	ROSEMONT (178, 217, 210, 211)	17	0.6%
418	MOUNT ROYAL (004, 014, 181)	18	0.7%
419	PORTNEUF (101, 171, 178)	19	0.7%
420	QUEBEC EAST (094, 095, 096, 163, 194, 216, 242)	37	1.3%
421	RICHMOND (015, 087, 092, 164)	25	0.9%
422	ROBERVAL (068, 085, 087, 128, 161)	25	0.9%
423	SAINT-HYACINTHE (120, 122, 174, 189, 224, 226)	26	0.9%
424	SAINT-AURICE (097, 103, 110, 162)	27	1.0%
425	SHERBROOKE (004, 114, 145, 231)	25	0.9%
426	TERREBONNE (110, 125, 218, 267, 335)	19	0.7%
427	TROIS-RIVIERES (061, 112)	13	0.5%
428	VAUDREUIL (068, 114, 115, 167, 168, 169, 177, 224, 267)	30	1.1%
429	BLAINVILLE-DEUX-MONTAGNES (025, 026, 104, 105, 199, 200, 20	31	1.1%
430	CHATEAUQUAY (039, 040, 107, 108, 113, 115)	16	0.6%
431	CHAMBLY (014, 015)	2	0.1%
432	LAVAL-DES RAPIDES (193, 203, 210, 211, 250)	19	0.7%
433	SAINT MICHEL (138, 139, 145, 148)	12	0.4%
434	NOTRE DAME-DE-GRACE (035, 047)	12	0.4%
435	SAINT HENRI-WESTMOUNT (179)	7	0.3%

v1016: 1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
436	HACHELAGA-MAISONNEUVE (002)	6	0.2%
437	CHAMPLAIN (037, 053, 054)	13	0.5%
501	ALGOMA (037, 056, 119, 156)	25	0.9%
502	BRANT (037, 118, 120, 283, 284)	25	0.9%
503	THUNDER BAY-ATIHOKAN (044, 072, 083, 128)	24	0.9%
504	HALTON (028, 147, 234, 269)	20	0.7%
505	HAMILTON EAST (063, 066, 086)	19	0.7%
506	PRINCE EDWARD-HASTINGS (082, 103, 156)	20	0.7%
507	HURON-BRUCE (033, 059, 162, 168)	26	0.9%
508	KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS (013, 090, 182, 270, 274, 275, 276)	25	0.9%
509	KITCHENER (125, 177, 223)	18	0.7%
510	KENT (100, 200)	14	0.5%
511	LONDON-MIDDLESEX (009, 010, 087, 138)	19	0.7%
512	DURHAM-NORTHUMBERLAND (057, 058, 070)	12	0.4%
513	ONTARIO (052, 060, 065, 066, 194, 229)	21	0.8%
514	OTTAWA WEST (028, 180, 181, 205)	19	0.7%
515	SIMCOE SOUTH (015, 017, 158, 159)	12	0.4%
516	MISSISSAUGA NORTH (009, 013, 019)	20	0.7%
517	SARNIA (040, 041, 099, 114, 115, 198, 199)	26	0.9%
518	SIMCOE-NORTH (059, 070, 074, 148, 178)	19	0.7%
519	BROADVIEW GREENWOOD (052, 055, 056)	12	0.4%
520	DON VALLEY (121, 166, 281, 312)	22	0.8%
521	ETOBICOKE-LAKESHORE (077, 130, 159, 194)	24	0.9%
522	ROSEDALE (059, 060, 143, 217, 210, 215)	36	1.3%
523	ST. PAULS (102, 103, 181, 188)	16	0.6%
524	YORK CENTRE (145, 180, 182, 196, 197, 198, 206)	18	0.7%
525	YORK-SCARBOROUGH (218, 219)	7	0.3%
526	YORK-WEST (118, 143, 151, 173, 174)	25	0.9%
527	WELLINGTON-DUFFERIN-SIMCOE (050, 051, 064, 065, 072)	19	0.7%
528	WINDSOR-WALKERVILLE (061, 104, 112, 113, 134)	27	1.0%
529	BRAMPTON-GEORGETOWN (010, 048, 051, 073, 077, 078, 173, 299)	25	0.9%
530	HAMILTON WEST (250)	6	0.2%
531	HASTINGS-FRONTENAC (029)	6	0.2%
532	WATERLOO (043, 044)	6	0.2%
533	ESSEX-KENT (020)	5	0.2%
534	LONDON-MIDDLESEX (017, 179, 180)	13	0.5%
535	NORTHUMBERLAND (057, P058, 070)	13	0.5%
536	VICTORIA-HALIBURTON (177)	6	0.2%
537	OTTAWA CENTRE (135, 142, 143)	12	0.4%
538	YORK-PEEL (257)	7	0.3%
539	MISSISSAUGA SOUTH (084, 254)	12	0.4%
540	SPADINA (062)	6	0.2%
541	YORK EAST (230)	3	0.1%
542	DON VALLEY EAST (068, 072, 223, 244, 248)	18	0.7%

# v1016: 1979 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
543	SCARBOROUGH CENTRE (032)	6	<div></div>	0.2%
544	YORK SOUTH-WESTON (055)	6	<div></div>	0.2%
545	GUELPH (196, 197)	7	<div></div>	0.3%
601	BRANDON-SOURIS (027, 038, 080, 156, 157, 158, 200)	30	<div></div>	1.1%
602	PORTAGE-MARQUETTE (043, 080, 107, 141)	28	<div></div>	1.0%
603	WINNIPEG NORTH (004, 052, 053, 079, 089, 090, 108, 138, 139,	33	<div></div>	1.2%
604	WINNIPEG-ST. JAMES (063, 064, 065, 075, 079, 111, 181)	14	<div></div>	0.5%
605	WINNIPEG-ASSINIBOINE (122, 123, 124, 161, 216)	18	<div></div>	0.7%
701	KINDERSLEY-LLOYDMINSTER (068, 081, 095, 151)	26	<div></div>	0.9%
702	MOOSE JAW (022, 048, 070, 136)	26	<div></div>	0.9%
703	REGINA EAST (004, 043, 101, 122, 204)	31	<div></div>	1.1%
704	SASKATOON EAST (001, 113)	14	<div></div>	0.5%
705	HUMBOLDT-LAKE CENTRE (091, 179, 180)	12	<div></div>	0.4%
801	CROWFOOT (020, 074, 086, 087, 088, 152)	15	<div></div>	0.5%
802	CALGARY SOUTH (093, 110)	12	<div></div>	0.4%
803	EDMONTON-WEST (092, 116)	12	<div></div>	0.4%
804	MEDICINE HAT (078, 110, 230, 206, 238, 239, 240)	33	<div></div>	1.2%
805	BOW RIVER (026, 225)	14	<div></div>	0.5%
806	WETASKIWIN (012, 013, 092, 093, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 157	28	<div></div>	1.0%
807	VEGREVILLE (008, 025)	11	<div></div>	0.4%
808	CALGARY WEST (117, 166, 168, 233, 236)	28	<div></div>	1.0%
809	CALGARY EAST (232)	6	<div></div>	0.2%
810	EDMONTON NORTH (039)	6	<div></div>	0.2%
811	EDMONTON EAST (170)	5	<div></div>	0.2%
812	CALGARY NORTH (014, 161, 162)	13	<div></div>	0.5%
813	YELLOWHEAD (170, 171)	6	<div></div>	0.2%
901	RICHMOND-SOUTH DELTA (007, 008, 027, 031, 032, 165, 166, 25	26	<div></div>	0.9%
902	NORTH VANCOUVER-BURNABY (006, 105, 176, 182)	18	<div></div>	0.7%
903	FRASER VALLEY WEST (006, 024, 075, 077, 215, 230, 252)	27	<div></div>	1.0%
904	KOOTENAY EAST-REVELSTOKE (032, 033, 123, 155, 156, 157)	20	<div></div>	0.7%
905	SURREY,WHITE ROCK-NORTH DELTA (017, 085, 087, 088, 089, 138	32	<div></div>	1.2%
906	VANCOUVER KINGSWAY (031, 041, 064, 137, 168)	31	<div></div>	1.1%
907	VANCOUVER QUADRA (004, 018, 051, 142, 219)	29	<div></div>	1.1%
908	VICTORIA (147, 174, 195, 196, 212, 223)	32	<div></div>	1.2%
909	BURNABY (034, 036)	12	<div></div>	0.4%
910	MISION-PORT MOODY (064, 065, 066, 070, 071, 151)	19	<div></div>	0.7%
911	NEW WESTMINSTER-COQUITLAM (017, 018)	7	<div></div>	0.3%
912	OKANAGAN NORTH (028, 084, 085)	12	<div></div>	0.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-335] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			

v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER

Notes 1979 POLL NUMBER. ACTUAL POLL NUMBER IS CODED. SEE REF. NO. 1016 FOR LIST OF CONSTITUENCIES AND POLL CORRESPONDENCE. 1979 POLL NUMBERS ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR PANEL RESPONDENTS.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1308	47.4%
1	POLL NUMBER 1	5	0.2%
2	POLL NUMBER 2	6	0.2%
3	POLL NUMBER 3	4	0.1%
4	POLL NUMBER 4	27	1.0%
5	POLL NUMBER 5	12	0.4%
6	POLL NUMBER 6	5	0.2%
7	POLL NUMBER 7	8	0.3%
8	POLL NUMBER 8	8	0.3%
9	POLL NUMBER 9	5	0.2%
10	POLL NUMBER 10	3	0.1%
11	POLL NUMBER 11	3	0.1%
12	POLL NUMBER 12	6	0.2%
13	POLL NUMBER 13	13	0.5%
14	POLL NUMBER 14	18	0.7%
15	POLL NUMBER 15	6	0.2%
16		4	0.1%
17	POLL NUMBER 17	13	0.5%
18	POLL NUMBER 18	9	0.3%
19	POLL NUMBER 19	4	0.1%
20	POLL NUMBER 20	11	0.4%
22	POLL NUMBER 22	2	0.1%
23	POLL NUMBER 23	1	0.0%
24	POLL NUMBER 24	10	0.4%
25	POLL NUMBER 25	6	0.2%
26	POLL NUMBER 26	6	0.2%
27	POLL NUMBER 27	3	0.1%
28	POLL NUMBER 28	13	0.5%
29	POLL NUMBER 29	0	
31	POLL NUMBER 31	8	0.3%
32	POLL NUMBER 32	8	0.3%
33	POLL NUMBER 33	4	0.1%
34	POLL NUMBER 34	6	0.2%
35	POLL NUMBER 35	7	0.3%
36	POLL NUMBER 36	7	0.3%
37	POLL NUMBER 37	8	0.3%
38	POLL NUMBER 38	8	0.3%
39	POLL NUMBER 39	8	0.3%
40	POLL NUMBER 40	7	0.3%
41	POLL NUMBER 41	9	0.3%
43	POLL NUMBER 43	5	0.2%
44	POLL NUMBER 44	6	0.2%
45	POLL NUMBER 45	7	0.3%

v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	POLL NUMBER 46	6	0.2%
47	POLL NUMBER 47	12	0.4%
48	POLL NUMBER 48	5	0.2%
49	POLL NUMBER 49	5	0.2%
50	POLL NUMBER 50	3	0.1%
51	POLL NUMBER 51	15	0.5%
52	POLL NUMBER 52	11	0.4%
53	POLL NUMBER 53	3	0.1%
54	POLL NUMBER 54	4	0.1%
55	POLL NUMBER 55	12	0.4%
56	POLL NUMBER 56	9	0.3%
57	POLL NUMBER 57	4	0.1%
58	POLL NUMBER 58	6	0.2%
59	POLL NUMBER 59	13	0.5%
60	POLL NUMBER 60	7	0.3%
61	POLL NUMBER 61	6	0.2%
62	POLL NUMBER 62	10	0.4%
63	POLL NUMBER 63	15	0.5%
64	POLL NUMBER 64	3	0.1%
65	POLL NUMBER 65	6	0.2%
66	POLL NUMBER 66	9	0.3%
68	POLL NUMBER 68	13	0.5%
69	POLL NUMBER 69	2	0.1%
70	POLL NUMBER 70	6	0.2%
71	POLL NUMBER 71	4	0.1%
72	POLL NUMBER 72	10	0.4%
73	POLL NUMBER 73	2	0.1%
74	POLL NUMBER 74	4	0.1%
75	POLL NUMBER 75	10	0.4%
76	POLL NUMBER 76	2	0.1%
77	POLL NUMBER 77	9	0.3%
78	POLL NUMBER 78	6	0.2%
79	POLL NUMBER 79	5	0.2%
80	POLL NUMBER 80	11	0.4%
81	POLL NUMBER 81	4	0.1%
82	POLL NUMBER 82	5	0.2%
83	POLL NUMBER 83	4	0.1%
84	POLL NUMBER 84	8	0.3%
85	POLL NUMBER 85	9	0.3%
86	POLL NUMBER 86	12	0.4%
87	POLL NUMBER 87	11	0.4%
88	POLL NUMBER 88	1	0.0%
89	POLL NUMBER 89	5	0.2%
90	POLL NUMBER 90	11	0.4%
91	POLL NUMBER 91	3	0.1%

v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POLL NUMBER 92	10	0.4%
93	POLL NUMBER 93	6	0.2%
94	POLL NUMBER 94	5	0.2%
95	POLL NUMBER 95	8	0.3%
96	POLL NUMBER 96	9	0.3%
97	POLL NUMBER 97	12	0.4%
98	POLL NUMBER 98	2	0.1%
99	POLL NUMBER 99	5	0.2%
100	POLL NUMBER 100	3	0.1%
101	POLL NUMBER 101	7	0.3%
102	POLL NUMBER 102	4	0.1%
103	POLL NUMBER 103	10	0.4%
104	POLL NUMBER 104	6	0.2%
105	POLL NUMBER 105	1	0.0%
107	POLL NUMBER 107	2	0.1%
108	POLL NUMBER 108	4	0.1%
109		2	0.1%
110	POLL NUMBER 110	7	0.3%
111	POLL NUMBER 111	1	0.0%
112	POLL NUMBER 112	9	0.3%
113	POLL NUMBER 113	10	0.4%
114	POLL NUMBER 114	7	0.3%
115	POLL NUMBER 115	10	0.4%
116	POLL NUMBER 116	6	0.2%
117	POLL NUMBER 117	5	0.2%
118	POLL NUMBER 118	7	0.3%
119	POLL NUMBER 119	4	0.1%
120	POLL NUMBER 120	6	0.2%
121	POLL NUMBER 121	3	0.1%
122	POLL NUMBER 122	10	0.4%
123	POLL NUMBER 123	5	0.2%
124	POLL NUMBER 124	2	0.1%
125	POLL NUMBER 125	5	0.2%
126	POLL NUMBER 126	0	
127	POLL NUMBER 127	0	
128	POLL NUMBER 128	11	0.4%
129	POLL NUMBER 129	0	
130	POLL NUMBER 130	4	0.1%
131	POLL NUMBER 131	6	0.2%
132	POLL NUMBER 132	3	0.1%
133	POLL NUMBER 133	1	0.0%
134	POLL NUMBER 134	5	0.2%
135	POLL NUMBER 135	6	0.2%
136	POLL NUMBER 136	8	0.3%
137	POLL NUMBER 137	9	0.3%

v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
138	POLL NUMBER 138	7	0.3%
139	POLL NUMBER 139	8	0.3%
140	POLL NUMBER 140	6	0.2%
141	POLL NUMBER 141	3	0.1%
142	POLL NUMBER 142	7	0.3%
143	POLL NUMBER 143	11	0.4%
145	POLL NUMBER 145	11	0.4%
146	POLL NUMBER 146	9	0.3%
147	POLL NUMBER 147	7	0.3%
148	POLL NUMBER 148	9	0.3%
149	POLL NUMBER 149	2	0.1%
150	POLL NUMBER 150	1	0.0%
151	POLL NUMBER 151	5	0.2%
152	POLL NUMBER 152	7	0.3%
153	POLL NUMBER 153	5	0.2%
155	POLL NUMBER 155	6	0.2%
156	POLL NUMBER 156	5	0.2%
157	POLL NUMBER 157	8	0.3%
158	POLL NUMBER 158	1	0.0%
159	POLL NUMBER 159	10	0.4%
160	POLL NUMBER 160	3	0.1%
161	POLL NUMBER 161	7	0.3%
162	POLL NUMBER 162	9	0.3%
163	POLL NUMBER 163	1	0.0%
164	POLL NUMBER 164	1	0.0%
165	POLL NUMBER 165	2	0.1%
166	POLL NUMBER 166	4	0.1%
167	POLL NUMBER 167	2	0.1%
168	POLL NUMBER 168	13	0.5%
169	POLL NUMBER 169	2	0.1%
170	POLL NUMBER 170	9	0.3%
171	POLL NUMBER 171	6	0.2%
173	POLL NUMBER 173	9	0.3%
174	POLL NUMBER 174	17	0.6%
175	POLL NUMBER 175	5	0.2%
176	POLL NUMBER 176	1	0.0%
177	POLL NUMBER 177	7	0.3%
178	POLL NUMBER 178	14	0.5%
179	POLL NUMBER 179	12	0.4%
180	POLL NUMBER 180	8	0.3%
181	POLL NUMBER 181	9	0.3%
182	POLL NUMBER 182	11	0.4%
187	POLL NUMBER 187	6	0.2%
188	POLL NUMBER 188	2	0.1%
189	POLL NUMBER 189	5	0.2%

v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
190	POLL NUMBER 190	3	0.1%
191	POLL NUMBER 191	3	0.1%
192		1	0.0%
193	POLL NUMBER 193	1	0.0%
194	POLL NUMBER 194	13	0.5%
195	POLL NUMBER 195	5	0.2%
196	POLL NUMBER 196	6	0.2%
197	POLL NUMBER 197	6	0.2%
198	POLL NUMBER 198	2	0.1%
199	POLL NUMBER 199	4	0.1%
200	POLL NUMBER 200	7	0.3%
201	POLL NUMBER 201	2	0.1%
203	POLL NUMBER 203	2	0.1%
204	POLL NUMBER 204	3	0.1%
205	POLL NUMBER 205	7	0.3%
206	POLL NUMBER 206	3	0.1%
208	POLL NUMBER 208	4	0.1%
210	POLL NUMBER 210	8	0.3%
211	POLL NUMBER 211	3	0.1%
212	POLL NUMBER 212	6	0.2%
213		1	0.0%
215	POLL NUMBER 215	9	0.3%
216	POLL NUMBER 216	11	0.4%
217	POLL NUMBER 217	11	0.4%
218	POLL NUMBER 218	2	0.1%
219	POLL NUMBER 219	10	0.4%
220	POLL NUMBER 220	1	0.0%
222	POLL NUMBER 222	1	0.0%
223	POLL NUMBER 223	9	0.3%
224	POLL NUMBER 224	8	0.3%
225	POLL NUMBER 225	3	0.1%
226	POLL NUMBER 226	0	
227	POLL NUMBER 227	2	0.1%
228	POLL NUMBER 228	2	0.1%
229	POLL NUMBER 229	2	0.1%
230	POLL NUMBER 230	7	0.3%
231	POLL NUMBER 231	9	0.3%
232	POLL NUMBER 232	2	0.1%
233	POLL NUMBER 233	7	0.3%
234	POLL NUMBER 234	9	0.3%
235	POLL NUMBER 235	6	0.2%
236	POLL NUMBER 236	3	0.1%
237		1	0.0%
238	POLL NUMBER 238	9	0.3%
239	POLL NUMBER 239	1	0.0%

v1017: 1979 POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
240	POLL NUMBER 240	0	
242	POLL NUMBER 242	5	0.2%
243	POLL NUMBER 243	1	0.0%
244	POLL NUMBER 244	4	0.1%
248	POLL NUMBER 248	2	0.1%
250	POLL NUMBER 250	11	0.4%
251	POLL NUMBER 251	0	
252	POLL NUMBER 252	5	0.2%
254	POLL NUMBER 254	5	0.2%
255	POLL NUMBER 255	1	0.0%
256	POLL NUMBER 256	2	0.1%
257	POLL NUMBER 257	7	0.3%
258	POLL NUMBER 258	4	0.1%
262		6	0.2%
267	POLL NUMBER 267	3	0.1%
269	POLL NUMBER 269	0	
270	POLL NUMBER 270	0	
274	POLL NUMBER 274	1	0.0%
275	POLL NUMBER 275	0	
276	POLL NUMBER 276	0	
281	POLL NUMBER 281	0	
283	POLL NUMBER 283	4	0.1%
284	POLL NUMBER 284	3	0.1%
295	POLL NUMBER 295	1	0.0%
296	POLL NUMBER 296	1	0.0%
297	POLL NUMBER 297	0	
299	POLL NUMBER 299	3	0.1%
312	POLL NUMBER 312	0	
335	POLL NUMBER 335	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1018: MOVED OUT OF PROVINCE BETWEEN 74-79?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	RESPONDENT MOVED OUT OF PROVINCE BETWEEN 1974 AND 1979		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT A PANEL RESPONDENT	1463	<div></div> 53.0%
1	RESPONDENT MOVED OUT OF PROVINCE SINCE 1974	62	<div></div> 2.2%
9	RESPONDENT DID NOT MOVE OUT OF PROVINCE	1236	<div></div> 44.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1021: INTEREST IN ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q1. WE HAVE FOUND THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES DON'T PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO ELECTIONS. HOW ABOUT YOURSELF? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE VERY INTERESTED IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, FAIRLY INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED IN IT?		
Notes	Q1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	885	<div></div> 32.3%
2	FAIRLY INTERESTED	1093	<div></div> 39.9%
3	SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	543	<div></div> 19.8%
4	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	219	<div></div> 8.0%
8	D.K.	3	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1022: INTEREST IN POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2736 /-] [Invalid=25 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER YOU PAY MUCH ATTENTION TO POLITICS GENERALLY. I MEAN FROM DAY TO DAY, WHEN THERE ISN'T A BIG ELECTION CAMPAIGN GOING ON. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FOLLOW POLITICS VERY CLOSELY, FAIRLY CLOSELY, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?		
Notes	Q2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY CLOSELY	395	<div></div> 14.4%
2	FAIRLY CLOSELY	1299	<div></div> 47.5%
3	NOT MUCH AT ALL	1042	<div></div> 38.1%
8	D.K.	7	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1023: MORE ATTENTION: FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2672 /-] [Invalid=89 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1023: MORE ATTENTION: FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Literal question	WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU PAY MORE ATTENTION TO FEDERAL POLITICS, PROVINCIAL POLITICS, OR LOCAL POLITICS?		
Notes	Q3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FEDERAL	669	<div></div> 25.0%
2	PROVINCIAL	580	<div></div> 21.7%
3	LOCAL	328	<div></div> 12.3%
4	ALL ABOUT EQUALLY	725	<div></div> 27.1%
5	FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL EQUALLY	302	<div></div> 11.3%
6	FEDERAL AND LOCAL EQUALLY	23	<div></div> 0.9%
7	PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL EQUALLY	45	<div></div> 1.7%
8	D.K.	71	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1024: LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT MOST IMPORTANT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2584 /-] [Invalid=177 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	AS FAR AS YOU ARE CONCERNED PERSONALLY, WHICH GOVERNMENT IS MORE IMPORTANT IN AFFECTING HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY GET ON, THE ONE IN OTTAWA, THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) OR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERE IN (NAME CITY, TOWNSHIP, ETC.)?		
Notes	Q4 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ONE IN OTTAWA, FEDERAL	843	<div></div> 32.6%
2	PROVINCIAL	932	<div></div> 36.1%
3	LOCAL	275	<div></div> 10.6%
4	ALL ABOUT EQUALLY	346	<div></div> 13.4%
5	FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL EQUALLY	154	<div></div> 6.0%
6	FEDERAL AND LOCAL EQUALLY	10	<div></div> 0.4%
7	PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL EQUALLY	24	<div></div> 0.9%
8	D.K.	159	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1025: YOUR GOVERNMENT: WHICH LEVEL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2705 /-] [Invalid=56 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR GOVERNMENT, WHICH GOVERNMENT COMES TO MIND, THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA OR THE GOVERNMENT OF (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q5 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CANADA	1462	<div></div> 54.0%
2	PROVINCE	885	<div></div> 32.7%
3	NEITHER	53	<div></div> 2.0%

# v1025: YOUR GOVERNMENT: WHICH LEVEL			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	BOTH	305	<div><div></div></div> 11.3%
8	D.K.	38	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1026: MATERIAL SATISFACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2730 /-] [Invalid=31 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ARE DOING THESE DAYS. FIRST, LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE -- THE THINGS YOU CAN BUY AND DO -- ALL THE THINGS THAT MAKE UP YOUR MATERIAL STANDARD OF LIVING.		
Literal question	WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?		
Notes	Q6A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY SATISFIED	665	<div><div></div></div> 24.4%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	1409	<div><div></div></div> 51.6%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	483	<div><div></div></div> 17.7%
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	173	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
8	D.K.	13	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1027: GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON MATERIAL SATISFACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2683 /-] [Invalid=78 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ARE DOING THESE DAYS. FIRST, LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE -- THE THINGS YOU CAN BUY AND DO -- ALL THE THINGS THAT MAKE UP YOUR MATERIAL STANDARD OF LIVING. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?		
Literal question	Q6B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?		
Notes	Q6A, Q6B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
1	GREAT DEAL	847	<div><div></div></div> 31.6%
2	SOMETHING	955	<div><div></div></div> 35.6%
3	NOT MUCH	864	<div><div></div></div> 32.2%
8	D.K.	64	
9	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q6A	14	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1028: MATERIAL STATE IN 4 YEARS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2583 /-] [Invalid=178 /-]		

# v1028: MATERIAL STATE IN 4 YEARS				
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF THINGS AND LOOKING AHEAD OVER THE NEXT THREE OR FOUR YEARS, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WILL BE BETTER OFF, WORSE OFF, OR WILL THINGS STAY ABOUT THE SAME?			
Notes	Q7 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	BETTER OFF	677	<div></div>	26.2%
2	WORSE OFF	599	<div></div>	23.2%
3	ABOUT THE SAME	1307	<div></div>	50.6%
8	D.K.	160		
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1029: LIFE SATISFACTION				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2728 /-] [Invalid=33 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?			
Notes	Q8A in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY SATISFIED	875	<div></div>	32.1%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	1508	<div></div>	55.3%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	270	<div></div>	9.9%
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	75	<div></div>	2.7%
8	D.K.	15		
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1030: GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON LIFE SATISFACTION				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2692 /-] [Invalid=69 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q8A. NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?			
Literal question	Q8B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?			
Notes	Q8A, Q8B in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	<div></div>	0.6%
1	GREAT DEAL	461	<div></div>	17.1%
2	SOMETHING	902	<div></div>	33.5%
3	NOT MUCH	1312	<div></div>	48.7%
8	D.K.	53		
9	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q8A	16		

# v1030: GOVERNMENT IMPACT ON LIFE SATISFACTION				
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1031: 'POLITICS'- MEANING 1ST				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1269 /-] [Invalid=1492 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Literal question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT POLITICS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?			
Notes	Q9A.1 in the documentation. CONTENT OF POLITICS DEFINITION CODED HERE.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	GOVERNMENT	209	<div></div>	16.5%
2	RUNNING THE COUNTRY / SOCIETY, THE WAY THINGS ARE	73	<div></div>	5.8%
3	ELECTIONS, ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, VOTING	102	<div></div>	8.0%
4	MAKING LAWS, LEGISLATING	25	<div></div>	2.0%
5	ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS, THE BUREAUCRACY	19	<div></div>	1.5%
6	REFERENCES TO 'THE AUTHORITIES', THOSE WHO RUN THE COUNTRY	25	<div></div>	2.0%
7	REFERENCES TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM	0		
8	GOV'T OUTPUTS, ACHIEVEMENTS, POLICY FAILURES (GEN.)	9	<div></div>	0.7%
9	CHANGE, CHANGE IN (OF) GOV'T	5	<div></div>	0.4%
10	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REFERENCES	34	<div></div>	2.7%
11	THE PRIME MINISTER	22	<div></div>	1.7%
12	PARLIAMENT	11	<div></div>	0.9%
13	PROVINCIAL PREMIERS	1	<div></div>	0.1%
14	REFERENCES TO PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES	7	<div></div>	0.6%
15	OTTAWA	15	<div></div>	1.2%
16	REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC PROVINCES	5	<div></div>	0.4%
17	REFERENCES TO MAYORS, ETC.	0		
18	REFERENCES TO LOCAL COUNCILS	1	<div></div>	0.1%
19	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	4	<div></div>	0.3%
20	POLITICIANS POSITIVE	10	<div></div>	0.8%
21	POLITICIANS NEUTRAL	56	<div></div>	4.4%
22	POLITICIANS NEGATIVE	40	<div></div>	3.2%
23	POLITICIANS AS LAWMAKERS	2	<div></div>	0.2%
24	POLITICIANS UNREPRESENTATIVE (INTERESTS, CHARACTERISTICS)	9	<div></div>	0.7%
25	POLITICIANS AS DEBATERS, SPEAKERS	11	<div></div>	0.9%
26	POLITICIANS AS CONSTITUENCY SERVANTS, POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE	8	<div></div>	0.6%
27	REFERENCES TO PROVIDING LEADERSHIP, THE LEADERS (GENERAL)	49	<div></div>	3.9%
30	TRUDEAU	18	<div></div>	1.4%
31	CLARK	12	<div></div>	0.9%
32	BROADBENT	0		
33	PROVINCIAL PREMIERS	3	<div></div>	0.2%
34	CABINET MINISTERS, OTHER SPECIFIC POLITICIANS	1	<div></div>	0.1%

# v1031: 'POLITICS'- MEANING 1ST				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
40	ECONOMY	27	<div></div>	2.1%
41	TAXES, GATHERING AND SPENDING OF, BUDGETING	20	<div></div>	1.6%
42	OTHER REFERENCES TO MONEY	12	<div></div>	0.9%
43	WASTE OF MONEY, GAMBLERS	10	<div></div>	0.8%
44	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING	11	<div></div>	0.9%
45	OTHER ISSUE REFERENCES	8	<div></div>	0.6%
46	THE REFERENDUM, NATIONAL UNITY, SEPARATISM	7	<div></div>	0.6%
47	ENERGY	1	<div></div>	0.1%
48	IMMIGRATION	0		
49	JOBS, UNEMPLOYMENT	13	<div></div>	1.0%
50	POLITICAL PARTIES, GENERAL REFERENCES	43	<div></div>	3.4%
51	POLITICAL PARTIES AS STANDING FOR THINGS / IDEOLOGY	2	<div></div>	0.2%
52	REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC IDEOLOGIES	2	<div></div>	0.2%
53	LIBERAL PARTY	8	<div></div>	0.6%
54	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY	1	<div></div>	0.1%
55	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY (N.D.P.)	2	<div></div>	0.2%
56	SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY	2	<div></div>	0.2%
57	PARTY QUEBECOIS (PQ)	4	<div></div>	0.3%
58	PROVINCIAL PARTIES (OTHER)	0		
60	GENERAL POSITIVE REFERENCES	13	<div></div>	1.0%
61	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	66	<div></div>	5.2%
62	REFERENCES TO EXISTENCE OF CONFLICT, ALWAYS FIGHTING, ETC.	35	<div></div>	2.8%
63	REFERENCES TO GOVERNMENTS IN CONFLICT WITH EACH OTHER IN CAN	0		
64	REFERENCES TO INTERNATIONAL POLITICS	6	<div></div>	0.5%
65	CORRUPTION, DISHONESTY, IMMORALITY	35	<div></div>	2.8%
66	POWER REFERENCES, (TOO MUCH POWER IN HIGH PLACES)	8	<div></div>	0.6%
67	BROKEN PROMISES, SHATTERED DREAMS	15	<div></div>	1.2%
68	PROMISES (GENERAL REFERENCE) NEUTRAL	3	<div></div>	0.2%
69	NEGOTIATION, CONSULTATION (GENERAL), COMPROMISE	8	<div></div>	0.6%
70	REFERENCES TO UNITED STATES	2	<div></div>	0.2%
71	PERSONAL REFERENCES, PERSONAL EXPERIENCE	15	<div></div>	1.2%
72	PEOPLE CAN'T AFFECT THE SYSTEM, PEOPLE HAVE NO SAY	3	<div></div>	0.2%
80	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	44	<div></div>	3.5%
87	OTHER	44	<div></div>	3.5%
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND OR THIRD MENTION	13	<div></div>	1.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1405		
88	DON'T KNOW	87		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1032: 'POLITICS'-MEANING 2ND				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1351 /-] [Invalid=1410 /-]			

# v1032: 'POLITICS'-MEANING 2ND				
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question		WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? (2ND MENTION)		
Notes		Q10D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	GOVERNMENT	26	<div></div>	1.9%
2	RUNNING THE COUNTRY / SOCIETY, THE WAY THINGS ARE	52	<div></div>	3.8%
3	ELECTIONS, ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, VOTING	34	<div></div>	2.5%
4	MAKING LAWS, LEGISLATING	26	<div></div>	1.9%
5	ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS, THE BUREAUCRACY	11	<div></div>	0.8%
6	REFERENCES TO 'THE AUTHORITIES', THOSE WHO RUN THE COUNTRY	9	<div></div>	0.7%
7	REFERENCES TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM	1	<div></div>	0.1%
8	GOV'T OUTPUTS, ACHIEVEMENTS, POLICY FAILURES (GEN.)	18	<div></div>	1.3%
9	CHANGE, CHANGE IN (OF) GOV'T	11	<div></div>	0.8%
10	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REFERENCES	19	<div></div>	1.4%
11	THE PRIME MINISTER	12	<div></div>	0.9%
12	PARLIAMENT	12	<div></div>	0.9%
13	PROVINCIAL PREMIERS	5	<div></div>	0.4%
14	REFERENCES TO PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES	7	<div></div>	0.5%
15	OTTAWA	10	<div></div>	0.7%
16	REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC PROVINCES	6	<div></div>	0.4%
17	REFERENCES TO MAYORS, ETC.	2	<div></div>	0.1%
18	REFERENCES TO LOCAL COUNCILS	5	<div></div>	0.4%
19	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	<div></div>	0.1%
20	POLITICIANS POSITIVE	4	<div></div>	0.3%
21	POLITICIANS NEUTRAL	39	<div></div>	2.9%
22	POLITICIANS NEGATIVE	29	<div></div>	2.1%
23	POLITICIANS AS LAWMAKERS	0		
24	POLITICIANS UNREPRESENTATIVE (INTERESTS, CHARACTERISTICS)	16	<div></div>	1.2%
25	POLITICIANS AS DEBATERS, SPEAKERS	7	<div></div>	0.5%
26	POLITICIANS AS CONSTITUENCY SERVANTS, POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE	6	<div></div>	0.4%
27	REFERENCES TO PROVIDING LEADERSHIP, THE LEADERS (GENERAL)	19	<div></div>	1.4%
30	TRUDEAU	15	<div></div>	1.1%
31	CLARK	9	<div></div>	0.7%
32	BROADBENT	0		
33	PROVINCIAL PREMIERS	2	<div></div>	0.1%
34	CABINET MINISTERS, OTHER SPECIFIC POLITICIANS	9	<div></div>	0.7%
40	ECONOMY	17	<div></div>	1.3%
41	TAXES, GATHERING AND SPENDING OF, BUDGETING	26	<div></div>	1.9%
42	OTHER REFERENCES TO MONEY	10	<div></div>	0.7%
43	WASTE OF MONEY, GAMBLERS	10	<div></div>	0.7%
44	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING	18	<div></div>	1.3%

# v1032: 'POLITICS'-MEANING 2ND				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
45	OTHER ISSUE REFERENCES	20	<div></div>	1.5%
46	THE REFERENDUM, NATIONAL UNITY, SEPARATISM	13	<div></div>	1.0%
47	ENERGY	9	<div></div>	0.7%
48	IMMIGRATION	1	<div></div>	0.1%
49	JOBS, UNEMPLOYMENT	14	<div></div>	1.0%
50	POLITICAL PARTIES, GENERAL REFERENCES	20	<div></div>	1.5%
51	POLITICAL PARTIES AS STANDING FOR THINGS / IDEOLOGY	7	<div></div>	0.5%
52	REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC IDEOLOGIES	2	<div></div>	0.1%
53	LIBERAL PARTY	4	<div></div>	0.3%
54	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY	6	<div></div>	0.4%
55	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY (N.D.P.)	1	<div></div>	0.1%
56	SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY	1	<div></div>	0.1%
57	PARTY QUEBECOIS (PQ)	2	<div></div>	0.1%
58	PROVINCIAL PARTIES (OTHER)	0	<div></div>	
60	GENERAL POSITIVE REFERENCES	15	<div></div>	1.1%
61	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	47	<div></div>	3.5%
62	REFERENCES TO EXISTENCE OF CONFLICT, ALWAYS FIGHTING, ETC.	22	<div></div>	1.6%
63	REFERENCES TO GOVERNMENTS IN CONFLICT WITH EACH OTHER IN CAN	3	<div></div>	0.2%
64	REFERENCES TO INTERNATIONAL POLITICS	5	<div></div>	0.4%
65	CORRUPTION, DISHONESTY, IMMORALITY	24	<div></div>	1.8%
66	POWER REFERENCES, (TOO MUCH POWER IN HIGH PLACES)	13	<div></div>	1.0%
67	BROKEN PROMISES, SHATTERED DREAMS	15	<div></div>	1.1%
68	PROMISES (GENERAL REFERENCE) NEUTRAL	2	<div></div>	0.1%
69	NEGOTIATION, CONSULTATION (GENERAL), COMPROMISE	5	<div></div>	0.4%
70	REFERENCES TO UNITED STATES	3	<div></div>	0.2%
71	PERSONAL REFERENCES, PERSONAL EXPERIENCE	10	<div></div>	0.7%
72	PEOPLE CAN'T AFFECT THE SYSTEM, PEOPLE HAVE NO SAY	4	<div></div>	0.3%
80	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	8	<div></div>	0.6%
87	OTHER	33	<div></div>	2.4%
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND OR THIRD MENTION	538	<div></div>	39.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1408		
88	DON'T KNOW	2		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1033: 'POLITICS'-MEANING 3RD				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1353 /-] [Invalid=1408 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Literal question	WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? (2ND MENTION)			
Notes	Q10D in the documentation.			

v1033: 'POLITICS'-MEANING 3RD

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GOVERNMENT	7	0.5%
2	RUNNING THE COUNTRY / SOCIETY, THE WAY THINGS ARE	10	0.7%
3	ELECTIONS, ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, VOTING	11	0.8%
4	MAKING LAWS, LEGISLATING	9	0.7%
5	ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS, THE BUREAUCRACY	7	0.5%
6	REFERENCES TO 'THE AUTHORITIES', THOSE WHO RUN THE COUNTRY	7	0.5%
7	REFERENCES TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM	0	
8	GOV'T OUTPUTS, ACHIEVEMENTS, POLICY FAILURES (GEN.)	5	0.4%
9	CHANGE, CHANGE IN (OF) GOV'T	1	0.1%
10	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REFERENCES	2	0.1%
11	THE PRIME MINISTER	0	
12	PARLIAMENT	3	0.2%
13	PROVINCIAL PREMIERS	4	0.3%
14	REFERENCES TO PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES	9	0.7%
15	OTTAWA	3	0.2%
16	REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC PROVINCES	1	0.1%
17	REFERENCES TO MAYORS, ETC.	1	0.1%
18	REFERENCES TO LOCAL COUNCILS	3	0.2%
19	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	0.1%
20	POLITICIANS POSITIVE	3	0.2%
21	POLITICIANS NEUTRAL	13	1.0%
22	POLITICIANS NEGATIVE	11	0.8%
23	POLITICIANS AS LAWMAKERS	0	
24	POLITICIANS UNREPRESENTATIVE (INTERESTS, CHARACTERISTICS)	9	0.7%
25	POLITICIANS AS DEBATERS, SPEAKERS	5	0.4%
26	POLITICIANS AS CONSTITUENCY SERVANTS, POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE	1	0.1%
27	REFERENCES TO PROVIDING LEADERSHIP, THE LEADERS (GENERAL)	5	0.4%
30	TRUDEAU	1	0.1%
31	CLARK	8	0.6%
32	BROADBENT	0	
33	PROVINCIAL PREMIERS	2	0.1%
34	CABINET MINISTERS, OTHER SPECIFIC POLITICIANS	11	0.8%
40	ECONOMY	5	0.4%
41	TAXES, GATHERING AND SPENDING OF, BUDGETING	3	0.2%
42	OTHER REFERENCES TO MONEY	5	0.4%
43	WASTE OF MONEY, GAMBLERS	0	
44	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING	14	1.0%
45	OTHER ISSUE REFERENCES	14	1.0%
46	THE REFERENDUM, NATIONAL UNITY, SEPARATISM	5	0.4%
47	ENERGY	2	0.1%
48	IMMIGRATION	2	0.1%

# v1033: 'POLITICS'-MEANING 3RD			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	JOBS, UNEMPLOYMENT	4	0.3%
50	POLITICAL PARTIES, GENERAL REFERENCES	10	0.7%
51	POLITICAL PARTIES AS STANDING FOR THINGS / IDEOLOGY	4	0.3%
52	REFERENCES TO SPECIFIC IDEOLOGIES	0	
53	LIBERAL PARTY	1	0.1%
54	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY	4	0.3%
55	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY (N.D.P.)	4	0.3%
56	SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY	0	
57	PARTY QUEBECOIS (PQ)	2	0.1%
58	PROVINCIAL PARTIES (OTHER)	0	
60	GENERAL POSITIVE REFERENCES	2	0.1%
61	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	22	1.6%
62	REFERENCES TO EXISTENCE OF CONFLICT, ALWAYS FIGHTING, ETC.	5	0.4%
63	REFERENCES TO GOVERNMENTS IN CONFLICT WITH EACH OTHER IN CAN	1	0.1%
64	REFERENCES TO INTERNATIONAL POLITICS	8	0.6%
65	CORRUPTION, DISHONESTY, IMMORALITY	5	0.4%
66	POWER REFERENCES, (TOO MUCH POWER IN HIGH PLACES)	2	0.1%
67	BROKEN PROMISES, SHATTERED DREAMS	4	0.3%
68	PROMISES (GENERAL REFERENCE) NEUTRAL	5	0.4%
69	NEGOTIATION, CONSULTATION (GENERAL), COMPROMISE	2	0.1%
70	REFERENCES TO UNITED STATES	1	0.1%
71	PERSONAL REFERENCES, PERSONAL EXPERIENCE	8	0.6%
72	PEOPLE CAN'T AFFECT THE SYSTEM, PEOPLE HAVE NO SAY	4	0.3%
80	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	1	0.1%
87	OTHER	11	0.8%
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND OR THIRD MENTION	1040	76.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1408	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1034: 'POLITICS'-LEVEL NAMED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=399 /-] [Invalid=2362 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT POLITICS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	<MEANING OF POLITICS, LEVEL OF REFERENCE>		
Notes	Q9B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTERNATIONAL	7	1.8%
2	FEDERAL	218	54.6%

# v1034: 'POLITICS'-LEVEL NAMED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	PROVINCIAL	33	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%
4	LOCAL	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
5	INTERNATIONAL AND FEDERAL	15	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
6	FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL	87	<div><div></div></div> 21.8%
7	LOCAL AND FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
8	OTHER COMBINATIONS	21	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
0	NO ANSWER TO QUESTION, HALF SAMPLE 1	1485	
9	IMPOSSIBLE TO ASCERTAIN	877	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1035: 'POLITICS'-POSITIVE/NEGATIVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2630 /-] [Invalid=131 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT POLITICS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE WORD POLITICS IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	<MEANING OF POLITICS, EVALUATIVE REFERENCE>		
Notes	Q9C.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY POSITIVE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
2	POSITIVE	34	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
3	MILDLY POSITIVE	53	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
4	NEUTRAL	721	<div><div></div></div> 27.4%
5	MILDLY NEGATIVE	104	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
6	NEGATIVE	154	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
7	STONGLY NEGATIVE	90	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
9	NO ANSWER TO QUESTION	1469	<div><div></div></div> 55.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	IMPOSSIBLE TO ASCERTAIN	114	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1036: 'POLTCS' SOLVE PROBLEMS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1235 /-] [Invalid=1526 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT IT DOES NOT. DO YOU FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS, OR NOT?		
Notes	Q10A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES, SOLVES PROBLEMS	827	<div><div></div></div> 67.0%
2	NO, DOES NOT	346	<div><div></div></div> 28.0%
3	MAKES THINGS WORSE	62	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
0	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
8	NO OPINION	118	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1037: 'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1334 /-] [Invalid=1427 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Q10B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" to Q10A.		
Pre-question	Q10A. SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT IT DOES NOT. DO YOU FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS, OR NOT?		
Literal question	Q10B.1 CAN YOU THINK OF ANY EXAMPLES WHERE POLITICS HAS HELPED TO SOLVE PROBLEMS? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q10A, Q10B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES, BUT NO EXAMPLE GIVEN	242	18.1%
2	NO, DOES NOT	346	25.9%
3	MAKES THINGS WORSE	62	4.6%
4	REFERENCES TO LAWS, PASSING THEM, LEGAL AFFAIRS AND PROBLEMS	18	1.3%
5	PARTICIPATION IS A GOOD THING; LETS PEOPLE HAVE INFLUENCE	3	0.2%
10	ECONOMIC - GENERAL, STANDARD OF LIVING, ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	21	1.6%
11	ECONOMIC - INFLATION, PRICES, WAGES AND PRICES	17	1.3%
12	ECONOMIC - UNEMPLOYMENT, JOBS	39	2.9%
13	ECONOMIC - REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	4	0.3%
14	ECONOMIC - FOREIGN TRADE, EXPORTS, IMPORTS	8	0.6%
15	ECONOMIC - TAXES	7	0.5%
20	EDUCATION - GENERAL	2	0.1%
21	EDUCATION - SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAMMES	0	
22	EDUCATION - SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS	2	0.1%
23	EDUCATION - SCHOLARSHIPS	4	0.3%
30	LABOUR, UNIONS - CONTROL LABOUR	7	0.5%
31	LABOUR, UNIONS - SETTLE STRIKES	42	3.1%
32	BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, CAPITAL - HELPS	8	0.6%
33	BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, CAPITAL - SUBSIDIES	8	0.6%
34	BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, CAPITAL - CONTROL	2	0.1%
35	THE POOR - GENERAL MENTION	3	0.2%
36	THE POOR - SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES FOR THE POOR	1	0.1%
40	TRUDEAU	2	0.1%
41	CLARK	1	0.1%
42	BROADBENT	0	
43	OTHER FEDERAL POLITICIANS	5	0.4%
44	PROVINCIAL POLITICIANS	2	0.1%
45	LOCAL POLITICIANS	2	0.1%
50	NATIONAL UNITY - KEEPING COUNTRY TOGETHER	4	0.3%
51	FEDERALISM - SETTLE/PRODUCE CONFLICT	6	0.4%
52	FEDERALISM - LANGUAGE PROTECTION	2	0.1%
53	FEDERALISM - LANGUAGE POLICY GENERALLY	2	0.1%
54	SYMBOLIC ACTIONS (FLAG)	1	0.1%
55	OCTOBER CRISIS, FLQ	7	0.5%
56	HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUAL RIGHTS	3	0.2%











# v1037: 'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
60	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - GENERAL	15	1.1%
61	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - PENSIONS	49	3.7%
62	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - FAMILY ALLOWANCE	3	0.2%
63	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - HEALTH CARE, INSURANCE	36	2.7%
64	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - WELFARE	8	0.6%
65	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
66	AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE	7	0.5%
69	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES (OTHER - SPECIFIC)	6	0.4%
70	OTHER ISSUES - ENERGY, OIL	31	2.3%
71	LOCAL ISSUES	17	1.3%
72	HOUSING AID, MORTGAGE AID	12	0.9%
73	IMMIGRANTS	18	1.3%
74	AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS, FORESTRY, FISHING	25	1.9%
75	PUBLIC WORKS, ROADS, TRANSPORTATION	19	1.4%
76	GRANTS, PROJECTS, RESEARCH	5	0.4%
77	ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION	7	0.5%
79	OTHER ISSUES	6	0.4%
80	INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, EVENTS	43	3.2%
81	INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL FIGURES	0	
85	PERSONAL PROBLEMS	17	1.3%
86	OTHER	21	1.6%
87	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	5	0.4%
99	NO ANSWER, OR NO SECOND MENTION, NO OPINION	99	7.4%
0	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
88	DON'T KNOW	19	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1038: 'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1353 /-] [Invalid=1408 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Q10B.2 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" to Q10A.		
Pre-question	Q10A. SOME PEOPLE FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT IT DOES NOT. DO YOU FEEL THAT POLITICS HELPS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS, OR NOT?		
Literal question	Q10B.2 CAN YOU THINK OF ANY EXAMPLES WHERE POLITICS HAS HELPED TO SOLVE PROBLEMS? (2ND MENTION)		
Notes	Q10A, Q10B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES, BUT NO EXAMPLE GIVEN	0	
2	NO, DOES NOT	0	
3	MAKES THINGS WORSE	0	
4	REFERENCES TO LAWS, PASSING THEM, LEGAL AFFAIRS AND PROBLEMS	7	0.5%
5	PARTICIPATION IS A GOOD THING; LETS PEOPLE HAVE INFLUENCE	1	0.1%
10	ECONOMIC - GENERAL, STANDARD OF LIVING, ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	4	0.3%

v1038: 'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	ECONOMIC - INFLATION, PRICES, WAGES AND PRICES	6	0.4%
12	ECONOMIC - UNEMPLOYMENT, JOBS	7	0.5%
13	ECONOMIC - REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	2	0.1%
14	ECONOMIC - FOREIGN TRADE, EXPORTS, IMPORTS	4	0.3%
15	ECONOMIC - TAXES	3	0.2%
20	EDUCATION - GENERAL	1	0.1%
21	EDUCATION - SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAMMES	1	0.1%
22	EDUCATION - SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS	1	0.1%
23	EDUCATION - SCHOLARSHIPS	1	0.1%
30	LABOUR, UNIONS - CONTROL LABOUR	3	0.2%
31	LABOUR, UNIONS - SETTLE STRIKES	3	0.2%
32	BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, CAPITAL - HELPS	2	0.1%
33	BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, CAPITAL - SUBSIDIES	4	0.3%
34	BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, CAPITAL - CONTROL	1	0.1%
35	THE POOR - GENERAL MENTION	1	0.1%
36	THE POOR - SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES FOR THE POOR	3	0.2%
40	TRUDEAU	3	0.2%
41	CLARK	1	0.1%
42	BROADBENT	0	
43	OTHER FEDERAL POLITICIANS	0	
44	PROVINCIAL POLITICIANS	5	0.4%
45	LOCAL POLITICIANS	1	0.1%
50	NATIONAL UNITY - KEEPING COUNTRY TOGETHER	4	0.3%
51	FEDERALISM - SETTLE/PRODUCE CONFLICT	3	0.2%
52	FEDERALISM - LANGUAGE PROTECTION	3	0.2%
53	FEDERALISM - LANGUAGE POLICY GENERALLY	3	0.2%
54	SYMBOLIC ACTIONS (FLAG)	1	0.1%
55	OCTOBER CRISIS, FLQ	3	0.2%
56	HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUAL RIGHTS	3	0.2%
60	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - GENERAL	12	0.9%
61	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - PENSIONS	13	1.0%
62	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - FAMILY ALLOWANCE	9	0.7%
63	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - HEALTH CARE, INSURANCE	17	1.3%
64	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES - WELFARE	9	0.7%
65	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	5	0.4%
66	AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE	3	0.2%
69	SOCIAL PROGRAMMES (OTHER - SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
70	OTHER ISSUES - ENERGY, OIL	14	1.0%
71	LOCAL ISSUES	10	0.7%
72	HOUSING AID, MORTGAGE AID	10	0.7%
73	IMMIGRANTS	8	0.6%
74	AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS, FORESTRY, FISHING	14	1.0%
75	PUBLIC WORKS, ROADS, TRANSPORTATION	14	1.0%
76	GRANTS, PROJECTS, RESEARCH	2	0.1%
77	ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION	4	0.3%

# v1038: 'POLITICS'-PROBLEM SOLVED 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
79	OTHER ISSUES	4	0.3%
80	INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, EVENTS	11	0.8%
81	INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL FIGURES	0	
85	PERSONAL PROBLEMS	5	0.4%
86	OTHER	9	0.7%
87	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	3	0.2%
99	NO ANSWER, OR NO SECOND MENTION, NO OPINION	1090	80.6%
0	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1039: PARTY IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAKE DIFFERENCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1313 /-] [Invalid=1448 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE SAY THAT IT DOESN'T MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE WHICH PARTY IS IN POWER IN OTTAWA, WHILE OTHERS THINK THAT IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?		
Notes	Q11A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE	422	32.1%
2	SOME DIFFERENCE	471	35.9%
3	NO DIFFERENCE	420	32.0%
0	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW, NA	1412	
8	D.K.	36	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1040: PARTY IN PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT MAKE DIFFERENCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1283 /-] [Invalid=1478 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT IN THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT? DOES IT MAKE MUCH DIFFERENCE THERE?		
Notes	Q11B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE	488	38.0%
2	SOME DIFFERENCE	455	35.5%
3	NO DIFFERENCE	340	26.5%
0	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW, NA	1414	
8	D.K.	64	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1041: MP'S LOSE TOUCH			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2677 /-] [Invalid=84 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU		

# v1041: MP'S LOSE TOUCH			
	STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE. GENERALLY, THOSE ELECTED TO PARLIAMENT SOON LOSE TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE.		
Notes	Q12A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	199	<div><div></div></div> 7.4%
2	AGREE	643	<div><div></div></div> 24.0%
3	DISAGREE	419	<div><div></div></div> 15.7%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	26	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 51.9%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	84	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1042: GOVERNMENT DOESN'T CARE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2698 /-] [Invalid=63 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	I DON'T THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT CARES MUCH WHAT PEOPLE LIKE ME THINK.		
Notes	Q12B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	168	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
2	AGREE	544	<div><div></div></div> 20.2%
3	DISAGREE	564	<div><div></div></div> 20.9%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 51.5%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	63	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1043: POLITICS COMPLICATED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2721 /-] [Invalid=40 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	SOMETIMES, POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT SEEM SO COMPLICATED THAT A PERSON LIKE ME CAN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON.		
Notes	Q12C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	238	<div><div></div></div> 8.7%
2	AGREE	664	<div><div></div></div> 24.4%
3	DISAGREE	377	<div><div></div></div> 13.9%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	52	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 51.1%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	40	

# v1043: POLITICS COMPLICATED			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1044: PEOPLE LIKE ME HAVE NO SAY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2712 /-] [Invalid=49 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES.		
Notes	Q12D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	180	 6.6%
2	AGREE	583	 21.5%
3	DISAGREE	515	 19.0%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	44	 1.6%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	 51.3%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	49	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1045: SO MANY VOTERS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2718 /-] [Invalid=43 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES.		
Notes	Q12E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	48	 1.8%
2	AGREE	147	 5.4%
3	DISAGREE	752	 27.7%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	381	 14.0%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	 51.1%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	43	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1046: GOVERNMENT DISHONEST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2554 /-] [Invalid=207 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	MANY PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT ARE DISHONEST.		
Notes	Q12F in the documentation.		

# v1046: GOVERNMENT DISHONEST			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	88	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
2	AGREE	385	<div><div></div></div> 15.1%
3	DISAGREE	642	<div><div></div></div> 25.1%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	49	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 54.4%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	207	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1047: GOVERNMENT WASTES TAXES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2651 /-] [Invalid=110 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT WASTE A LOT OF THE MONEY WE PAY IN TAXES.		
Notes	Q12G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	337	<div><div></div></div> 12.7%
2	AGREE	681	<div><div></div></div> 25.7%
3	DISAGREE	227	<div><div></div></div> 8.6%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 52.4%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	110	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1048: CAN TRUST GOVERNMENT DO WHAT IS RIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2657 /-] [Invalid=104 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	MOST OF THE TIME WE CAN TRUST PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT.		
Notes	Q12H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	64	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
2	AGREE	804	<div><div></div></div> 30.3%
3	DISAGREE	353	<div><div></div></div> 13.3%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	46	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 52.3%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	104	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1049: GOVERNMENT SMART PEOPLE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		

# v1049: GOVERNMENT SMART PEOPLE			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2670 /-] [Invalid=91 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	MOST OF THE PEOPLE RUNNING GOVERNMENT ARE SMART PEOPLE WHO USUALLY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING.		
Notes	Q12I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	96	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
2	AGREE	789	<div><div></div></div> 29.6%
3	DISAGREE	364	<div><div></div></div> 13.6%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	31	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 52.1%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	91	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1050: CANADA: REDUCE MILITARY SPEND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2531 /-] [Invalid=230 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	CANADA SHOULD REDUCE ITS PRESENT LEVEL OF MILITARY SPENDING.		
Notes	Q12J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	81	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
2	AGREE	285	<div><div></div></div> 11.3%
3	DISAGREE	649	<div><div></div></div> 25.6%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	126	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 54.9%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	230	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1051: CANADA: REDUCE FORGEIN AID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2596 /-] [Invalid=165 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT SOME OPINIONS THAT YOU HEAR DIFFERENT PEOPLE GIVING. AS I READ EACH ONE, I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO TELL ME OFFHAND WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE.		
Literal question	CANADA SHOULD REDUCE ITS FOREIGN AID.		
Notes	Q12K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	129	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
2	AGREE	399	<div><div></div></div> 15.4%

# v1051: CANADA: REDUCE FORGEIN AID			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	DISAGREE	614	<div><div></div></div> 23.7%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	64	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	<div><div></div></div> 53.5%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	165	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1052: READ NEWSPAPER-FEDERAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1348 /-] [Invalid=1413 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q13A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	572	<div><div></div></div> 42.4%
2	SOMETIMES	368	<div><div></div></div> 27.3%
3	SELDOM	259	<div><div></div></div> 19.2%
4	NEVER	149	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
8	D.K.	5	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1053: DISCUSS POLITICS-FEDERAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1348 /-] [Invalid=1413 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?		
Notes	Q13B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	327	<div><div></div></div> 24.3%
2	SOMETIMES	516	<div><div></div></div> 38.3%
3	SELDOM	306	<div><div></div></div> 22.7%
4	NEVER	199	<div><div></div></div> 14.8%
8	D.K.	5	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1054: CONVINCE FRIENDS-FEDERAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		

# v1054: CONVINCE FRIENDS-FEDERAL POLITICS			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1347 /-] [Invalid=1414 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU		
Notes	Q13C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	101	<div><div></div></div> 7.5%
2	SOMETIMES	165	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
3	SELDOM	185	<div><div></div></div> 13.7%
4	NEVER	896	<div><div></div></div> 66.5%
8	D.K.	6	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1055: ATTEND MEETING-FEDERAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1348 /-] [Invalid=1413 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?		
Notes	Q13D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	48	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
2	SOMETIMES	194	<div><div></div></div> 14.4%
3	SELDOM	286	<div><div></div></div> 21.2%
4	NEVER	820	<div><div></div></div> 60.8%
8	D.K.	5	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1056: CONTACT OFFICIALS-FEDERAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1347 /-] [Invalid=1414 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> CONTACT PUBLIC OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS?		
Notes	Q13E in the documentation.		

# v1056: CONTACT OFFICIALS-FEDERAL POLITICS				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	46	<div><div></div></div>	3.4%
2	SOMETIMES	194	<div><div></div></div>	14.4%
3	SELDOM	250	<div><div></div></div>	18.6%
4	NEVER	857	<div><div></div></div>	63.6%
8	D.K.	6		
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1057: CAMPAIGN WORK-FEDERAL POLITICS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1344 /-] [Invalid=1417 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.			
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE?			
Notes	Q13F in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	44	<div><div></div></div>	3.3%
2	SOMETIMES	104	<div><div></div></div>	7.7%
3	SELDOM	126	<div><div></div></div>	9.4%
4	NEVER	1070	<div><div></div></div>	79.6%
8	D.K.	9		
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1058: CONTRIBUTE MONEY-FEDERAL POLITICS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1344 /-] [Invalid=1417 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE DO QUITE A LOT IN POLITICS WHILE OTHERS FIND THEY HAVEN'T THE TIME OR PERHAPS THE INTEREST TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. I'LL READ YOU BRIEFLY SOME OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH OF THEM. FIRST, PLEASE TELL ME HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN FEDERAL POLITICS - OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, OR NEVER.			
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE.			
Notes	Q13G in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	21	<div><div></div></div>	1.6%
2	SOMETIMES	96	<div><div></div></div>	7.1%
3	SELDOM	71	<div><div></div></div>	5.3%
4	NEVER	1156	<div><div></div></div>	86.0%
8	D.K.	9		
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				

# v1059: READ NEWSPAPERS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1346 /-] [Invalid=1415 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ ABOUT POLITICS IN THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q14A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	605	<div><div></div></div> 44.9%
2	SOMETIMES	373	<div><div></div></div> 27.7%
3	SELDOM	219	<div><div></div></div> 16.3%
4	NEVER	149	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
8	D.K.	7	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1060: DISCUSS POLITICS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1343 /-] [Invalid=1418 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOWS R> DISCUSS POLITICS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?		
Notes	Q14B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	354	<div><div></div></div> 26.4%
2	SOMETIMES	481	<div><div></div></div> 35.8%
3	SELDOM	278	<div><div></div></div> 20.7%
4	NEVER	230	<div><div></div></div> 17.1%
8	D.K.	10	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1061: CONVINCE FRIENDS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1342 /-] [Invalid=1419 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU? (HALF SAMPLE 2 ONLY)		
Notes	Q14C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	110	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
2	SOMETIMES	160	<div><div></div></div> 11.9%
3	SELDOM	173	<div><div></div></div> 12.9%
4	NEVER	899	<div><div></div></div> 67.0%
8	D.K.	11	

# v1061: CONVINCE FRIENDS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1062: ATTEND MEETING-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1342 /-] [Invalid=1419 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?		
Notes	Q14D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	49	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
2	SOMETIMES	215	<div><div></div></div> 16.0%
3	SELDOM	247	<div><div></div></div> 18.4%
4	NEVER	831	<div><div></div></div> 61.9%
8	D.K.	11	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1063: CONTACT OFFICIALS-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1343 /-] [Invalid=1418 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> ATTEND A POLITICAL MEETING OR RALLY?		
Notes	Q14E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	48	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
2	SOMETIMES	202	<div><div></div></div> 15.0%
3	SELDOM	226	<div><div></div></div> 16.8%
4	NEVER	867	<div><div></div></div> 64.6%
8	D.K.	10	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1064: CAMPAIGN WORK-PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1342 /-] [Invalid=1419 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> SPEND TIME WORKING FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR A CANDIDATE?		
Notes	Q14F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OFTEN	39	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%

# v1064: CAMPAIGN WORK-PROVINCIAL POLITICS				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
2	SOMETIMES	97	<div></div> 7.2%	
3	SELDOM	121	<div></div> 9.0%	
4	NEVER	1085	<div></div> 80.8%	
8	D.K.	11		
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1065: CONTRIB MONEY-PROVINCIAL POLITICS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1339 /-] [Invalid=1422 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.			
Pre-question	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THESE THINGS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (PROVINCE)?			
Literal question	HOW OFTEN DOES R> CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE?			
Notes	Q14G in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	OFTEN	30	<div></div> 2.2%	
2	SOMETIMES	99	<div></div> 7.4%	
3	SELDOM	71	<div></div> 5.3%	
4	NEVER	1139	<div></div> 85.1%	
8	D.K.	14		
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1066: CANADA DIVIDED IN REGIONS?				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2466 /-] [Invalid=295 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS.			
Notes	Q15A in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	YES	1449	<div></div> 58.8%	
2	NO	1017	<div></div> 41.2%	
8	D.K.	277		
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1067: R LIVES IN: REGION CODED				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1133 /-] [Invalid=1628 /-]			
Universe	Q15B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q15A.			
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS.			
Literal question	Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?			

v1067: R LIVES IN: REGION CODED

Notes

Q15A, Q15B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	EAST, EASTERN	120	10.6%
2	WEST, WESTERN, THE WEST	288	25.4%
3	CENTRAL, CENTRE OF CANADA, MIDDLE	153	13.5%
4	CENTRAL EASTERN	9	0.8%
5	WEST CENTRAL	0	
6	ATLANTIC, ATLANTIC CANADA, ATLANTIC PROVINCES/ REGION	86	7.6%
7	MARITIME AREA/REGION, MARITIME PROVINCES	66	5.8%
8	PACIFIC	20	1.8%
9	B.C. COAST, COASTAL REGION OF B.C.	7	0.6%
10	WEST OF THE ROCKIES	1	0.1%
11	FAR WEST, EXTREME WEST	2	0.2%
12	PRAIRIES	43	3.8%
13	WESTERN PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
14	NORTHERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	7	0.6%
15	EASTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	3	0.3%
16	SOUTHERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	23	2.0%
17	WESTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	4	0.4%
18	CENTRAL (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	3	0.3%
19	SOUTH WESTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	8	0.7%
20	NORTHWESTERN (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	4	0.4%
21	EAST CENTRAL (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	0	
22	NORTH EAST (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	0	
23	SOUTH EAST (NAMED OWN PROVINCE)	3	0.3%
24	ENGLISH CANADA, ENGLISH SPEAKING, ENGLISH	21	1.9%
25	FRENCH SPEAKING, FRENCH REGION, FRANCOPHONE, FRENCH	9	0.8%
26	FRENCH AND ENGLISH SPEAKING	1	0.1%
27	CANADA WITHOUT QUEBEC	3	0.3%
28	SOUTHERN CANADA	2	0.2%
29	NORTHERN CANADA	1	0.1%
30	UPPER CANADA	2	0.2%
31	CANADA	2	0.2%
32	MONTREAL OR SECTION OR SUBURB OF MONTREAL	13	1.1%
33	TORONTO OR SECTION OR SUBURB OF TORONTO	10	0.9%
34	GASPE, GASPE EST, GASPE SUD	22	1.9%
35	SAGUENAY, SAGUENAY LAC ST. JEAN AREA, LAC ST. JEAN	31	2.7%
36	ST. MAURICE, ANY MENTION OF MAURICE	23	2.0%
37	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, TOWNSHIPS, ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, CITIE	85	7.5%
38	MID WEST	2	0.2%
39	MID EAST	1	0.1%
40	CENTRAL MIDDLE PRAIRIES	2	0.2%

# v1067: R LIVES IN: REGION CODED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	POOR, DEPRESSED, UNDERDEVELOPED, FORGOTTEN REGION	20	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
42	RICH, WEALTHY, HIGH WAGE, MOST DEVELOPED, THE HAVES, UPPER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
43	CONTROLLING REGION, INFLUENTIAL, MOST POWERFUL, GOVERNMENTAL	0	
44	GRAIN BELT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
45	WESTERN PLAINS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
46	WESTERN MOUNTAINS, MOUNTAINOUS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
47	INDUSTRIAL, CENTRAL INDUSTRIALIZED	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
48	CENTRAL LOWLANDS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
49	BANANA BELT, GOLDEN HORSESHOE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
50	U.S. REGION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
51	THE GARDEN OF EDEN, THE BEST PART	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
52	A SAFE REGION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
53	POPULATED AREA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
54	WASP	0	
55	INDUSTRIAL EAST	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
56	HEARTLAND OF CANADA	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
57	THE FAIR REGION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
58	AGRICULTURAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
59	BREAD BASKET OF THE COUNTRY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
92	P.C., CONSERVATIVE	0	
93	N.D.P.	0	
94	LIBERAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
97	DON'T KNOW	30	
98	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q15A	1295	
99	N.A.	303	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1068: R LIVES IN: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1441	<div><div></div></div> 99.4%
1	MENTIONED	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1069: R LIVES IN: PEI			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		

# v1069: R LIVES IN: PEI			
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?	
Literal question		Q15B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.	
Notes		Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1448	99.9%
1	MENTIONED	1	0.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			

# v1070: R LIVES IN: NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2C NOVA SCOTIA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1448	99.9%
1	MENTIONED	1	0.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1071: R LIVES IN: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1446	99.8%
1	MENTIONED	3	0.2%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1072: R LIVES IN: QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2E QUEBEC MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1291	89.1%
1	MENTIONED	158	10.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1073: R LIVES IN: ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		

# v1073: R LIVES IN: ONTARIO			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2F ONTARIO MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1354	<div></div> 93.4%
1	MENTIONED	95	<div></div> 6.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1074: R LIVES IN: MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2G MANITOBA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1445	<div></div> 99.7%
1	MENTIONED	4	<div></div> 0.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1075: R LIVES IN: SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2H SASKATCHEWAN MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1447	<div></div> 99.9%
1	MENTIONED	2	<div></div> 0.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1076: R LIVES IN: ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1076: R LIVES IN: ALBERTA			
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2I ALBERTA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1438	99.2%
1	MENTIONED	11	0.8%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1077: R LIVES IN: BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q15A. PEOPLE OFTEN THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS AGREE ON WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL DIVISIONS ARE. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU THINK OF CANADA AS BEING DIVIDED INTO REGIONS. ; Q15B.1 WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?		
Literal question	Q15B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA MENTIONED AS REGION R LIVES IN.		
Notes	Q15A, Q15B.1, Q152.J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1434	99.0%
1	MENTIONED	15	1.0%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1312	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1078: COMMON FEEL WITH REGION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1419 /-] [Invalid=1342 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE A LOT IN COMMON, OR NOT MUCH IN COMMON, WITH OTHER PEOPLE IN THIS REGION OF (REGION NAMED IN Q15B - "WHAT REGION DO YOU LIVE IN?")		
Notes	Q16 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A LOT	976	68.8%
2	SOME THINGS	305	21.5%
3	NOT MUCH	138	9.7%
8	D.K.	30	
9	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q15A	1312	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1079: REGION PAY FAIR SHARE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1449 /-] [Invalid=1312 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN TERMS OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION PAYS ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE COST, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?		

# v1079: REGION PAY FAIR SHARE?			
Notes		Q17A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FAIR	417	<div><div></div></div> 28.8%
2	MORE	837	<div><div></div></div> 57.8%
3	LESS	71	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
8	D.K.	124	<div><div></div></div> 8.6%
9	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q15A	1312	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1080: UNFAIR COST: 1ST MENTION			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=469 /-] [Invalid=2292 /-]	
Universe		Q17B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "more" or "less" for Q17A.	
Pre-question		Q17A. IN TERMS OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION PAYS ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE COST, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?	
Literal question		WHAT COSTS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?	
Notes		Q17A, Q17B.1 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NOTHING	23	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
1	EVERYTHING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	21	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
2	TAXES, WE PAY MORE TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	106	<div><div></div></div> 22.6%
3	INCOME TAX, TAX TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	38	<div><div></div></div> 8.1%
4	HIGHER SALES TAX, SALES TAX	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
5	GENERAL COST OF LIVING, HIGH COST OF LIVING, INFLATION	13	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
6	UNEMPLOYMENT, JOB CREATION PROGRAMMES	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
7	MEDICAL, HEALTH INSURANCE, HEALTH CARE	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
8	WELFARE, WELFARE PROGRAMMES	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
9	PRICE OF OIL/GAS/FUEL, OIL TAXES	23	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
10	ENERGY POLICY, SUBSIDIZING OIL/GAS	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
11	FREIGHT RATES, COST OF SHIPPING GOODS/GRAIN/ WHEAT	28	<div><div></div></div> 6.0%
12	TRANSPORTATION	11	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
13	HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
14	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
15	COST OF HOUSING, MORTGAGES TOO HIGH, TAXES ON HOMES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
16	PROPERTY TAXES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
17	EDUCATION, SCHOOLS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
18	COST OF SUPPORTING THE AGED	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
19	COST OF BILINGUALISM	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
20	TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
21	TOO MUCH TO EAST, SUBSIDIZING THE EAST	12	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
22	TOO MUCH TO MARITIMES/ATLANTIC PROVINCES	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
23	SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, OTHER PROVINCES, OTHER REGIONS (NOT	39	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%

# v1080: UNFAIR COST: 1ST MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	TOO MANY SUBSIDIES (UNSPECIFIED)	5	1.1%
25	COST OF FOOD, FOOD TAXES	7	1.5%
26	BEEF, LIVESTOCK	1	0.2%
27	WHEAT, GRAIN	0	
28	COST OF FARMING, COST OF FARM MACHINERY, AGRICULTURAL SUBSID	4	0.9%
29	CLOTHING	0	
30	COST OF CARS	0	
31	WE HAVE THE RESOURCES/INDUSTRIES BUT DON'T GET THE FULL BENE	18	3.8%
32	PAY COST OF HAVING NO (NATURAL) RESOURCES/ INDUSTRIES	4	0.9%
33	IMMIGRATION	2	0.4%
34	DUTIES, TARRIFS, EXCISE TAXES	2	0.4%
35	GENERAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS, RUNNING THE COUNTRY	26	5.5%
36	TOO MANY PEOPLE EMPLOYED BY GOVERNMENT,HIGH SALARIES, NEED	3	0.6%
37	FORESTRY, FISHING, NATURAL PARKS	0	
38	R.C.M.P., PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCES, POLICE	4	0.9%
39	INDIANS	1	0.2%
40	OLYMPIC DEBT, COST OF THE OLYMPICS	1	0.2%
41	STILL PAY FOR EXPO VIA LOTTERIES	0	
42	TOURISM	0	
43	TOO MUCH TO ONTARIO	0	
44	COST OF ALL MANUFACTURED GOODS (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.4%
45	COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
46	NATURAL RESOURCES GIVEN TO OTHER COUNTRIES / NOT DEVELOPED	1	0.2%
47	THE QUEEN	1	0.2%
48	SPACE PROGRAM	0	
49	SUPPORTING OUR ATHLETES	1	0.2%
50	HYDRO, ELECTRICITY	1	0.2%
51	OTHER SPECIFIC SUBSIDIES	1	0.2%
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	36	
99	INAP., CODED 1,8 OR 9 IN Q17A	2256	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1081: UNFAIR COST: 2ND MENTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=479 /-] [Invalid=2282 /-]		
Universe	Q17B.2 asked only to respondents who answered "more" or "less" for Q17A.		
Pre-question	Q17A. IN TERMS OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION PAYS ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE COST, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?		
Literal question	WHAT COSTS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q17A, Q17B.2 in the documentation.		

v1081: UNFAIR COST: 2ND MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	331	69.1%
1	EVERYTHING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	0	
2	TAXES, WE PAY MORE TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	15	3.1%
3	INCOME TAX, TAX TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	8	1.7%
4	HIGHER SALES TAX, SALES TAX	3	0.6%
5	GENERAL COST OF LIVING, HIGH COST OF LIVING, INFLATION	2	0.4%
6	UNEMPLOYMENT, JOB CREATION PROGRAMMES	4	0.8%
7	MEDICAL, HEALTH INSURANCE, HEALTH CARE	5	1.0%
8	WELFARE, WELFARE PROGRAMMES	6	1.3%
9	PRICE OF OIL/GAS/FUEL, OIL TAXES	5	1.0%
10	ENERGY POLICY, SUBSIDIZING OIL/GAS	2	0.4%
11	FREIGHT RATES, COST OF SHIPPING GOODS/GRAIN/ WHEAT	12	2.5%
12	TRANSPORTATION	11	2.3%
13	HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES	0	
14	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	2	0.4%
15	COST OF HOUSING, MORTGAGES TOO HIGH, TAXES ON HOMES	6	1.3%
16	PROPERTY TAXES	2	0.4%
17	EDUCATION, SCHOOLS	5	1.0%
18	COST OF SUPPORTING THE AGED	2	0.4%
19	COST OF BILINGUALISM	0	
20	TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC	4	0.8%
21	TOO MUCH TO EAST, SUBSIDIZING THE EAST	4	0.8%
22	TOO MUCH TO MARITIMES/ATLANTIC PROVINCES	1	0.2%
23	SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, OTHER PROVINCES, OTHER REGIONS (NOT	7	1.5%
24	TOO MANY SUBSIDIES (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.6%
25	COST OF FOOD, FOOD TAXES	3	0.6%
26	BEEF, LIVESTOCK	1	0.2%
27	WHEAT, GRAIN	1	0.2%
28	COST OF FARMING, COST OF FARM MACHINERY, AGRICULTURAL SUBSID	5	1.0%
29	CLOTHING	3	0.6%
30	COST OF CARS	1	0.2%
31	WE HAVE THE RESOURCES/INDUSTRIES BUT DON'T GET THE FULL BENE	8	1.7%
32	PAY COST OF HAVING NO (NATURAL) RESOURCES/ INDUSTRIES	3	0.6%
33	IMMIGRATION	1	0.2%
34	DUTIES, TARRIFS, EXCISE TAXES	1	0.2%
35	GENERAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS, RUNNING THE COUNTRY	3	0.6%
36	TOO MANY PEOPLE EMPLOYED BY GOVERNMENT,HIGH SALARIES, NEED	1	0.2%
37	FORESTRY, FISHING, NATURAL PARKS	3	0.6%
38	R.C.M.P., PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCES, POLICE	0	

# v1081: UNFAIR COST: 2ND MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
39	INDIANS	0	
40	OLYMPIC DEBT, COST OF THE OLYMPICS	0	
41	STILL PAY FOR EXPO VIA LOTTERIES	1	0.2%
42	TOURISM	1	0.2%
43	TOO MUCH TO ONTARIO	0	
44	COST OF ALL MANUFACTURED GOODS (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.2%
45	COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT	0	
46	NATURAL RESOURCES GIVEN TO OTHER COUNTRIES / NOT DEVELOPED	0	
47	THE QUEEN	0	
48	SPACE PROGRAM	1	0.2%
49	SUPPORTING OUR ATHLETES	0	
50	HYDRO, ELECTRICITY	1	0.2%
51	OTHER SPECIFIC SUBSIDIES	0	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
99	INAP., CODED 1,8 OR 9 IN Q17A	2282	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1082: UNFAIR COST: 3RD MENTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=485 /-] [Invalid=2276 /-]		
Universe	Q17B.3 asked only to respondents who answered "more" or "less" for Q17A.		
Pre-question	Q17A. IN TERMS OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION PAYS ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE COST, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?		
Literal question	WHAT COSTS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q17A, Q17B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	449	92.6%
1	EVERYTHING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	0	
2	TAXES, WE PAY MORE TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	4	0.8%
3	INCOME TAX, TAX TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
4	HIGHER SALES TAX, SALES TAX	0	
5	GENERAL COST OF LIVING, HIGH COST OF LIVING, INFLATION	0	
6	UNEMPLOYMENT, JOB CREATION PROGRAMMES	0	
7	MEDICAL, HEALTH INSURANCE, HEALTH CARE	0	
8	WELFARE, WELFARE PROGRAMMES	3	0.6%
9	PRICE OF OIL/GAS/FUEL, OIL TAXES	2	0.4%
10	ENERGY POLICY, SUBSIDIZING OIL/GAS	1	0.2%
11	FREIGHT RATES, COST OF SHIPPING GOODS/GRAIN/ WHEAT	3	0.6%
12	TRANSPORTATION	1	0.2%
13	HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES	1	0.2%
14	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	0	
15	COST OF HOUSING, MORTGAGES TOO HIGH, TAXES ON HOMES	1	0.2%

v1082: UNFAIR COST: 3RD MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	PROPERTY TAXES	0	
17	EDUCATION, SCHOOLS	1	0.2%
18	COST OF SUPPORTING THE AGED	0	
19	COST OF BILINGUALISM	0	
20	TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC	1	0.2%
21	TOO MUCH TO EAST, SUBSIDIZING THE EAST	0	
22	TOO MUCH TO MARITIMES/ATLANTIC PROVINCES	0	
23	SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, OTHER PROVINCES, OTHER REGIONS (NOT	2	0.4%
24	TOO MANY SUBSIDIES (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
25	COST OF FOOD, FOOD TAXES	0	
26	BEEF, LIVESTOCK	0	
27	WHEAT, GRAIN	2	0.4%
28	COST OF FARMING, COST OF FARM MACHINERY, AGRICULTURAL SUBSID	1	0.2%
29	CLOTHING	1	0.2%
30	COST OF CARS	2	0.4%
31	WE HAVE THE RESOURCES/INDUSTRIES BUT DON'T GET THE FULL BENE	1	0.2%
32	PAY COST OF HAVING NO (NATURAL) RESOURCES/ INDUSTRIES	1	0.2%
33	IMMIGRATION	1	0.2%
34	DUTIES, TARRIFS, EXCISE TAXES	1	0.2%
35	GENERAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS, RUNNING THE COUNTRY	2	0.4%
36	TOO MANY PEOPLE EMPLOYED BY GOVERNMENT,HIGH SALARIES, NEED	2	0.4%
37	FORESTRY, FISHING, NATURAL PARKS	0	
38	R.C.M.P., PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCES, POLICE	0	
39	INDIANS	0	
40	OLYMPIC DEBT, COST OF THE OLYMPICS	0	
41	STILL PAY FOR EXPO VIA LOTTERIES	0	
42	TOURISM	0	
43	TOO MUCH TO ONTARIO	0	
44	COST OF ALL MANUFACTURED GOODS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
45	COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT	0	
46	NATURAL RESOURCES GIVEN TO OTHER COUNTRIES / NOT DEVELOPED	0	
47	THE QUEEN	0	
48	SPACE PROGRAM	0	
49	SUPPORTING OUR ATHLETES	0	
50	HYDRO, ELECTRICITY	1	0.2%
51	OTHER SPECIFIC SUBSIDIES	0	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
99	INAP., CODED 1,8 OR 9 IN Q17A	2276	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1083: REGION GET FAIR BENEFITS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1331 /-] [Invalid=1430 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN TERMS OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION RECEIVES ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?		
Notes	Q18 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FAIR	70	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
2	MORE	749	<div><div></div></div> 56.3%
3	LESS	512	<div><div></div></div> 38.5%
8	D.K.	118	
9	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q15A	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1084: ANY REGION PAY TOO MUCH?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1010 /-] [Invalid=1751 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q18. IN TERMS OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION RECEIVES ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE?		
Literal question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE?		
Notes	Q18, Q19A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	424	<div><div></div></div> 42.0%
2	NO	586	<div><div></div></div> 58.0%
8	D.K.	439	
9	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q15A	1312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1085: PAY TOO MUCH: REGION MENTIONED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=196 /-] [Invalid=2565 /-]		
Universe	Q19B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q19A.		
Pre-question	Q18. IN TERMS OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE (REGION NAMED IN Q15B) REGION RECEIVES ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS, MORE THAN ITS FAIR SHARE, OR LESS THAN ITS FAIR SHARE? ; Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE?		
Literal question	Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Notes	Q18, Q19A, Q19B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	EAST, EASTERN	11	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
2	WEST, WESTERN	56	<div><div></div></div> 28.6%
3	WEST COAST	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
4	CENTRAL	6	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
5	CENTRAL WESTERN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%

# v1085: PAY TOO MUCH: REGION MENTIONED				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
6	CENTRAL AND WESTERN	2	<div></div>	1.0%
7	PRAIRIES	15	<div></div>	7.7%
8	MARITIMES	36	<div></div>	18.4%
9	ATLANTIC, ATLANTIC PROVINCES	11	<div></div>	5.6%
10	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	2	<div></div>	1.0%
11	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL PRAIRIES	1	<div></div>	0.5%
12	MARITIMES AND WESTERN REGION	5	<div></div>	2.6%
13	MARITIMES AND INDIAN NORTH-WEST	1	<div></div>	0.5%
14	PRAIRIES AND PACIFIC	1	<div></div>	0.5%
15	NORTH PRAIRIES	1	<div></div>	0.5%
16	N.W.T.	2	<div></div>	1.0%
17	EASTERN PROVINCES EXCEPT QUEBEC	2	<div></div>	1.0%
18	NORTHERN ONTARIO AND MARITIMES	1	<div></div>	0.5%
19	SOUTHERN ONTARIO	1	<div></div>	0.5%
20	WEST ONTARIO	1	<div></div>	0.5%
21	OTHER SPECIFIC AREA, TOWN, CITY OF ONTARIO	1	<div></div>	0.5%
22	OTHER SPECIFIC AREA, TOWN, CITY OF QUEBEC	4	<div></div>	2.0%
23	WEST AND EAST	1	<div></div>	0.5%
24	CENTRAL EASTERN	1	<div></div>	0.5%
25	TORONTO OR SECTION OR SUBURBS OF TORONTO	3	<div></div>	1.5%
26	MONTREAL OR SECTION OR SUBURBS OF MONTREAL	5	<div></div>	2.6%
27	LARGE CITIES (UNSPECIFIED)	1	<div></div>	0.5%
28	GASPE / REGION OF GASPE	1	<div></div>	0.5%
29	MONTREAL, TORONTO AND INDUSTRIAL REGIONS	1	<div></div>	0.5%
30	JAMES BAY	1	<div></div>	0.5%
31	NAMED LARGE CITIES (TORONTO, MONTREAL, ETC., OVER 100,000 PO	1	<div></div>	0.5%
33	RICH PROVINCES / RICHER	5	<div></div>	2.6%
34	MORE POPULATED	1	<div></div>	0.5%
35	WEST OIL FIELDS	2	<div></div>	1.0%
36	LARGE COMPANIES	1	<div></div>	0.5%
37	ANGLOPHONE	1	<div></div>	0.5%
39	LESS POPULATED AREAS	1	<div></div>	0.5%
40	POOR REGIONS	1	<div></div>	0.5%
41	ISOLATED AREAS, NORTHERN AND THE MARITIMES	2	<div></div>	1.0%
45	REST OF CANADA	1	<div></div>	0.5%
88	D.K., N.A.	228		
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q19A	2337		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1086: PAY TOO MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?			

# v1086: PAY TOO MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Literal question	NEWFOUNDLAND MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	416	98.1%
1	MENTIONED	8	1.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1087: PAY TOO MUCH: PEI			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	P.E.I. MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	420	99.1%
1	MENTIONED	4	0.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1088: PAY TOO MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	NOVA SCOTIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	421	99.3%
1	MENTIONED	3	0.7%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1089: PAY TOO MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	NEW BRUNSWICK MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	420	99.1%

# v1089: PAY TOO MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MENTIONED	4	0.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1090: PAY TOO MUCH: QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	QUEBEC MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	388	91.5%
1	MENTIONED	36	8.5%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1091: PAY TOO MUCH: ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	ONTARIO MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	300	70.8%
1	MENTIONED	124	29.2%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1092: PAY TOO MUCH: MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	MANITOBA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	414	97.6%
1	MENTIONED	10	2.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1093: PAY TOO MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	SASKATCHEWAN MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	415	97.9%
1	MENTIONED	9	2.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1094: PAY TOO MUCH: ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	ALBERTA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	327	77.1%
1	MENTIONED	97	22.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1095: PAY TOO MUCH: BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q19A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT PAY MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE? ; Q19B. WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	BRITISH COLUMBIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT PAYS MORE.		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B, Q19B.2J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	357	84.2%
1	MENTIONED	67	15.8%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2337	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1096: ANY REGION GET TOO MUCH?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1128 /-] [Invalid=1633 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1096: ANY REGION GET TOO MUCH?			
Literal question		ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?	
Notes		Q20A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	783	<div></div> 69.4%
2	NO	345	<div></div> 30.6%
8	D.K.	321	
9	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q15A	1312	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1097: GET TOO MUCH: REGION			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=354 /-] [Invalid=2407 /-]	
Universe		Q20B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q20A.	
Pre-question		Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?	
Literal question		Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?	
Notes		Q20A, Q20B.1 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	EAST, EASTERN	56	<div></div> 15.8%
2	EASTERN COAST / EASTERN SEABOARD	6	<div></div> 1.7%
3	WEST, WESTERN	53	<div></div> 15.0%
4	CENTRAL	17	<div></div> 4.8%
5	CENTRAL AND THE N.W.T.	1	<div></div> 0.3%
6	CENTRAL AND WESTERN	3	<div></div> 0.8%
7	CENTRAL AND THE PRAIRIES	1	<div></div> 0.3%
8	PRAIRIES	13	<div></div> 3.7%
9	MARITIMES	107	<div></div> 30.2%
10	ATLANTIC	8	<div></div> 2.3%
11	ATLANTIC AND NORTHERN	1	<div></div> 0.3%
12	EASTERN AND WESTERN CANADA	2	<div></div> 0.6%
13	EASTERN AND NORTHERN REGION	1	<div></div> 0.3%
14	EASTERN CANADA EXCLUDING MARITIMES	1	<div></div> 0.3%
15	MARITIMES AND THE WEST	3	<div></div> 0.8%
16	MARITIMES AND THE EAST	4	<div></div> 1.1%
17	MARITIMES AND THE N.W.T.	4	<div></div> 1.1%
18	EVERYTHING EAST OF OTTAWA	1	<div></div> 0.3%
19	N.W.T.	2	<div></div> 0.6%
20	N.W.T., YUKON	2	<div></div> 0.6%
21	UPPER CANADA	3	<div></div> 0.8%
22	PACIFIC	0	
23	MARITIMES AND PRAIRIES	3	<div></div> 0.8%
24	CENTRAL AND PACIFIC	1	<div></div> 0.3%
25	NAMED LARGE CITIES - TORONTO, MONTREAL, OTTAWA, HALIFAX, CAL	14	<div></div> 4.0%
26	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, TOWN, CITY OF ONTARIO	1	<div></div> 0.3%

# v1097: GET TOO MUCH: REGION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, TOWN, CITY OF QUEBEC	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
28	OTHER SPECIFIC AREAS, TOWN, CITY OF MARITIMES	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
29	GASPE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
30	LABRADOR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
31	MARITIMES AND CENTRAL	0	
32	TORONTO AND PART OF WESTERN CANADA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
33	MONTREAL, TORONTO AND CENTRAL PRAIRIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
39	MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE, WEST TO LONDON, WINDSOR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
41	SOUTHERN ONTARIO AND WESTERN PROVINCES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
42	EASTERN ONTARIO	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
43	SOUTHERN ONTARIO	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
44	EAST OF ONTARIO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
45	EASTERN ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
47	EASTERN QUEBEC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
50	MANITOBA INDIANS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
51	NORTHERN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
52	MOST OF THE MAINLAND	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
56	ENGLISH CANADA / ENGLISH REGIONS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
57	FRENCH CANADA / FRENCH REGIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
59	INDUSTRIAL REGIONS OF EAST ONTARIO, B.C. AND ALBERTA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
60	INDUSTRIAL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
61	THE FARMING COMMUNITY IN THE WEST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
63	RICH REGIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
64	POOR, POOR PROVINCES, POOR DEPRESSED, LESS WELL OFF	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
65	LESS POPULATED REGIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
66	THOSE WHO PAY LESS TAXES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
71	ALL THE REST	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
88	D.K., N.A.	429	
99	INAP., CODED 2,8 OR 9 IN Q20A	1978	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1098: GET TOO MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	743	<div><div></div></div> 94.9%
1	MENTIONED	40	<div><div></div></div> 5.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	

# v1098: GET TOO MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1099: GET TOO MUCH: PEI			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	775	<div><div></div></div> 99.0%
1	MENTIONED	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1100: GET TOO MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2C NOVA SCOTIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	774	<div><div></div></div> 98.9%
1	MENTIONED	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1101: GET TOO MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	775	<div><div></div></div> 99.0%
1	MENTIONED	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1102: GET TOO MUCH: QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		

# v1102: GET TOO MUCH: QUEBEC			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2E QUEBEC MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	439	56.1%
1	MENTIONED	344	43.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1103: GET TOO MUCH: ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2F ONTARIO MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	572	73.1%
1	MENTIONED	211	26.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1104: GET TOO MUCH: MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2G MANITOBA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	773	98.7%
1	MENTIONED	10	1.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1105: GET TOO MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2H SASKATCHEWAN MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		

# v1105: GET TOO MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN			
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	773	<div></div> 98.7%
1	MENTIONED	10	<div></div> 1.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1106: GET TOO MUCH: ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2I ALBERTA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	700	<div></div> 89.4%
1	MENTIONED	83	<div></div> 10.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1107: GET TOO MUCH: BRISITH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 /-] [Invalid=1978 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. ARE THERE ANY (OTHER) REGIONS OF CANADA THAT RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ;Q20B.1 WHICH ONE(S)? ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q20B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA MENTIONED AS REGION THAT RECEIVES MORE.		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B.1, Q20B.2J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	761	<div></div> 97.2%
1	MENTIONED	22	<div></div> 2.8%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1978	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1108: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 1ST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=691 /-] [Invalid=2070 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "more" or "less" in Q17A and/or in Q18, or who answered "yes" for Q19A, Q20A.		
Literal question	WHY DO YOU THINK SOME REGIONS PAY MORE OR SOME REGIONS RECEIVE MORE THAN OTHERS?		
Notes	Q21.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POLITICAL FACTORS/AFFILIATIONS	58	<div></div> 8.4%
2	THEY HAVE MORE MEMBERS/SEATS/STRENGTH IN PARLIAMENT	46	<div></div> 6.7%
3	THEY HAVE INFLUENCE IN PARLIAMENT	15	<div></div> 2.2%

v1108: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 1ST

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	SOME M.P.'S DO MORE	9	1.3%
5	DUE TO POPULATION, SIZE OF PROVINCE, CONCENTRATION OF POPUL	70	10.1%
6	FAVOURITISM, DEPENDS ON WHO'S IN AND ON YOUR SIDE	24	3.5%
7	BLACKMAIL, THREATS	3	0.4%
8	TO KEEP THEM HAPPY, SOME REGIONS ARE CATERED TO	7	1.0%
9	PROVINCIAL LEADER POWER WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	6	0.9%
10	FEDERAL LEADERS FIGHT MORE FOR OWN REGIONS	8	1.2%
11	DUE TO OVER TAXATION, TAX STRUCTURE	9	1.3%
12	ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE REGION, REGIONAL DISPARITY	82	11.9%
13	PAY MORE BECAUSE OF THEIR WEALTH / HAVE MORE MONEY, RICHER	76	11.0%
14	HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, LACK OF JOBS	14	2.0%
15	DEPRESSED REGIONS, NEEDY AREAS, POOR REGIONS, "THE HAVE-NOTS	62	9.0%
16	LACK OF NATURAL RESOURCES	12	1.7%
17	FOR SOCIAL SERVICES	3	0.4%
18	FOR FREIGHT RATES, PAY MORE BECAUSE OF DISTANCES TO MARKET	7	1.0%
19	WE ARE ALWAYS SUBSIDIZING SOMETHING	4	0.6%
20	FOR ROAD BUILDING	0	
21	CATHOLIC VOTE	0	
22	MORE BIG BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT, LARGE CORPORATIONS, BANKS	7	1.0%
23	MORE INDUSTRIAL, EAST/CENTRAL REGION MORE INDUSTRIAL	39	5.6%
24	MORE AGRICULTURAL, WEST MORE AGRICULTURAL	1	0.1%
25	BECAUSE THEY ARE ENGLISH / WE ARE FRENCH	9	1.3%
26	M.P.'S DON'T KNOW, UNDERSTAND	3	0.4%
27	"THE SQUEAKY WHEEL", SELFISH TYPES, THEY DEMAND MORE	18	2.6%
28	BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE NATURAL RESOURCES	41	5.9%
29	BECAUSE THEY HAVE OIL/GAS	14	2.0%
30	BECAUSE THEY HAVE HYDRO	1	0.1%
31	PAY MORE BECAUSE OUR OWN BECOMES AN IMPORT, NO BENEFIT FROM	2	0.3%
32	MORE JOBS/WORK	1	0.1%
33	POOR ADMINISTRATION	7	1.0%
34	BECAUSE OF THE TYPE OF PEOPLE	3	0.4%
35	EVERYONE SHOUD PAY THE SAME	2	0.3%
36	THE OLYMPICS	0	
37	LOCATION OF GOVERNMENT	10	1.4%
38	LACK OF INDUSTRY	2	0.3%
39	NOT DEVELOPING THEIR NATURAL RESOURCES	0	
40	UNION POWER	0	

# v1108: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 1ST			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	BECAUSE THEY ARE FRENCH, SPECIAL STATUS TO QUEBEC, SEPARATIO	15	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
42	PROVINCIAL LEADERS NOT THINKING ABOUT OWN PEOPLE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
88	DON'T KNOW	89	
89	REFUSED	3	
99	INAP., CODED 1 IN Q17 AND 1 IN Q18, OR 2 OR 8 IN Q19A AND 2	1978	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1109: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 2ND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=691 /-] [Invalid=2070 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "more" or "less" in Q17A and/or in Q18, or who answered "yes" for Q19A, Q20A.		
Literal question	WHY DO YOU THINK SOME REGIONS PAY MORE OR SOME REGIONS RECEIVE MORE THAN OTHERS?		
Notes	Q21.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	476	<div><div></div></div> 68.9%
1	POLITICAL FACTORS/AFFILIATIONS	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
2	THEY HAVE MORE MEMBERS/SEATS/STRENGTH IN PARLIAMENT	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
3	THEY HAVE INFLUENCE IN PARLIAMENT	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
4	SOME M.P.'S DO MORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
5	DUE TO POPULATION, SIZE OF PROVINCE, CONCENTRATION OF POPUL	27	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
6	FAVOURITISM, DEPENDS ON WHO'S IN AND ON YOUR SIDE	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
7	BLACKMAIL, THREATS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
8	TO KEEP THEM HAPPY, SOME REGIONS ARE CATERED TO	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
9	PROVINCIAL LEADER POWER WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
10	FEDERAL LEADERS FIGHT MORE FOR OWN REGIONS	0	
11	DUE TO OVER TAXATION, TAX STRUCTURE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
12	ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE REGION, REGIONAL DISPARITY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
13	PAY MORE BECAUSE OF THEIR WEALTH / HAVE MORE MONEY, RICHER	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
14	HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, LACK OF JOBS	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
15	DEPRESSED REGIONS, NEEDY AREAS, POOR REGIONS, "THE HAVE-NOTS	20	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
16	LACK OF NATURAL RESOURCES	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
17	FOR SOCIAL SERVICES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
18	FOR FREIGHT RATES, PAY MORE BECAUSE OF DISTANCES TO MARKET	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
19	WE ARE ALWAYS SUBSIDIZING SOMETHING	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
20	FOR ROAD BUILDING	0	
21	CATHOLIC VOTE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
22	MORE BIG BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT, LARGE CORPORATIONS, BANKS	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%

# v1109: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 2ND			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	MORE INDUSTRIAL, EAST/CENTRAL REGION MORE INDUSTRIAL	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
24	MORE AGRICULTURAL, WEST MORE AGRICULTURAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
25	BECAUSE THEY ARE ENGLISH / WE ARE FRENCH	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
26	M.P.'S DON'T KNOW, UNDERSTAND	0	
27	"THE SQUEAKY WHEEL", SELFISH TYPES, THEY DEMAND MORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
28	BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE NATURAL RESOURCES	18	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
29	BECAUSE THEY HAVE OIL/GAS	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
30	BECAUSE THEY HAVE HYDRO	0	
31	PAY MORE BECAUSE OUR OWN BECOMES AN IMPORT, NO BENEFIT FROM	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
32	MORE JOBS/WORK	0	
33	POOR ADMINISTRATION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
34	BECAUSE OF THE TYPE OF PEOPLE	0	
35	EVERYONE SHOUD PAY THE SAME	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
36	THE OLYMPICS	0	
37	LOCATION OF GOVERNMENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
38	LACK OF INDUSTRY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
39	NOT DEVELOPING THEIR NATURAL RESOURCES	0	
40	UNION POWER	0	
41	BECAUSE THEY ARE FRENCH, SPECIAL STATUS TO QUEBEC, SEPARATIO	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
42	PROVINCIAL LEADERS NOT THINKING ABOUT OWN PEOPLE	0	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
89	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 1 IN Q17 AND 1 IN Q18, OR 2 OR 8 IN Q19A AND 2	2070	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1110: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 3RD			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=215 /-] [Invalid=2546 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "more" or "less" in Q17A and/or in Q18, or who answered "yes" for Q19A, Q20A.		
Literal question	(IF "MORE" OR "LESS" IN Q17A AND/OR IN Q18 OR IF "YES" IN Q19A AND/OR IN Q20A) WHY DO YOU THINK SOME REGIONS PAY MORE OR SOME REGIONS RECEIVE MORE THAN OTHERS? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q21.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	181	<div><div></div></div> 84.2%
1	POLITICAL FACTORS/AFFILIATIONS	0	
2	THEY HAVE MORE MEMBERS/SEATS/STRENGTH IN PARLIAMENT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	THEY HAVE INFLUENCE IN PARLIAMENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
4	SOME M.P.'S DO MORE	0	
5	DUE TO POPULATION, SIZE OF PROVINCE, CONCENTRATION OF POPUL	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%

v1110: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 3RD

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	FAVOURITISM, DEPENDS ON WHO'S IN AND ON YOUR SIDE	0	
7	BLACKMAIL, THREATS	0	
8	TO KEEP THEM HAPPY, SOME REGIONS ARE CATERED TO	1	0.5%
9	PROVINCIAL LEADER POWER WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.5%
10	FEDERAL LEADERS FIGHT MORE FOR OWN REGIONS	0	
11	DUE TO OVER TAXATION, TAX STRUCTURE	0	
12	ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE REGION, REGIONAL DISPARITY	1	0.5%
13	PAY MORE BECAUSE OF THEIR WEALTH / HAVE MORE MONEY, RICHER	3	1.4%
14	HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, LACK OF JOBS	3	1.4%
15	DEPRESSED REGIONS, NEEDY AREAS, POOR REGIONS, "THE HAVE-NOTS	1	0.5%
16	LACK OF NATURAL RESOURCES	0	
17	FOR SOCIAL SERVICES	0	
18	FOR FREIGHT RATES, PAY MORE BECAUSE OF DISTANCES TO MARKET	2	0.9%
19	WE ARE ALWAYS SUBSIDIZING SOMETHING	1	0.5%
20	FOR ROAD BUILDING	0	
21	CATHOLIC VOTE	0	
22	MORE BIG BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT, LARGE CORPORATIONS, BANKS	2	0.9%
23	MORE INDUSTRIAL, EAST/CENTRAL REGION MORE INDUSTRIAL	1	0.5%
24	MORE AGRICULTURAL, WEST MORE AGRICULTURAL	0	
25	BECAUSE THEY ARE ENGLISH / WE ARE FRENCH	0	
26	M.P.'S DON'T KNOW, UNDERSTAND	0	
27	"THE SQUEAKY WHEEL", SELFISH TYPES, THEY DEMAND MORE	2	0.9%
28	BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE NATURAL RESOURCES	2	0.9%
29	BECAUSE THEY HAVE OIL/GAS	4	1.9%
30	BECAUSE THEY HAVE HYDRO	0	
31	PAY MORE BECAUSE OUR OWN BECOMES AN IMPORT, NO BENEFIT FROM	0	
32	MORE JOBS/WORK	0	
33	POOR ADMINISTRATION	1	0.5%
34	BECAUSE OF THE TYPE OF PEOPLE	0	
35	EVERYONE SHOUD PAY THE SAME	0	
36	THE OLYMPICS	0	
37	LOCATION OF GOVERNMENT	2	0.9%
38	LACK OF INDUSTRY	0	
39	NOT DEVELOPING THEIR NATURAL RESOURCES	0	
40	UNION POWER	0	
41	BECAUSE THEY ARE FRENCH, SPECIAL STATUS TO QUEBEC, SEPARATIO	0	
42	PROVINCIAL LEADERS NOT THINKING ABOUT OWN PEOPLE	0	

# v1110: WHY REGIONS UNEQUAL: 3RD			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
89	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 1 IN Q17 AND 1 IN Q18, OR 2 OR 8 IN Q19A AND 2	2546	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1111: ANY PROVINCE PAY TOO MUCH?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2108 /-] [Invalid=653 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA?		
Notes	Q22A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1242	<div></div> 58.9%
2	NO	866	<div></div> 41.1%
8	D.K.	635	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1112: PROVINCE PAY MUCH:GENERAL MENTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q22B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q22A.		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA?		
Literal question	Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	EAST, EASTERN	5	<div></div> 0.2%
2	ATLANTIC	11	<div></div> 0.4%
3	MARITIMES	29	<div></div> 1.1%
4	WEST, WESTERN	32	<div></div> 1.2%
5	PRAIRIES	6	<div></div> 0.2%
6	EASTERN CANADA AND MARITIMES	1	<div></div> 0.0%
7	WESTERN AND MARITIMES	1	<div></div> 0.0%
8	SOME WESTERN	2	<div></div> 0.1%
9	N.W.T.	1	<div></div> 0.0%
10	NORTHERN ONTARIO	1	<div></div> 0.0%
11	RICH PROVINCES / RICHER	8	<div></div> 0.3%
12	POOR / POORER	1	<div></div> 0.0%
13	THE STATES	1	<div></div> 0.0%
14	WESTERN AND EASTERN	2	<div></div> 0.1%
15	OIL RICH PROVINCES	2	<div></div> 0.1%

# v1112: PROVINCE PAY MUCH:GENERAL MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	DON'T KNOW, NO REGION MENTIONED	1139	<div></div> 41.3%
99		1519	<div></div> 55.0%
98	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q22A	0	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1113: PROV PAY MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1191	<div></div> 95.9%
1	MENTIONED	51	<div></div> 4.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1114: PROV PAY MUCH: PEI			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1200	<div></div> 96.6%
1	MENTIONED	42	<div></div> 3.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1115: PROV PAY MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2C NOVA SCOTIA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2C in the documentation.		

# v1115: PROV PAY MUCH: NOVA SCOTIA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1181	<div><div></div></div> 95.1%
1	MENTIONED	61	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1116: PROV PAY MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1190	<div><div></div></div> 95.8%
1	MENTIONED	52	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1117: PROV PAY MUCH: QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2E QUEBEC (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	980	<div><div></div></div> 78.9%
1	MENTIONED	262	<div><div></div></div> 21.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1118: PROV PAY MUCH: ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2F ONTARIO (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2F in the documentation.		

v1118: PROV PAY MUCH: ONTARIO

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	628	<div></div> 50.6%
1	MENTIONED	614	<div></div> 49.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1119: PROV PAY MUCH: MANITOBA

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)
Literal question	Q22B.2G MANITOBA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2G in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1173	<div></div> 94.4%
1	MENTIONED	69	<div></div> 5.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1120: PROV PAY MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2H SASKATCHEWAN (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1141	<div></div> 91.9%
1	MENTIONED	101	<div></div> 8.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1121: PROV PAY MUCH: ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2I ALBERTA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	678	<div></div> 54.6%
1	MENTIONED	564	<div></div> 45.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1122: PROV PAY MUCH: BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1242 /-] [Invalid=1519 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q22A. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT (DIFFERENT) REGIONS. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC PROVINCES. IN YOUR OPINION, ARE SOME OF THE PROVINCES BEARING MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE COSTS OF GOVERNING CANADA? ; Q22B.1 WHICH (PROVINCES ARE BEARING MORE THAN A FAIR SHARE OF COSTS?) (REGIONS MENTIONED)		
Literal question	Q22B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA (MENTIONED AS BEARING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q22A, Q22B.1, Q22B.2J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	949	<div></div> 76.4%
1	MENTIONED	293	<div></div> 23.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1519	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1123: ANY PROVINCE GET TOO MUCH?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2079 /-] [Invalid=682 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?		
Notes	Q23A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1349	<div></div> 64.9%
2	NO	730	<div></div> 35.1%
8	DON'T KNOW	664	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1124: PROVINCE GET TOO MUCH: GENERAL MENTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1636 /-] [Invalid=1125 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	EAST, EASTERN	15	<div></div> 0.9%
2	ATLANTIC, EAST COAST	16	<div></div> 1.0%
3	MARITIMES	99	<div></div> 6.1%
4	WEST, WESTERN	56	<div></div> 3.4%
5	PRAIRIES	4	<div></div> 0.2%
6	SMALLER EASTERN PROVINCES	2	<div></div> 0.1%
7	MARITIMES AND NORTH WEST TERRITORIES	4	<div></div> 0.2%
8	MARITIMES AND WESTERN	4	<div></div> 0.2%
9	NORTH WEST TERRITORIES	5	<div></div> 0.3%
10	NORTH WEST TERRITORIES AND YUKON	1	<div></div> 0.1%
11	EASTERN AND CENTRAL	2	<div></div> 0.1%
12	PARTS OF THE WEST	1	<div></div> 0.1%
13	NAMED LARGE CITIES-- TORONTO, MONTREAL, VANCOUVER, OVER 100	5	<div></div> 0.3%
14	NAMES SPECIFIC AREAS OF QUEBEC	1	<div></div> 0.1%
15	MORE POPULATED AREA	1	<div></div> 0.1%
16	UPPER CANADA	1	<div></div> 0.1%
17	SOUTHERN ONTARIO	1	<div></div> 0.1%
18	POORER	2	<div></div> 0.1%
19	UNITED STATES	0	
20	YUKON	1	<div></div> 0.1%
21	THE STATES	3	<div></div> 0.2%
99	INAP., CODED 2 TO 9 IN Q. 23A	1412	<div></div> 86.3%
88	DON'T KNOW	1125	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1125: PROV GET MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		

# v1125: PROV GET MUCH: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1240	<div></div> 91.9%
1	MENTIONED	109	<div></div> 8.1%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1126: PROV GET MUCH: PEI			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1277	<div></div> 94.7%
1	MENTIONED	72	<div></div> 5.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1127: PROV GET MUCH: NOVA SCOTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2C NOVA SCOTIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1270	<div></div> 94.1%
1	MENTIONED	79	<div></div> 5.9%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1128: PROV GET MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		

# v1128: PROV GET MUCH: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Literal question	Q23B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1274	94.4%
1	MENTIONED	75	5.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1129: PROV GET MUCH: QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2E QUEBEC (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	723	53.6%
1	MENTIONED	626	46.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1130: PROV GET MUCH: ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2F ONTARIO (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	882	65.4%
1	MENTIONED	467	34.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1131: PROV GET MUCH: MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2G MANITOBA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1304	96.7%

# v1131: PROV GET MUCH: MANITOBA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MENTIONED	45	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1132: PROV GET MUCH: SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2H SASKATCHEWAN (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1293	<div><div></div></div> 95.8%
1	MENTIONED	56	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1133: PROV GET MUCH: ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2I HNEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1087	<div><div></div></div> 80.6%
1	MENTIONED	262	<div><div></div></div> 19.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1134: PROV GET MUCH: BRISITSH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1349 /-] [Invalid=1412 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2J BRITSH COLUMBIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1263	<div><div></div></div> 93.6%
1	MENTIONED	86	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1412	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1135: ANY PROVINCE MORE POWER?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2225 /-] [Invalid=536 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?		
Notes	Q23A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1675	<div></div> 75.3%
2	NO	550	<div></div> 24.7%
8	D.K.	518	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1136: POWERFUL PROVINCE: GENERAL MENTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=79 /-] [Invalid=2682 /-]		
Universe	Q23B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q23A.		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA?		
Literal question	Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	EASTERN	2	<div></div> 2.5%
2	WEST, WESTERN, WESTERN CANADA	34	<div></div> 43.0%
3	RICHER PROVINCES	4	<div></div> 5.1%
4	SMALL PROVINCES	0	
5	OTTAWA	2	<div></div> 2.5%
6	P.C.	4	<div></div> 5.1%
7	LIBERAL	14	<div></div> 17.7%
8	PARTI QUEBECOIS	1	<div></div> 1.3%
9	UNION NATIONALE AND LIBERAL	1	<div></div> 1.3%
10	CREDITIST GOVERNMENT IN THE WEST	1	<div></div> 1.3%
11	N.D.P.	1	<div></div> 1.3%
12	PROVINCES WHICH ARE ON THE GOVERNMENT SIDE	1	<div></div> 1.3%
13	WHERE THERE ARE MINES, NATURAL GAS AND OTHER INDUSTRIES	2	<div></div> 2.5%
14	LIBERAL AND P.C.	3	<div></div> 3.8%
15	P.C. AND N.D.P.	1	<div></div> 1.3%
16	S.C.	1	<div></div> 1.3%
17	THE STATES	2	<div></div> 2.5%
18	THE ONES WHO ARE ON THE SAME SIDE AS OTTAWA	1	<div></div> 1.3%
19	BIGGER PROVINCES	1	<div></div> 1.3%
20	MORE POPULATED PROVINCES	2	<div></div> 2.5%
21	LIBERALS AND P.Q.	1	<div></div> 1.3%
88	DON'T KNOW	1596	
99	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN Q24A	1086	

# v1136: POWERFUL PROVINCE: GENERAL MENTION			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1137: POWERFUL PROVINCE: NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2A NEWFOUNDLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1672	99.8%
1	MENTIONED	3	0.2%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1138: POWERFUL PROVINCE: PEI			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2B PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1669	99.6%
1	MENTIONED	6	0.4%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1139: POWERFUL PROVINCE: NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2C NOVA SCOTIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1670	99.7%
1	MENTIONED	5	0.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1140: POWERFUL PROVINCE: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		

# v1140: POWERFUL PROVINCE: NEW BRUNSWICK			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2D NEW BRUNSWICK (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1670	99.7%
1	MENTIONED	5	0.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1141: POWERFUL PROVINCE: QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2E QUEBEC (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	894	53.4%
1	MENTIONED	781	46.6%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1142: POWERFUL PROVINCE: ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2F ONTARIO (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	653	39.0%
1	MENTIONED	1022	61.0%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1143: POWERFUL PROVINCE: MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2G MANITOBA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		

# v1143: POWERFUL PROVINCE: MANITOBA			
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1636	<div></div> 97.7%
1	MENTIONED	39	<div></div> 2.3%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1144: POWERFUL PROVINCE: SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2H SASKATCHEWAN (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1616	<div></div> 96.5%
1	MENTIONED	59	<div></div> 3.5%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1145: POWERFUL PROVINCE: ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2I ALBERTA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	740	<div></div> 44.2%
1	MENTIONED	935	<div></div> 55.8%
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1146: POWERFUL PROVINCE: BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1675 /-] [Invalid=1086 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. WHAT ABOUT BENEFITS? WOULD YOU SAY THAT SOME PROVINCES RECEIVE MORE THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE BENEFITS OF BEING PART OF CANADA? ; Q23B. WHICH PROVINCES ARE THESE?		
Literal question	Q23B.2J BRITISH COLUMBIA (MENTIONED AS RECEIVING MORE THAN FAIR SHARE.)		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B, Q23B.2J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT MENTIONED	1423	<div></div> 85.0%
1	MENTIONED	252	<div></div> 15.0%

# v1146: POWERFUL PROVINCE: BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1086	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1147: FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	(HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.		
Literal question	FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q25A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	51	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	

v1147: FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	26	0.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.0%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	48	1.7%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	268	9.7%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	0	
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	152	5.5%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	6	0.2%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	306	11.1%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	

# v1147: FEEL ABOUT PROVINCE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	63	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	580	<div><div></div></div> 21.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	513	<div><div></div></div> 18.6%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
95	95 SCORE	31	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
96	96 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	625	<div><div></div></div> 22.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1148: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q25.A (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.		
Literal question	Q25B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE OF (PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q25A, Q25B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	95	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	92	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%

v1148: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	2 SCORE	1	0.0%
3	3 SCORE	1	0.0%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	4	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	1	0.0%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	77	2.8%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.0%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	89	3.2%
21	21 SCORE	1	0.0%
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	12	0.4%
26	26 SCORE	1	0.0%
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	120	4.3%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	9	0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	169	6.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	

v1148: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	567	20.5%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	1	0.0%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	7	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	1	0.0%
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	329	11.9%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	1	0.0%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	19	0.7%
66	66 SCORE	1	0.0%
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	387	14.0%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	77	2.8%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	353	12.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	1	0.0%
85	85 SCORE	12	0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	187	6.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	

# v1148: FEEL ABOUT GOVERNMENT OF PROVINCE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	8	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	134	4.9%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1149: FEEL ABOUT REGION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q25C asked only to respondents whose region mentioned in Q15B was not the same as province.		
Pre-question	Q25.A (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.		
Literal question	Q25C. (IF REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B) HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT THIS REGION OF (NAME REGION MENTIONED IN Q15B. IF SAME AS PROVINCE, GO TO Q25D.)?		
Notes	Q25A, Q25C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	49	1.8%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	3	0.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	5	0.2%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	5	0.2%

v1149: FEEL ABOUT REGION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.0%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	8	0.3%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.0%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	16	0.6%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	91	3.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	1	0.0%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	72	2.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	10	0.4%

# v1149: FEEL ABOUT REGION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	179	<div><div></div></div> 6.5%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	256	<div><div></div></div> 9.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	218	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	175	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
999	INAP	1611	<div><div></div></div> 58.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1150: FEEL ABOUT CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q25.A (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER		

# v1150: FEEL ABOUT CANADA			
	YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.		
Literal question	Q25D. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?		
Notes	Q25A, Q25D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	72	2.6%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	8	0.3%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	11	0.4%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	10	0.4%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.0%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	25	0.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	0	
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	33	1.2%

v1150: FEEL ABOUT CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	0	
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	304	11.0%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.0%
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	3	0.1%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	171	6.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	8	0.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	1	0.0%
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	260	9.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	69	2.5%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	441	16.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	2	0.1%
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	30	1.1%

# v1150: FEEL ABOUT CANADA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	487	<div><div></div></div> 17.6%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	39	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	781	<div><div></div></div> 28.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1151: FEEL ABT GOVT OF CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q25.A (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.		
Literal question	Q25E. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?		
Notes	Q25A, Q25E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	158	<div><div></div></div> 5.7%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	62	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
2	2 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	67	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	

v1151: FEEL ABT GOVT OF CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	74	2.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	12	0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	99	3.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	5	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	197	7.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	5	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	1	0.0%
50	NEUTRAL	726	26.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	8	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	

# v1151: FEEL ABT GOVT OF CANADA			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
60	60 SCORE	376	<div><div></div></div> 13.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	365	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	75	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	255	<div><div></div></div> 9.2%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	147	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	76	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1152: FEEL ABOUT PARLIAMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

v1152: FEEL ABOUT PARLIAMENT

Pre-question	Q25.A (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.
Literal question	Q25F. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT PARLIAMENT?
Notes	Q25A, Q25F in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	256	9.3%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	42	1.5%
2	2 SCORE	1	0.0%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	38	1.4%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	72	2.6%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	11	0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	117	4.2%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	5	0.2%

v1152: FEEL ABOUT PARLIAMENT

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	177	6.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	809	29.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	6	0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	1	0.0%
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	319	11.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	25	0.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	329	11.9%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	56	2.0%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	247	8.9%

v1152: FEEL ABOUT PARLIAMENT

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	11	0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	137	5.0%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	3	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	93	3.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1153: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q25.A (HAND RESPONDENT CARD NO. 2) YOU WILL SEE HERE A DRAWING OF A THERMOMETER. IT IS CALLED A FEELING THERMOMETER BECAUSE IT HELPS US MEASURE PEOPLE'S FEELINGS TOWARDS VARIOUS THINGS. HERE IS HOW IT WORKS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50-DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.
Literal question	Q25G. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE UNITED STATES?
Notes	Q25A, Q25G in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	184	6.7%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	85	3.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	1	0.0%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	

v1153: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	10 SCORE	62	2.2%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.0%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	69	2.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	12	0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	108	3.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	4	0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	196	7.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	1	0.0%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	831	30.1%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.0%
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	

v1153: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
55	55 SCORE	6	0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	300	10.9%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	1	0.0%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	16	0.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	337	12.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	70	2.5%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	270	9.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	9	0.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	105	3.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	4	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	2	0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	84	3.0%

# v1153: FEEL ABOUT U.S.A.			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1154: MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2205 /-] [Invalid=556 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION.		
Literal question	WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q26A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO IMPORTANT ISSUES.	282	12.8%
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	218	9.9%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	6	0.3%
3	INTEREST RATES	7	0.3%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	195	8.8%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	5	0.2%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	8	0.4%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODE 62)	23	1.0%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	15	0.7%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY)	1	0.0%
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	12	0.5%
12	THE BUDGET	4	0.2%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT	163	7.4%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION (ALSO SEE CODE 64)	4	0.2%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	11	0.5%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE/HELP FOR AGED/OLD	7	0.3%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES/ COSTS (ALSO SEE CODE 65)	0	
18	FARMS / AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	6	0.3%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	9	0.4%
20	OIL / ENERGY CRISIS / POLICY (GENERAL) (ALSO SEE CODES 67 +	66	3.0%
21	ECOLOGY / POLLUTION	2	0.1%
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD / FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRA	8	0.4%
23	TRANSPORTATION	4	0.2%
24	EDUCATION	1	0.0%
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED)	55	2.5%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF THE GOVERNMENT (ALSO SEE	143	6.5%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY (ALSO SEE CODE 78)	123	5.6%
28	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	9	0.4%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	4	0.2%

v1154: MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	4	0.2%
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIANS, METIS)	3	0.1%
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE / CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS / STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	7	0.3%
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	1	0.0%
35	REFERENDUM	24	1.1%
36	QUEBEC'S DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FREN	2	0.1%
37	GOVERNMENT, RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT, PAST	5	0.2%
38	LACK OF TRUST / HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKE PROMISES	3	0.1%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	9	0.4%
40	THE FISHERIES	2	0.1%
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	0	
42	HERITAGE TRUST FUND (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	1	0.0%
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	0	
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE	0	
46	STATUS OF WOMEN (SALARIES FOR WOMEN AT HOME)	0	
47	MERCHANT NAVY	0	
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	2	0.1%
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	18	0.8%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	108	4.9%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	10	0.5%
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	4	0.2%
64	CUT BACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	22	1.0%
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD.	2	0.1%
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN / CROWN CORPORATIONS - SELL = POSITIVE	55	2.5%
69	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION	7	0.3%
71	TRUDEAU	182	8.3%
72	CLARK	23	1.0%
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	5	0.2%
74	THE PARTY	1	0.0%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	1	0.0%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
77	QUEBEC ISSUES	17	0.8%
78	QUEBEC'S INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM - FOR = POSITIVE, AGAINST	206	9.3%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM - FOR = POSITIVE	42	1.9%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	22	1.0%

# v1154: MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	SOCIAL WELFARE - FOR = POSITIVE, AGAINST - NEGATIVE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
82	DO AWAY / REVISE FAMILY ALLOWANCE = POSITIVE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL = POSITIVE	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
84	R.C.M.P. INVESTIGATION - FOR = POSITIVE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
85	METRIC SYSTEM - AGAINST = POSITIVE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
86	HAVE GUN CONTROL = POSITIVE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
87	HAVE CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AGAIN = POSITIVE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	556	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1155: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: FEEL STRONG			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1923 /-] [Invalid=838 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q26A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q26B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE? (STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q26A, Q26B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY CONCERNED	1620	<div><div></div></div> 84.2%
2	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	188	<div><div></div></div> 9.8%
3	NOT VERY CONCERNED	55	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	60	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 IN Q26A	838	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1156: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: DO WHAT?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1923 /-] [Invalid=838 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q26A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Interviewer's instructions	Q26B.2 (R'S FEELINGS ABOUT MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (PRESCRIPTION/ACTION CALLED FOR ON ISSUE CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q26A, Q26B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	72	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
1	SOMETHING SHOULD BE DONE	1236	<div><div></div></div> 64.3%
2	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (GENERAL)	53	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
3	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (SPECIFIC POLICY)	234	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
4	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT (OR STOP WHAT IT IS NOW DOING)	84	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
5	PRESENT GOVERNMENT/JOE CLARK CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT/ DOU	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	SATISFIED, NO COMPLAINTS	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%

# v1156: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: DO WHAT?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	CAN'T DEFINE	232	<div><div></div></div> 12.1%
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 IN Q26A	838	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1157: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE: ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1923 /-] [Invalid=838 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q26A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Interviewer's instructions	Q26B.3 (R'S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q26A, Q26B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITIVE - FOR	254	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
2	NEUTRAL	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
3	NEGATIVE - AGAINST	426	<div><div></div></div> 22.2%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	1231	<div><div></div></div> 64.0%
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 IN Q26A	838	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1158: PARTY CLOSEST ON ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1726 /-] [Invalid=1035 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q26A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q26C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q26A, Q26C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO PARTY	173	<div><div></div></div> 10.0%
1	LIBERALS	617	<div><div></div></div> 35.7%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	651	<div><div></div></div> 37.7%
3	N.D.P.	246	<div><div></div></div> 14.3%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	22	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
5	LIB AND PC	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	LIB AND N.D.P.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
7	OTHER COMBINATIONS/ANSWERS	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
8	D.K.	197	
9	INAP., 00 OR 88 IN Q26A	838	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1159: ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1866 /-] [Invalid=895 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1159: ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTING?			
Pre-question	Q26A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q26D. HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q26A, Q26D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	947	<div></div> 50.8%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	557	<div></div> 29.8%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	362	<div></div> 19.4%
8	D.K.	57	
9	INAP., CODED 00 OR 88 IN Q26A	838	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1160: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1794 /-] [Invalid=967 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q26A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q26A, Q27A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OTHER ISSUES.	616	<div></div> 34.3%
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	121	<div></div> 6.7%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	6	<div></div> 0.3%
3	INTEREST RATES	1	<div></div> 0.1%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	81	<div></div> 4.5%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	3	<div></div> 0.2%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	6	<div></div> 0.3%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODE 62)	18	<div></div> 1.0%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	19	<div></div> 1.1%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY)	3	<div></div> 0.2%
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	10	<div></div> 0.6%
12	THE BUDGET	2	<div></div> 0.1%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT	134	<div></div> 7.5%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION (ALSO SEE CODE 64)	15	<div></div> 0.8%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	9	<div></div> 0.5%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE/HELP FOR AGED/OLD	8	<div></div> 0.4%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES/ COSTS (ALSO SEE CODE 65)	3	<div></div> 0.2%
18	FARMS / AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	4	<div></div> 0.2%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	8	<div></div> 0.4%
20	OIL / ENERGY CRISIS / POLICY (GENERAL) (ALSO SEE CODES 67 +	60	<div></div> 3.3%
21	ECOLOGY / POLLUTION	1	<div></div> 0.1%

v1160: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD / FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRA	16	0.9%
23	TRANSPORTATION	5	0.3%
24	EDUCATION	1	0.1%
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED)	21	1.2%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF THE GOVERNMENT (ALSO SEE	52	2.9%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY (ALSO SEE CODE 78)	88	4.9%
28	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	6	0.3%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	3	0.2%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIANS, METIS)	3	0.2%
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE / CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	1	0.1%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS / STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	1	0.1%
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	6	0.3%
35	REFERENDUM	5	0.3%
36	QUEBEC'S DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FREN	6	0.3%
37	GOVERNMENT, RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT, PAST	6	0.3%
38	LACK OF TRUST / HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKE PROMISES	1	0.1%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
40	THE FISHERIES	3	0.2%
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	3	0.2%
42	HERITAGE TRUST FUND (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	3	0.2%
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	1	0.1%
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	0	
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE	0	
46	STATUS OF WOMEN (SALARIES FOR WOMEN AT HOME)	1	0.1%
47	MERCHANT NAVY	1	0.1%
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	1	0.1%
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	15	0.8%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	47	2.6%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	11	0.6%
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	1	0.1%
64	CUT BACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	11	0.6%
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	1	0.1%
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD.	1	0.1%
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN / CROWN CORPORATIONS - SELL = POSITIVE	54	3.0%
69	NUCLEAR POWER	3	0.2%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION	8	0.4%
71	TRUDEAU	35	2.0%
72	CLARK	15	0.8%

# v1160: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT ELECTION ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	3	0.2%
74	THE PARTY	0	
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	1	0.1%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
77	QUEBEC ISSUES	15	0.8%
78	QUEBEC'S INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM - FOR = POSITIVE, AGAINST	119	6.6%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM - FOR = POSITIVE	40	2.2%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	23	1.3%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE - FOR = POSITIVE, AGAINST - NEGATIVE	4	0.2%
82	DO AWAY / REVISE FAMILY ALLOWANCE = POSITIVE	1	0.1%
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL = POSITIVE	9	0.5%
84	R.C.M.P. INVESTIGATION - FOR = POSITIVE	1	0.1%
85	METRIC SYSTEM - AGAINST = POSITIVE	2	0.1%
86	HAVE GUN CONTROL = POSITIVE	1	0.1%
87	HAVE CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AGAIN = POSITIVE	9	0.5%
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	129	
99	INAP., CODED 00 OR 88 IN Q26A.	838	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1161: 2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: FEEL STRONG			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1178 /-] [Invalid=1583 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q27B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?		
Interviewer's instructions	(STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q27A, Q27B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY CONCERNED	969	82.3%
2	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	135	11.5%
3	NOT VERY CONCERNED	38	3.2%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	36	3.1%
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 OR 99 IN Q27A	1583	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1162: 2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: DO WHAT?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1178 /-] [Invalid=1583 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?		
Interviewer's instructions	Q27B.2 (R'S FEELINGS ABOUT MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (PRESCRIPTION/ACTION CALLED FOR ON ISSUE CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q27A, Q27B.2 in the documentation.		

# v1162: 2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: DO WHAT?				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	51	<div><div></div></div>	4.3%
1	SOMETHING SHOULD BE DONE	683	<div><div></div></div>	58.0%
2	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (GENERAL)	36	<div><div></div></div>	3.1%
3	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (SPECIFIC POLICY)	167	<div><div></div></div>	14.2%
4	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT (OR STOP WHAT IT IS NOW DOING)	74	<div><div></div></div>	6.3%
5	PRESENT GOVERNMENT/JOE CLARK CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT/DOUB	3	<div><div></div></div>	0.3%
6	SATISFIED, NO COMPLAINTS	6	<div><div></div></div>	0.5%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	158	<div><div></div></div>	13.4%
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 OR 99 IN Q27A	1583		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1163: 2ND IMPORTANT ISSUE: ATTITUDE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1178 /-] [Invalid=1583 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?			
Literal question	Q27B.3 (R'S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)			
Notes	Q27A, Q27B.3 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	POSITIVE - FOR	156	<div><div></div></div>	13.2%
2	NEUTRAL	10	<div><div></div></div>	0.8%
3	NEGATIVE - AGAINST	210	<div><div></div></div>	17.8%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	802	<div><div></div></div>	68.1%
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 OR 99 IN Q27A	1583		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1164: PARTY CLOSEST ON 2ND ISSUE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1178 /-] [Invalid=1583 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?			
Literal question	Q27C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?			
Notes	Q27A, Q27C in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO PARTY	121	<div><div></div></div>	10.3%
1	LIBERALS	384	<div><div></div></div>	32.6%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	369	<div><div></div></div>	31.3%
3	N.D.P.	147	<div><div></div></div>	12.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	8	<div><div></div></div>	0.7%
5	LIB AND PC	7	<div><div></div></div>	0.6%
6	LIB AND N.D.P.	6	<div><div></div></div>	0.5%
7	OTHER COMBINATIONS/ANSWERS	10	<div><div></div></div>	0.8%
8	D.K., N.A.	126	<div><div></div></div>	10.7%

# v1164: PARTY CLOSEST ON 2ND ISSUE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 OR 99 IN Q27A	1583	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1165: 2ND ISSUE IMPORTANT IN VOTE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1146 /-] [Invalid=1615 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q27A. WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q27D. HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q27A, Q27D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	516	<div></div> 45.0%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	413	<div></div> 36.0%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	217	<div></div> 18.9%
8	D.K.	32	
9	INAP. CODED 0 OR 88 OR 99 IN Q27A	1583	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1166: NATIONAL UNITY-MEANING 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1247 /-] [Invalid=1514 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q28A.1 I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS NATIONAL UNITY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN NATIONAL UNITY IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS NATIONAL UNITY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN NATIONAL UNITY IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q27A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	<div></div> 1.4%
1	CANADA STAYING TOGETHER (NEUTRALLY WORDED) - THE COUNTRY ST	215	<div></div> 17.2%
2	CANADA STAYING TOGETHER (POSITIVELY WORDED) - WE NEED TO ST	144	<div></div> 11.5%
3	THE PROVINCES STAYING TOGETHER (NEUTRAL)	64	<div></div> 5.1%
4	THE PROVINCES STAYING TOGETHER (POSITIVE)	37	<div></div> 3.0%
5	THE PROVINCES SEPARATING - PROVINCIAL RIGHTS TO SEPARATE -	10	<div></div> 0.8%
6	THE PROVINCES WANTING MORE POWER	4	<div></div> 0.3%
7	THE PROVINCES SHOULD ALL BE TREATED ALIKE	10	<div></div> 0.8%
8	FEDERALISM, THE FEDERAL SYSTEM (GENERAL, NEUTRAL REF)	10	<div></div> 0.8%
9	THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS (GENERAL, NEUTRAL)	12	<div></div> 1.0%
10	FEDERALISM, DIFFICULTIES OF: OR PROBLEMS WITH:	2	<div></div> 0.2%
11	FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS - DIFFICULTIES OF RELATI	6	<div></div> 0.5%

v1166: NATIONAL UNITY-MEANING 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	REGION, REGIONAL CONFLICT (GENERAL)	5	0.4%
13	THE WEST, REF. TO, WEST RELATIONS WITH EAST	6	0.5%
14	ONTARIO, REF. TO	1	0.1%
15	EVERYBODY STAYING TOGETHER, EVERYONE, PEOPLE (POSITIVE)	61	4.9%
16	EVERYBODY STAYING TOGETHER, EVERYONE, PEOPLE (NEUTRAL)	47	3.8%
17	THE MARITIMES, REF. TO	3	0.2%
20	QUEBEC (NEUTRAL REF.) - THE QUEBEC PROBLEM	122	9.8%
21	QUEBEC (POSITIVE REF.) WANTING ITS RIGHTS, ASSERTING ITSELF	8	0.6%
22	QUEBEC (NEGATIVE REF.) MAKING TROUBLE, CREATING PROBLEMS	13	1.0%
23	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (NEUTRAL)	94	7.5%
24	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (POSITIVE OR ACCEPTING)	5	0.4%
25	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (NEGATIVE)	29	2.3%
26	QUEBEC AND CANADA, QUEBEC'S RELATIONS WITH CANADA OR OTHER	21	1.7%
27	QUEBEC LEAVING, IN ITS OWN, NOT A PART OF (NO SEPARATION OR	29	2.3%
28	QUEBEC LEAVING, (KEEPING QUEBEC) (POSITIVE)	5	0.4%
29	QUEBEC LEAVING (NEGATIVE)	21	1.7%
30	LANGUAGE	13	1.0%
31	BILINGUALISM, FRENCH AND ENGLISH	6	0.5%
32	FRENCH (NEUTRAL) - QUEBECKERS WANTING TO SPEAK FRENCH	1	0.1%
33	FRENCH (POSITIVE) - SHOULD BE ABLE TO SPEAK FRENCH	2	0.2%
34	FRENCH (NEGATIVE)	4	0.3%
35	CULTURE(S) EXISTENCE OF	4	0.3%
36	CULTURE(S) MAINTENANCE OF	1	0.1%
37	THE REFERENDUM	5	0.4%
40	NATIVE PEOPLE - WANTING RIGHTS, NEGLECTED	2	0.2%
41	REFUGEES/IMMIGRANTS - THREAT TO CULTURE	3	0.2%
42	THE UNITED STATES - RELATIONS WITH, JOINING WITH, DOMINANCE	3	0.2%
45	ECONOMY MORE IMPORTANT	1	0.1%
46	UNITY NECESSARY FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY	1	0.1%
49	GEOGRAPHY, TERRITORY, PHYSICAL MAKEUP (OF CANADA)	0	
50	A PROBLEM WE'VE ALWAYS HAD - HAS EXISTED SINCE CONFEDERATION	3	0.2%
51	THE ENGLISH AND THE FRENCH, RELATIONS BETWEEN	33	2.6%
52	THE FRENCH (NEUTRAL)	6	0.5%
53	THE FRENCH (POSITIVE)	2	0.2%
54	THE FRENCH (NEGATIVE)	1	0.1%
55	THE ENGLISH (NEUTRAL)	0	
56	THE ENGLISH (POSITIVE)	0	

v1166: NATIONAL UNITY-MEANING 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	THE ENGLISH (NEGATIVE)	0	
60	INTERNATIONAL HARMONY	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
65	TRUDEAU	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
66	LEVESQUE	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
69	PARTY QUEBECOIS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
80	OTHER	63	<div><div></div></div> 5.1%
86	FALSE PROBLEM (MEDIA ONLY), COVERUP	20	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
87	DON'T THINK ABOUT IT, DON'T CARE, DOESN'T BOTHER ME	40	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
88	DON'T KNOW	139	
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND OR THIRD MENTION, HALF SAMPLE 2	1375	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1167: NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=651 /-] [Invalid=2110 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	Q28A.1 I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS NATIONAL UNITY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN NATIONAL UNITY IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
Literal question	Q28A.2 (NATIONAL UNITY) (SECOND RESPONSE)
Notes	Q27A.1, Q27A.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
1	CANADA STAYING TOGETHER (NEUTRALLY WORDED) - THE COUNTRY ST	23	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
2	CANADA STAYING TOGETHER (POSITIVELY WORDED) - WE NEED TO ST	54	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%
3	THE PROVINCES STAYING TOGETHER (NEUTRAL)	21	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
4	THE PROVINCES STAYING TOGETHER (POSITIVE)	18	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
5	THE PROVINCES SEPARATING - PROVINCIAL RIGHTS TO SEPARATE -	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
6	THE PROVINCES WANTING MORE POWER	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
7	THE PROVINCES SHOULD ALL BE TREATED ALIKE	17	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
8	FEDERALISM, THE FEDERAL SYSTEM (GENERAL, NEUTRAL REF)	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
9	THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS (GENERAL, NEUTRAL)	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
10	FEDERALISM, DIFFICULTIES OF: OR PROBLEMS WITH:	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
11	FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS - DIFFICULTIES OF RELATI	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
12	REGION, REGIONAL CONFLICT (GENERAL)	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
13	THE WEST, REF. TO, WEST RELATIONS WITH EAST	32	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
14	ONTARIO, REF. TO	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	EVERYBODY STAYING TOGETHER, EVERYONE, PEOPLE (POSITIVE)	25	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
16	EVERYBODY STAYING TOGETHER, EVERYONE, PEOPLE (NEUTRAL)	20	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%

v1167: NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	THE MARITIMES, REF. TO	5	0.8%
20	QUEBEC (NEUTRAL REF.) - THE QUEBEC PROBLEM	29	4.5%
21	QUEBEC (POSITIVE REF.) WANTING ITS RIGHTS, ASSERTING ITSELF	4	0.6%
22	QUEBEC (NEGATIVE REF.) MAKING TROUBLE, CREATING PROBLEMS	10	1.5%
23	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (NEUTRAL)	16	2.5%
24	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (POSITIVE OR ACCEPTING)	7	1.1%
25	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (NEGATIVE)	53	8.1%
26	QUEBEC AND CANADA, QUEBEC'S RELATIONS WITH CANADA OR OTHER	8	1.2%
27	QUEBEC LEAVING, IN ITS OWN, NOT A PART OF (NO SEPARATION OR	8	1.2%
28	QUEBEC LEAVING, (KEEPING QUEBEC) (POSITIVE)	3	0.5%
29	QUEBEC LEAVING (NEGATIVE)	24	3.7%
30	LANGUAGE	20	3.1%
31	BILINGUALISM, FRENCH AND ENGLISH	12	1.8%
32	FRENCH (NEUTRAL) - QUEBECKERS WANTING TO SPEAK FRENCH	3	0.5%
33	FRENCH (POSITIVE) - SHOULD BE ABLE TO SPEAK FRENCH	2	0.3%
34	FRENCH (NEGATIVE)	5	0.8%
35	CULTURE(S) EXISTENCE OF	12	1.8%
36	CULTURE(S) MAINTENANCE OF	5	0.8%
37	THE REFERENDUM	2	0.3%
40	NATIVE PEOPLE - WANTING RIGHTS, NEGLECTED	5	0.8%
41	REFUGEES/IMMIGRANTS - THREAT TO CULTURE	3	0.5%
42	THE UNITED STATES - RELATIONS WITH, JOINING WITH, DOMINANCE	3	0.5%
45	ECONOMY MORE IMPORTANT	5	0.8%
46	UNITY NECESSARY FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY	11	1.7%
49	GEOGRAPHY, TERRITORY, PHYSICAL MAKEUP (OF CANADA)	2	0.3%
50	A PROBLEM WE'VE ALWAYS HAD - HAS EXISTED SINCE CONFEDERATION	3	0.5%
51	THE ENGLISH AND THE FRENCH, RELATIONS BETWEEN	9	1.4%
52	THE FRENCH (NEUTRAL)	3	0.5%
53	THE FRENCH (POSITIVE)	3	0.5%
54	THE FRENCH (NEGATIVE)	3	0.5%
55	THE ENGLISH (NEUTRAL)	0	
56	THE ENGLISH (POSITIVE)	1	0.2%
57	THE ENGLISH (NEGATIVE)	1	0.2%
60	INTERNATIONAL HARMONY	6	0.9%
65	TRUDEAU	7	1.1%
66	LEVESQUE	8	1.2%
69	PARTY QUEBECOIS	5	0.8%
80	OTHER	50	7.7%

v1167: NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	FALSE PROBLEM (MEDIA ONLY), COVERUP	2	0.3%
87	DON'T THINK ABOUT IT, DON'T CARE, DOESN'T BOTHER ME	5	0.8%
88	DON'T KNOW	1	
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND OR THIRD MENTION, HALF SAMPLE 2	2109	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1168: NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 3

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=219 /-] [Invalid=2542 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	Q28A.1 I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION. THAT ISSUE IS NATIONAL UNITY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN NATIONAL UNITY IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
Literal question	Q28A.3 (NATIONAL UNITY) (THIRD RESPONSE)
Notes	Q27A.1, Q27A.3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	8.2%
1	CANADA STAYING TOGETHER (NEUTRALLY WORDED) - THE COUNTRY ST	5	2.3%
2	CANADA STAYING TOGETHER (POSITIVELY WORDED) - WE NEED TO ST	8	3.7%
3	THE PROVINCES STAYING TOGETHER (NEUTRAL)	1	0.5%
4	THE PROVINCES STAYING TOGETHER (POSITIVE)	7	3.2%
5	THE PROVINCES SEPARATING - PROVINCIAL RIGHTS TO SEPARATE -	7	3.2%
6	THE PROVINCES WANTING MORE POWER	4	1.8%
7	THE PROVINCES SHOULD ALL BE TREATED ALIKE	3	1.4%
8	FEDERALISM, THE FEDERAL SYSTEM (GENERAL, NEUTRAL REF)	3	1.4%
9	THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS (GENERAL, NEUTRAL)	6	2.7%
10	FEDERALISM, DIFFICULTIES OF: OR PROBLEMS WITH:	5	2.3%
11	FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS - DIFFICULTIES OF RELATI	0	
12	REGION, REGIONAL CONFLICT (GENERAL)	4	1.8%
13	THE WEST, REF. TO, WEST RELATIONS WITH EAST	9	4.1%
14	ONTARIO, REF. TO	2	0.9%
15	EVERYBODY STAYING TOGETHER, EVERYONE, PEOPLE (POSITIVE)	9	4.1%
16	EVERYBODY STAYING TOGETHER, EVERYONE, PEOPLE (NEUTRAL)	2	0.9%
17	THE MARITIMES, REF. TO	3	1.4%
20	QUEBEC (NEUTRAL REF.) - THE QUEBEC PROBLEM	4	1.8%
21	QUEBEC (POSITIVE REF.) WANTING ITS RIGHTS, ASSERTING ITSELF	1	0.5%
22	QUEBEC (NEGATIVE REF.) MAKING TROUBLE, CREATING PROBLEMS	2	0.9%

v1168: NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (NEUTRAL)	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
24	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (POSITIVE OR ACCEPTING)	0	
25	QUEBEC SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE (NEGATIVE)	7	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
26	QUEBEC AND CANADA, QUEBEC'S RELATIONS WITH CANADA OR OTHER	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
27	QUEBEC LEAVING, IN ITS OWN, NOT A PART OF (NO SEPARATION OR	0	
28	QUEBEC LEAVING, (KEEPING QUEBEC) (POSITIVE)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
29	QUEBEC LEAVING (NEGATIVE)	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
30	LANGUAGE	9	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
31	BILINGUALISM, FRENCH AND ENGLISH	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
32	FRENCH (NEUTRAL) - QUEBECKERS WANTING TO SPEAK FRENCH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
33	FRENCH (POSITIVE) - SHOULD BE ABLE TO SPEAK FRENCH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
34	FRENCH (NEGATIVE)	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
35	CULTURE(S) EXISTENCE OF	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
36	CULTURE(S) MAINTENANCE OF	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
37	THE REFERENDUM	0	
40	NATIVE PEOPLE - WANTING RIGHTS, NEGLECTED	0	
41	REFUGEES/IMMIGRANTS - THREAT TO CULTURE	0	
42	THE UNITED STATES - RELATIONS WITH, JOINING WITH, DOMINANCE	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
45	ECONOMY MORE IMPORTANT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
46	UNITY NECESSARY FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY	8	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
49	GEOGRAPHY, TERRITORY, PHYSICAL MAKEUP (OF CANADA)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
50	A PROBLEM WE'VE ALWAYS HAD - HAS EXISTED SINCE CONFEDERATION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
51	THE ENGLISH AND THE FRENCH, RELATIONS BETWEEN	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
52	THE FRENCH (NEUTRAL)	0	
53	THE FRENCH (POSITIVE)	0	
54	THE FRENCH (NEGATIVE)	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
55	THE ENGLISH (NEUTRAL)	0	
56	THE ENGLISH (POSITIVE)	0	
57	THE ENGLISH (NEGATIVE)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
60	INTERNATIONAL HARMONY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
65	TRUDEAU	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
66	LEVESQUE	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
69	PARTY QUEBECOIS	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
80	OTHER	24	<div><div></div></div> 11.0%
86	FALSE PROBLEM (MEDIA ONLY), COVERUP	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
87	DON'T THINK ABOUT IT, DON'T CARE, DOESN'T BOTHER ME	0	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND OR THIRD MENTION, HALF SAMPLE 2	2542	

# v1168: NATIONAL UNITY MEANING 3			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1169: NATIONAL UNITY-WHY PROBLEM-1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2498 /-] [Invalid=263 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	WHY DO YOU THINK NATIONAL UNITY HAS BEEN A PROBLEM IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q28B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	THE FRENCH CULTURE, DEMANDS OF: (POSITIVE)	6	0.2%
2	THE FRENCH CULTURE, DEMANDS OF: (NEUTRAL)	41	1.6%
3	THE FRENCH CULTURE, DEMANDS OF: (NEGATIVE)	14	0.6%
4	QUEBEC, DEMANDS OF (POSITIVE)	8	0.3%
5	QUEBEC, DEMANDS OF (NEUTRAL)	114	4.6%
6	QUEBEC, DEMANDS OF (NEGATIVE)	31	1.2%
7	THE ENGLISH CULTURE, ACTIONS OF (POSITIVE)	0	
8	THE ENGLISH CULTURE, ACTIONS OF (NEUTRAL)	2	0.1%
9	THE ENGLISH CULTURE, ACTIONS OF (NEGATIVE)	12	0.5%
10	THE PROVINCES, DEMANDS AND ACTIONS OF (POSITIVE)	0	
11	THE PROVINCES, DEMANDS AND ACYIONS OF (NEUTRAL)	38	1.5%
12	THE PROVINCES, DEMANDS AND ACTIONS OF (NEGATIVE)	21	0.8%
13	THE FEDERAL GOV'T, ACTIONS OF (POSITIVE)	1	0.0%
14	THE FEDERAL GOV'T, ACTIONS OF (NEUTRAL)	11	0.4%
15	THE FEDERAL GOV'T, ACTIONS OF (NEGATIVE)	27	1.1%
16	THE PROVINCES AND FEDERAL GOV'T IN CONFLICT	10	0.4%
17	LANGUAGE (GENERAL)	80	3.2%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE (POSITIVE)	2	0.1%
19	FRENCH LANGUAGE (NEUTRAL)	15	0.6%
20	FRENCH LANGUAGE (NEGATIVE)	7	0.3%
21	ENGLISH LANGUAGE (POSITIVE)	1	0.0%
22	ENGLISH LANGUAGE (NEUTRAL)	0	
23	ENGLISH LANGUAGE (NEGATIVE)	1	0.0%
24	BILINGUALISM (POSITIVE)	0	
25	BILINGUALISM (NEUTRAL)	29	1.2%
26	BILINGUALISM (NEGATIVE)	3	0.1%
27	ENGLISH AND FRENCH, STRAINED RELATIONS, CANNOT GET ALONG	51	2.0%
28	LACK OF CONTACT BETWEEN ENGLISH AND FRENCH	10	0.4%
29	LACK OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR FRENCH	8	0.3%
30	POLITICAL PARTIES, ACTIONS OF (GENERAL)	11	0.4%
31	FEDERAL PC PARTY	0	
32	FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY	4	0.2%
33	FEDERAL N.D.P.	0	
34	FEDERAL SC	0	
35	PARTI QUEBECOIS	12	0.5%
36	OTHER PROVINCIAL PARTIES	0	

v1169: NATIONAL UNITY-WHY PROBLEM-1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
40	POLITICAL LEADERS, ACTIONS OF (GENERAL)	26	1.0%
41	TRUDEAU	8	0.3%
42	CLARK	0	
43	LEVESQUE	19	0.8%
44	OTHER LEADERS	2	0.1%
50	A HISTORICAL PROBLEM, HAS HISTORICAL ROOTS STAMS FROM CONQU	41	1.6%
51	COMPLICATIONS DUE TO DIFFERENT NATIONALITIES / DEMANDS OF D	63	2.5%
52	REGIONAL CONFLICT, REGIONAL ECONOMIC DISPARITY	30	1.2%
53	THE WEST, REF. TO	6	0.2%
54	ONTARIO, THE EAST, REF. TO	2	0.1%
55	MARITIMES, REF. TO	0	
56	HARD FEELINGS, PREJUDICES, GENERAL DISAGREEMENTS	39	1.6%
57	A 'NATURAL' THING	2	0.1%
58	GEOGRAPHY, SIZE, DISTANCE	30	1.2%
60	IMMIGRANTS, REF. TO, ETC. (POSITIVE)	0	
61	IMMIGRANTS, REF. TO, ETC. (NEUTRAL)	4	0.2%
62	IMMIGRANTS, REF. TO, TOO MANY, ETC. (NEGATIVE)	12	0.5%
63	NATIVE PEOPLE, DEMANDS OF (POSITIVE)	0	
64	NATIVE PEOPLE, DEMANDS OF (NEUTRAL)	3	0.1%
65	NATIVE PEOPLE, DEMANDS OF (NEGATIVE)	0	
66	SEPARATISTS, SEPARATISM (GENERAL REF.)	19	0.8%
70	PERSONALITY REF. (PEOPLE TOO PROUD, EXPECT TOO MUCH, TOO EXA	54	2.2%
80	OTHER	43	1.7%
86	FALSE PROBLEM	28	1.1%
87	IT'S NOT A PROBLEM	49	2.0%
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND MENTION, HALF SAMPLE 2	1448	58.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW	245	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1170: NATIONAL UNITY-WHY PROBLEM-2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2739 /-] [Invalid=22 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q28B.1 WHY DO YOU THINK NATIONAL UNITY HAS BEEN A PROBLEM IN CANADA?		
Literal question	Q28B.2 (NATIONAL UNITY, A PROBLEM?) (SECOND RESPONSE)		
Notes	Q28B.1, Q28B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	THE FRENCH CULTURE, DEMANDS OF: (POSITIVE)	2	0.1%
2	THE FRENCH CULTURE, DEMANDS OF: (NEUTRAL)	12	0.4%
3	THE FRENCH CULTURE, DEMANDS OF: (NEGATIVE)	6	0.2%
4	QUEBEC, DEMANDS OF (POSITIVE)	3	0.1%
5	QUEBEC, DEMANDS OF (NEUTRAL)	26	0.9%
6	QUEBEC, DEMANDS OF (NEGATIVE)	9	0.3%
7	THE ENGLISH CULTURE, ACTIONS OF (POSITIVE)	0	
8	THE ENGLISH CULTURE, ACTIONS OF (NEUTRAL)	4	0.1%
9	THE ENGLISH CULTURE, ACTIONS OF (NEGATIVE)	3	0.1%
10	THE PROVINCES, DEMANDS AND ACTIONS OF (POSITIVE)	1	0.0%
11	THE PROVINCES, DEMANDS AND ACYIONS OF (NEUTRAL)	10	0.4%
12	THE PROVINCES, DEMANDS AND ACTIONS OF (NEGATIVE)	2	0.1%
13	THE FEDERAL GOV'T, ACTIONS OF (POSITIVE)	1	0.0%
14	THE FEDERAL GOV'T, ACTIONS OF (NEUTRAL)	5	0.2%
15	THE FEDERAL GOV'T, ACTIONS OF (NEGATIVE)	10	0.4%
16	THE PROVINCES AND FEDERAL GOV'T IN CONFLICT	6	0.2%
17	LANGUAGE (GENERAL)	24	0.9%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE (POSITIVE)	2	0.1%
19	FRENCH LANGUAGE (NEUTRAL)	11	0.4%
20	FRENCH LANGUAGE (NEGATIVE)	14	0.5%
21	ENGLISH LANGUAGE (POSITIVE)	4	0.1%
22	ENGLISH LANGUAGE (NEUTRAL)	6	0.2%
23	ENGLISH LANGUAGE (NEGATIVE)	1	0.0%
24	BILINGUALISM (POSITIVE)	3	0.1%
25	BILINGUALISM (NEUTRAL)	10	0.4%
26	BILINGUALISM (NEGATIVE)	4	0.1%
27	ENGLISH AND FRENCH, STRAINED RELATIONS, CANNOT GET ALONG	27	1.0%
28	LACK OF CONTACT BETWEEN ENGLISH AND FRENCH	4	0.1%
29	LACK OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR FRENCH	12	0.4%
30	POLITICAL PARTIES, ACTIONS OF (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
31	FEDERAL PC PARTY	0	
32	FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY	5	0.2%
33	FEDERAL N.D.P.	1	0.0%
34	FEDERAL SC	0	
35	PARTI QUEBECOIS	7	0.3%
36	OTHER PROVINCIAL PARTIES	0	
40	POLITICAL LEADERS, ACTIONS OF (GENERAL)	11	0.4%

# v1170: NATIONAL UNITY-WHY PROBLEM-2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	TRUDEAU	7	0.3%
42	CLARK	0	
43	LEVESQUE	3	0.1%
44	OTHER LEADERS	3	0.1%
50	A HISTORICAL PROBLEM, HAS HISTORICAL ROOTS STAMS FROM CONQU	19	0.7%
51	COMPLICATIONS DUE TO DIFFERENT NATIONALITIES / DEMANDS OF D	31	1.1%
52	REGIONAL CONFLICT, REGIONAL ECONOMIC DISPARITY	28	1.0%
53	THE WEST, REF. TO	9	0.3%
54	ONTARIO, THE EAST, REF. TO	6	0.2%
55	MARITIMES, REF. TO	1	0.0%
56	HARD FEELINGS, PREJUDICES, GENERAL DISAGREEMENTS	14	0.5%
57	A 'NATURAL' THING	1	0.0%
58	GEOGRAPHY, SIZE, DISTANCE	9	0.3%
60	IMMIGRANTS, REF. TO, ETC. (POSITIVE)	0	
61	IMMIGRANTS, REF. TO, ETC. (NEUTRAL)	3	0.1%
62	IMMIGRANTS, REF. TO, TOO MANY, ETC. (NEGATIVE)	2	0.1%
63	NATIVE PEOPLE, DEMANDS OF (POSITIVE)	0	
64	NATIVE PEOPLE, DEMANDS OF (NEUTRAL)	0	
65	NATIVE PEOPLE, DEMANDS OF (NEGATIVE)	0	
66	SEPARATISTS, SEPARATISM (GENERAL REF.)	45	1.6%
70	PERSONALITY REF. (PEOPLE TOO PROUD, EXPECT TOO MUCH, TOO EXA	13	0.5%
80	OTHER	26	0.9%
86	FALSE PROBLEM	10	0.4%
87	IT'S NOT A PROBLEM	1	0.0%
99	NO ANSWER, NO SECOND MENTION, HALF SAMPLE 2	2259	82.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	19	
88	DON'T KNOW	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1171: NATIONAL UNITY-PARTY CLOSEST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1007 /-] [Invalid=1754 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents who mentioned "national unity" in Q26A, or Q27A.		
Literal question	(IF 'NATIONAL UNITY' MENTIONED IN Q26A (NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?) OR Q27A (WAS THERE ANY OTHER ISSUE THAT YOU THINK WAS IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?))		
Interviewer's instructions	RECORD ANSWER FROM Q26C OR Q27C AUTOMATICALLY		
Notes	Q28C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	262	26.0%
1	LIBERALS	385	38.2%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	238	23.6%

# v1171: NATIONAL UNITY-PARTY CLOSEST			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	N.D.P.	90	<div><div></div></div> 8.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
5	LIB AND PC	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
6	LIB AND N.D.P.	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
7	OTHER COMBINATIONS/ANSWERS	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
8	D.K., N.A.	182	
9	INAP., 00 OR 88 OR 99 IN Q28A	1572	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1172: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2676 /-] [Invalid=85 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON THE ISSUE OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS ARE MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q29A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A FREEZE ON BOTH (POSITIVE)	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
2	A FREEZE ON BOTH (NEUTRAL)	42	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
3	A FREEZE ON BOTH (NEGATIVE)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
4	CONTROLS PROGRAM (POSITIVE) - WORKED	55	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
5	CONTROLS PROGRAM (NEUTRAL)	56	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
6	CONTROLS PROGRAM (NEGATIVE) - DIDN'T WORK	172	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%
7	WAGES WERE CONTROLLED BUT PRICES WERE NOT	195	<div><div></div></div> 7.3%
8	PRICES SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	54	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
9	WAGES SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
10	PROFITS SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	WE SHOULD HAVE CONTROLS, BOTH SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	156	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
12	WE SHOULD NOT HAVE CONTROLS	27	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
13	A CONTROLS SYSTEM WON'T WORK	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
14	REFERENCE TO W & P CONTROLS AS RAISING MIN. WAGES	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
20	INFLATION, CURRENT SITUATION OF (GENERAL) (COST OF LIVING R	201	<div><div></div></div> 7.5%
21	INFLATION, CURRENT SITUATION (SPECIFIC) - FOOD, OIL, ETC.	26	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
22	WAGE AND PRICE SPIRAL	33	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
23	THE POOR, PEOPLE ON FIXED INCOMES, ARE SUFFERING MOST	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
24	WORKING CLASS, WORKING PEOPLE LOSE (WAGE EARNERS, FARMERS)	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
30	THE AIB (POSITIVE)	0	
31	THE AIB (NEUTRAL)	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
32	THE AIB (NEGATIVE)	0	
33	AIB OFFICIALS (JEAN-LUC PEPIN, BERYL PLUMPTRE, ETC.)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%

# v1172: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	REF. TO PARTIES AND POLITICIANS	16	0.6%
40	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (POSITIVE) - (GOV'T SHOULD	9	0.3%
41	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (NEUTRAL)	25	0.9%
42	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (NEGATIVE) - (GOV'T SHOULD	11	0.4%
47	STRIKES (POSITIVE)	0	
48	STRIKES (NEUTRAL)	9	0.3%
49	STRIKES (NEGATIVE)	6	0.2%
50	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (POSITIVE)	0	
51	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (NEUTRAL)	15	0.6%
52	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (NEGATIVE)	15	0.6%
53	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (POSITIVE)	0	
54	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (NEUTRAL)	6	0.2%
55	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (NEGATIVE)	5	0.2%
56	ACTIONS OF INDIVIDUALS (GREED, ETC.)	9	0.3%
57	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (POSITIVE)	0	
58	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (NEUTRAL)	0	
59	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (NEGATIVE)	0	
60	PERSONAL EFFECTS ON RESPONDENT	32	1.2%
80	OTHER	50	1.9%
99	NO ANSWER, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND, 3RD RESPONSE	1373	51.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW	67	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1173: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON THE ISSUE OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS ARE MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q29A.2 (WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS) (SECOND RESPONSE)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q29A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A FREEZE ON BOTH (POSITIVE)	2	0.1%
2	A FREEZE ON BOTH (NEUTRAL)	3	0.1%
3	A FREEZE ON BOTH (NEGATIVE)	0	
4	CONTROLS PROGRAM (POSITIVE) - WORKED	9	0.3%
5	CONTROLS PROGRAM (NEUTRAL)	10	0.4%
6	CONTROLS PROGRAM (NEGATIVE) - DIDN'T WORK	90	3.3%
7	WAGES WERE CONTROLLED BUT PRICES WERE NOT	80	2.9%
8	PRICES SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	69	2.5%
9	WAGES SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	24	0.9%
10	PROFITS SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	16	0.6%

# v1173: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	WE SHOULD HAVE CONTROLS, BOTH SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	105	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
12	WE SHOULD NOT HAVE CONTROLS	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
13	A CONTROLS SYSTEM WON'T WORK	20	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
14	REFERENCE TO W & P CONTROLS AS RAISING MIN. WAGES	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
20	INFLATION, CURRENT SITUATION OF (GENERAL) (COST OF LIVING R	118	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
21	INFLATION, CURRENT SITUATION (SPECIFIC) - FOOD, OIL, ETC.	33	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
22	WAGE AND PRICE SPIRAL	23	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
23	THE POOR, PEOPLE ON FIXED INCOMES, ARE SUFFERING MOST	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
24	WORKING CLASS, WORKING PEOPLE LOSE (WAGE EARNERS, FARMERS)	25	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
30	THE AIB (POSITIVE)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
31	THE AIB (NEUTRAL)	0	
32	THE AIB (NEGATIVE)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
33	AIB OFFICIALS (JEAN-LUC PEPIN, BERYL PLUMPTRE, ETC.)	0	
34	REF. TO PARTIES AND POLITICIANS	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
35		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
40	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (POSITIVE) - (GOV'T SHOULD	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
41	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (NEUTRAL)	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
42	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (NEGATIVE) - (GOV'T SHOULD	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
47	STRIKES (POSITIVE)	0	
48	STRIKES (NEUTRAL)	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
49	STRIKES (NEGATIVE)	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
50	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (POSITIVE)	0	
51	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (NEUTRAL)	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
52	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (NEGATIVE)	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
53	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (POSITIVE)	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
54	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (NEUTRAL)	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
55	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (NEGATIVE)	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
56	ACTIONS OF INDIVIDUALS (GREED, ETC.)	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
57	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (POSITIVE)	0	
58	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (NEUTRAL)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
59	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (NEGATIVE)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
60	PERSONAL EFFECTS ON RESPONDENT	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
80	OTHER	41	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
99	NO ANSWER, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND, 3RD RESPONSE	1871	<div><div></div></div> 68.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1174: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/88/0]		

# v1174: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 3RD RESPONSE			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2742 /-] [Invalid=19 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON THE ISSUE OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS ARE MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q29A.3 (WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS) (THIRD RESPONSE)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q29A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A FREEZE ON BOTH (POSITIVE)	2	0.1%
2	A FREEZE ON BOTH (NEUTRAL)	2	0.1%
3	A FREEZE ON BOTH (NEGATIVE)	1	0.0%
4	CONTROLS PROGRAM (POSITIVE) - WORKED	1	0.0%
5	CONTROLS PROGRAM (NEUTRAL)	3	0.1%
6	CONTROLS PROGRAM (NEGATIVE) - DIDN'T WORK	33	1.2%
7	WAGES WERE CONTROLLED BUT PRICES WERE NOT	10	0.4%
8	PRICES SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	20	0.7%
9	WAGES SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	6	0.2%
10	PROFITS SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	4	0.1%
11	WE SHOULD HAVE CONTROLS, BOTH SHOULD BE CONTROLLED	34	1.2%
12	WE SHOULD NOT HAVE CONTROLS	6	0.2%
13	A CONTROLS SYSTEM WON'T WORK	11	0.4%
14	REFERENCE TO W & P CONTROLS AS RAISING MIN. WAGES	0	
20	INFLATION, CURRENT SITUATION OF (GENERAL) (COST OF LIVING R	37	1.3%
21	INFLATION, CURRENT SITUATION (SPECIFIC) - FOOD, OIL, ETC.	20	0.7%
22	WAGE AND PRICE SPIRAL	15	0.5%
23	THE POOR, PEOPLE ON FIXED INCOMES, ARE SUFFERING MOST	3	0.1%
24	WORKING CLASS, WORKING PEOPLE LOSE (WAGE EARNERS, FARMERS)	14	0.5%
30	THE AIB (POSITIVE)	0	
31	THE AIB (NEUTRAL)	2	0.1%
32	THE AIB (NEGATIVE)	0	
33	AIB OFFICIALS (JEAN-LUC PEPIN, BERYL PLUMPTRE, ETC.)	1	0.0%
34	REF. TO PARTIES AND POLITICIANS	6	0.2%
40	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (POSITIVE) - (GOV'T SHOULD	14	0.5%
41	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (NEUTRAL)	4	0.1%
42	GOVERNMENT, CONTROL OF ECONOMY BY (NEGATIVE) - (GOV'T SHOULD	8	0.3%
47	STRIKES (POSITIVE)	0	
48	STRIKES (NEUTRAL)	7	0.3%
49	STRIKES (NEGATIVE)	5	0.2%
50	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (POSITIVE)	0	
51	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (NEUTRAL)	3	0.1%

# v1174: WAGE/PRICE CONTROL 3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	ACTIONS OF UNIONS (NEGATIVE)	5	0.2%
53	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (POSITIVE)	2	0.1%
54	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (NEUTRAL)	5	0.2%
55	ACTIONS OF BUSINESS (BIG) (NEGATIVE)	10	0.4%
56	ACTIONS OF INDIVIDUALS (GREED, ETC.)	7	0.3%
57	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (POSITIVE)	0	
58	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (NEUTRAL)	1	0.0%
59	UNIONS AND BUSINESS (NEGATIVE)	1	0.0%
60	PERSONAL EFFECTS ON RESPONDENT	9	0.3%
80	OTHER	29	1.1%
99	NO ANSWER, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND, 3RD RESPONSE	2401	87.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1175: FEEL ABOUT WAGE/PRICE CONTROL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1071 /-] [Invalid=1690 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents if "wage and price controls" mentioned in Q26A or Q27A.		
Literal question	HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS?		
Interviewer's instructions	RECORD ANSWERS FROM Q26B AND C OR Q27B AND C TO Q29B AND C AUTOMATICALLY		
Notes	Q29A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITIVE	323	30.2%
2	POSITIVE WITH QUALIFICATIONS (LIMITS, IF FAIRLY DONE)	248	23.2%
3	NEUTRAL	118	11.0%
4	NEGATIVE WITH QUALIFICATIONS	56	5.2%
5	NEGATIVE	326	30.4%
0	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 2	1420	
8	D.K.	102	
9	N.A.	168	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1176: PARTY CLOSEST WAGE/PRICE CONTROLS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1019 /-] [Invalid=1742 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS?		
Literal question	Q29C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Interviewer's instructions	(SEE DIRECTIVE ABOVE B)		
Notes	Q29B. Q29C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO PARTY IS CLOSEST	269	26.4%
1	LIBERALS	305	29.9%

# v1176: PARTY CLOSEST WAGE/PRICE CONTROLS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	239	<div><div></div></div> 23.5%
3	N.D.P.	172	<div><div></div></div> 16.9%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT / CREDITISTE	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
5	OTHER PARTY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
6	LIB AND PC	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
7	OTHER COMBINATIONS	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
8	D.K.	284	
9	N.A., INAP., HALF SAMPLE 2; NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1458	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1177: MAJORITY VS MINORITY GOVERNMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1287 /-] [Invalid=1474 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	BEFORE WE LEAVE THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL QUESTION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT		
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT IT IS BETTER WHEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS A MAJORITY OF SEATS IN PARLIAMENT, WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT MINORITY GOVERNMENTS CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE, WHICH DO YOU FEEL IS BETTER?		
Notes	Q30A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION	42	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
1	MAJORITY	664	<div><div></div></div> 51.6%
2	MINORITY	421	<div><div></div></div> 32.7%
3	IT DEPENDS	160	<div><div></div></div> 12.4%
8	D.K.	67	
9	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1; NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1407	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1178: SWITCH FOR MAJORITY GOVERNMENT?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1247 /-] [Invalid=1514 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IF YOU BELIEVED THAT ONE PARTY WAS MORE LIKELY TO BE ABLE TO FORM A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, BUT YOU DID NOT ORDINARILY VOTE FOR THAT PARTY, HOW LIKELY WOULD YOU BE TO VOTE FOR IT IN ORDER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, VERY LIKELY, SOMEWHAT LIKELY, OR NOT VERY LIKELY?		
Notes	Q30B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
1	VERY LIKELY	185	<div><div></div></div> 14.8%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	281	<div><div></div></div> 22.5%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	763	<div><div></div></div> 61.2%
8	D.K.	124	
9	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1179: MAJORITY GOVERNMENT ISSUE INFLUENCE VOTE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/8/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1258 /-] [Invalid=1503 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DID THIS QUESTION OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT HAVE A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR VERY LITTLE TO DO WITH THE WAY YOU VOTED IN THIS LAST ELECTION?		
Notes	Q30C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A GREAT DEAL	157	12.5%
2	SOMETHING	200	15.9%
3	VERY LITTLE	901	71.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	95	
9	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1180: SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION MEANING1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/88/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=563 /-] [Invalid=2198 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Literal question	THE QUEBEC GOVERNMENT WOULD LIKE TO NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION WITH THE REST OF CANADA. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q31.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INDEPENDENCE	76	13.5%
2	SEPARATION, SEPARATISM	96	17.1%
3	SEPARATE STATE (ETAT)	14	2.5%
5	REFERENDUM, REFERENCES TO	5	0.9%
10	QUEBEC TO HAVE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS	38	6.7%
11	QUEBEC TO HAVE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS, IN ASSOCIATION	33	5.9%
12	QUEBEC TO HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS	10	1.8%
13	QUEBEC TO HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS, IN ASSOCI	7	1.2%
14	QUEBEC TO HAVE SOME NEW RESPONSIBILITIES	2	0.4%
15	QUEBEC (QUEBEC GOVERNMENT) TRYING TO GET MORE CONTROL, RESP	5	0.9%
16	MORE INDEPENDENT, BUT ECONOMIC-ASSOCIATION	23	4.1%
17	QUEBEC TO HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER OWN ECONOMY	10	1.8%
20	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	3	0.5%
21	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF OTHER PROVINCES	0	
22	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF BOTH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND OTHER	0	
23	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF OTHERS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
30	PARTI QUEBECOIS, REFERENCES TO	3	0.5%
31	RENE LEVESQUE	2	0.4%

v1180: SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION MEANING1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
40	GENERAL POSITIVE REFERENCES	9	1.6%
41	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	68	12.1%
42	LEADING TO CHAOTIC SITUATION	1	0.2%
50	ASSOCIATION WITH CANADA	31	5.5%
51	ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER PROVINCES	32	5.7%
52	QUEBEC/CANADA BEING EQUALS	12	2.1%
53	ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION	6	1.1%
80	IT HAS NEVER BEEN MADE CLEAR	48	8.5%
81	OTHER	18	3.2%
99	NO ANSWER	11	2.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, NOT A QUEBEC RESPONDENT	2027	
88	DON'T KNOW	171	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1181: SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION MEANING2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=734 /-] [Invalid=2027 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.
Pre-question	Q31.1 THE QUEBEC GOVERNMENT WOULD LIKE TO NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION WITH THE REST OF CANADA. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
Literal question	Q31.2 (SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION) (SECOND RESPONSE)
Notes	Q31.1, Q31.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INDEPENDENCE	10	1.4%
2	SEPARATION, SEPARATISM	11	1.5%
3	SEPARATE STATE (ETAT)	10	1.4%
5	REFERENDUM, REFERENCES TO	1	0.1%
10	QUEBEC TO HAVE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS	14	1.9%
11	QUEBEC TO HAVE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS, IN ASSOCIATION	7	1.0%
12	QUEBEC TO HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS	1	0.1%
13	QUEBEC TO HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER ITS OWN AFFAIRS, IN ASSOCI	7	1.0%
14	QUEBEC TO HAVE SOME NEW RESPONSIBILITIES	1	0.1%
15	QUEBEC (QUEBEC GOVERNMENT) TRYING TO GET MORE CONTROL, RESP	2	0.3%
16	MORE INDEPENDENT, BUT ECONOMIC-ASSOCIATION	3	0.4%
17	QUEBEC TO HAVE MORE CONTROL OVER OWN ECONOMY	10	1.4%
20	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	4	0.5%
21	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF OTHER PROVINCES	3	0.4%
22	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF BOTH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND OTHER	1	0.1%
23	ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE OF OTHERS (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.3%
30	PARTI QUEBECOIS, REFERENCES TO	2	0.3%

v1181: SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION MEANING2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
31	RENE LEVESQUE	2	0.3%
40	GENERAL POSITIVE REFERENCES	8	1.1%
41	GENERAL NEGATIVE REFERENCES	40	5.4%
42	LEADING TO CHAOTIC SITUATION	2	0.3%
50	ASSOCIATION WITH CANADA	11	1.5%
51	ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER PROVINCES	27	3.7%
52	QUEBEC/CANADA BEING EQUALS	9	1.2%
53	ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION	10	1.4%
80	IT HAS NEVER BEEN MADE CLEAR	5	0.7%
81	OTHER	11	1.5%
99	NO SECOND MENTION	520	70.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, NOT A QUEBEC RESPONDENT	2027	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1182: RENEWED FEDERALISM MEANING1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=451 /-] [Invalid=2310 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.
Literal question	MANY PEOPLE THESE DAYS ARE TALKING ABOUT RENEWED FEDERALISM. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM-- RENEWED FEDERALISM-- IS MENTIONED? ANYTHING ELSE?
Notes	Q32.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CHANGE THE WAY THINGS ARE DONE (GENERAL)	46	10.2%
2	IMPROVE THE WAY THINGS ARE DONE (GENERAL)	37	8.2%
3	CHANGE NATURE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	22	4.9%
4	CHANGE NATURE OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
5	CANADIAN UNITY; NATIONAL UNITY (NEUTRAL)	6	1.3%
6	CANADIAN UNITY; NATIONAL UNITY (POSITIVE)	9	2.0%
7	CANADIAN UNITY; NATIONAL UNITY (NEGATIVE)	3	0.7%
10	CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION (GENERAL)	51	11.3%
11	IMPROVE THE CONSTITUTION (GENERAL)	20	4.4%
12	REPATRIATE THE CONSTITUTION	20	4.4%
15	PRODUCE A NEW DIVISION OF POWERS (GENERAL)	30	6.7%
16	MAKE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STRONGER	7	1.6%
17	MAKE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WEAKER	3	0.7%
18	ELIMINATE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
19	MAKE PROVINCES STRONGER	33	7.3%
20	MAKE PROVINCES WEAKER	0	
21	ELIMINATE PROVINCES	1	0.2%
25	ELIMINATE OVERLAPPING, REPETITION OF FUNCTIONS	2	0.4%
30	IDEA TO GIVE QUEBEC MORE POWER	5	1.1%
31	IDEA TO PROMOTE INDEPENDENCE/SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	6	1.3%
32	IDEA TO AVOID INDEPENDENCE/SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	5	1.1%

# v1182: RENEWED FEDERALISM MEANING1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	A SYSTEM TO KEEP QUEBEC; INTEGRATE QUEBEC INTO FEDERAL SYSTE	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
40	IDEA TO AVOID CHANGE	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
41	NO CHANGE, 'THE SAME OLD THING'	66	<div><div></div></div> 14.6%
80	IT HAS NEVER BEEN MADE CLEAR	31	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
81	OTHER	20	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
99	NO ANSWER, OR NO SECOND MENTION	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, NOT A QUEBEC RESPONDENT	2027	
88	DON'T KNOW	283	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1183: RENEWED FEDERALISM MEANING2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=734 /-] [Invalid=2027 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Literal question	WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE TERM RENEWED FEDERALISM IS MENTIONED?		
Notes	Q32.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CHANGE THE WAY THINGS ARE DONE (GENERAL)	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
2	IMPROVE THE WAY THINGS ARE DONE (GENERAL)	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
3	CHANGE NATURE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
4	CHANGE NATURE OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	CANADIAN UNITY; NATIONAL UNITY (NEUTRAL)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	CANADIAN UNITY; NATIONAL UNITY (POSITIVE)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
7	CANADIAN UNITY; NATIONAL UNITY (NEGATIVE)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
10	CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION (GENERAL)	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
11	IMPROVE THE CONSTITUTION (GENERAL)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
12	REPATRIATE THE CONSTITUTION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	PRODUCE A NEW DIVISION OF POWERS (GENERAL)	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
16	MAKE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STRONGER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
17	MAKE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WEAKER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
18	ELIMINATE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
19	MAKE PROVINCES STRONGER	19	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
20	MAKE PROVINCES WEAKER	0	
21	ELIMINATE PROVINCES	0	
25	ELIMINATE OVERLAPPING, REPETITION OF FUNCTIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
30	IDEA TO GIVE QUEBEC MORE POWER	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
31	IDEA TO PROMOTE INDEPENDENCE/SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
32	IDEA TO AVOID INDEPENDENCE/SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
33	A SYSTEM TO KEEP QUEBEC; INTEGRATE QUEBEC INTO FEDERAL SYSTE	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
40	IDEA TO AVOID CHANGE	0	
41	NO CHANGE, 'THE SAME OLD THING'	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
80	IT HAS NEVER BEEN MADE CLEAR	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

# v1183: RENEWED FEDERALISM MEANING2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	OTHER	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
99	NO ANSWER, OR NO SECOND MENTION	615	<div><div></div></div> 83.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, NOT A QUEBEC RESPONDENT	2027	
88	DON'T KNOW	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1184: QUEBEC OPTION:NO CHANGE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=673 /-] [Invalid=2088 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question	I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC.		
Literal question	AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) NO CHANGE.		
Notes	Q33A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	120	<div><div></div></div> 17.8%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	120	<div><div></div></div> 17.8%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	162	<div><div></div></div> 24.1%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	271	<div><div></div></div> 40.3%
0	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2027	
8	NO OPINION	61	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1185: QUEBEC OPTION:RENEWED FEDERALISM			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=461 /-] [Invalid=2300 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q33A. I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.		
Literal question	Q33B. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) RENEWED FEDERALISM.		
Notes	Q33A, Q33B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	126	<div><div></div></div> 27.3%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	153	<div><div></div></div> 33.2%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	101	<div><div></div></div> 21.9%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	81	<div><div></div></div> 17.6%
0	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2027	
8	NO OPINION	273	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1186: QUEBEC OPTION:SPECIAL STATUS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=488 /-] [Invalid=2273 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		

# v1186: QUEBEC OPTION:SPECIAL STATUS				
Pre-question		Q33A. I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.		
Literal question		Q33C. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) SPECIAL STATUS IN CONFEDERATION.		
Notes		Q33A, Q33C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	79	<div></div>	16.2%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	176	<div></div>	36.1%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	120	<div></div>	24.6%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	113	<div></div>	23.2%
0	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2027		
8	NO OPINION	246		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1187: QUEBEC OPTION:SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=517 /-] [Invalid=2244 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question		Q33A. I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.		
Literal question		Q33D. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION.		
Notes		Q33A, Q33D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	97	<div></div>	18.8%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	99	<div></div>	19.1%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	91	<div></div>	17.6%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	230	<div></div>	44.5%
0	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2027		
8	NO OPINION	217		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1188: QUEBEC OPTION:INDEPENDENCE				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=668 /-] [Invalid=2093 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question		Q33A. I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.		
Literal question		Q33E. (R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD) INDEPENDENCE.		
Notes		Q33A, Q33E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	56	<div></div>	8.4%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	57	<div></div>	8.5%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	88	<div></div>	13.2%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	467	<div></div>	69.9%
0	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2027		

# v1188: QUEBEC OPTION:INDEPENDENCE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	NO OPINION	66	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1189: REFERENDUM VOTE IF 'INDEPENDENCE'			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=651 /-] [Invalid=2110 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC IS PLANNING A REFERENDUM ON THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF QUEBEC. IF THE QUESTION IN THE REFERENDUM WERE TO BE "ARE YOU FOR INDEPENDENCE", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?		
Notes	Q34A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FOR	112	<div></div> 17.2%
2	AGAINST	539	<div></div> 82.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	D.K.	83	
9	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2010	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1190: REFERENDUM VOTE IF 'SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION'			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=513 /-] [Invalid=2248 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q34A. THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC IS PLANNING A REFERENDUM ON THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF QUEBEC. IF THE QUESTION IN THE REFERENDUM WERE TO BE "ARE YOU FOR INDEPENDENCE", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?		
Literal question	Q34B. IF THE QUESTION WERE TO BE "ARE YOU FOR SOVEREIGNTYASSOCIATION", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?		
Notes	Q34A, Q34B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FOR	201	<div></div> 39.2%
2	AGAINST	312	<div></div> 60.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	D.K.	214	
9	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2017	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1191: REFERENDUM VOTE:'NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION'			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=533 /-] [Invalid=2228 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q34A. THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC IS PLANNING A REFERENDUM ON THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF QUEBEC. IF THE QUESTION IN THE REFERENDUM WERE TO BE "ARE YOU FOR INDEPENDENCE", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?		
Literal question	Q34C. IF THE QUESTION WERE TO BE "DO YOU GIVE THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC A MANDATE TO NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION", WOULD YOU VOTE FOR OR AGAINST?		
Notes	Q34A, Q34C in the documentation.		

# v1191: REFERENDUM VOTE:'NEGOTIATE SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION'			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FOR	252	<div><div></div></div> 47.3%
2	AGAINST	281	<div><div></div></div> 52.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	D.K.	201	
9	INAP., NOT QUEBEC	2010	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1192: FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2491 /-] [Invalid=270 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		
Notes	Q35A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE, INDEPENDENT	297	<div><div></div></div> 11.9%
1	LIBERAL	1084	<div><div></div></div> 43.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	725	<div><div></div></div> 29.1%
3	N.D.P.	295	<div><div></div></div> 11.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	68	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
5	PC AND LIB	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	LIB AND N.D.P.	0	
7	OTHER	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
97	REFUSED	116	
98	D.K.	136	
99	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1193: FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2183 /-] [Invalid=578 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		
Literal question	Q35B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q35A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?		
Notes	Q35A, Q35B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	703	<div><div></div></div> 32.2%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	1119	<div><div></div></div> 51.3%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	361	<div><div></div></div> 16.5%
8	D.K.	11	
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 97 OR 98 IN Q35A	567	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			

# v1194: FEEL CLOSE TO PARTY?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=495 /-] [Invalid=2266 /-]		
Universe	Q36A asked only to respondents who "refused", or answered "don't know", "independent" or "none" for Q35A.		
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		
Literal question	Q36A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Notes	Q35A, Q36A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	REFUSED	46	<div><div></div></div> 9.3%
1	YES	164	<div><div></div></div> 33.1%
2	NO	285	<div><div></div></div> 57.6%
8	D.K.	55	
9	INAP., CODED 1 TO 3 OR 8 TO 9 IN Q35B.	2211	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1195: FEDERAL PARTY CLOSE TO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=162 /-] [Invalid=2599 /-]		
Universe	Q36B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q36A.		
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? ; Q36A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q36B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q35A, Q36A, Q36B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	REFUSED	31	<div><div></div></div> 19.1%
1	LIBERAL	52	<div><div></div></div> 32.1%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	43	<div><div></div></div> 26.5%
3	N.D.P.	31	<div><div></div></div> 19.1%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
5	PC AND LIB	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
6	LIB AND N.D.P.	0	
7	OTHER	0	
8	D.K.	0	
9	INAP, CODED 0 OR 2-9 IN Q.36A	2599	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1196: ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2642 /-] [Invalid=119 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?		
Notes	Q37A in the documentation.		

# v1196: ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	853	<div><div></div></div> 32.3%
2	NO	1789	<div><div></div></div> 67.7%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	60	
8	D.K.	59	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1197: PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=824 -/] [Invalid=1937 -/]		
Universe	Q37B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" to Q37A.		
Pre-question	Q37A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?		
Literal question	Q37B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q37A, Q37B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	383	<div><div></div></div> 46.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	213	<div><div></div></div> 25.8%
3	N.D.P./C.C.F.	171	<div><div></div></div> 20.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	54	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	LIBERAL AND P.C.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	41	
8	D.K., N.A.	6	
9	INAP., CODED 0,2 OR 8 IN 37A	1890	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1198: WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/8/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=656 -/] [Invalid=2105 -/]		
Universe	Q37C asked only to respondents who named a party in Q37A.		
Pre-question	Q37A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?		
Literal question	Q37C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?		
Notes	Q37A, Q37C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LAST ELECTION, MAY 22, 1979	182	<div><div></div></div> 27.7%
2	1978, LAST YEAR, 1 YEAR AGO	22	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
3	1976 - 1977, 2 OR 3 YEARS AGO	54	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
4	1974 - 1975, 4 OR 5 YEARS AGO	79	<div><div></div></div> 12.0%
5	1972 - 1973, 6 OR 7 YEARS AGO	43	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
6	1971 OR EARLIER, 8 OR MORE YEARS AGO	208	<div><div></div></div> 31.7%
7	SINCE THE LAST ELECTION, MAY 22, 1979	17	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
9	OTHER ANSWERS, TIME NOT SPECIFIED, UNABLE TO DETERMINE FROM	51	<div><div></div></div> 7.8%
0	DON,T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NOT SPECIFIED	126	

# v1198: WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	DON'T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NOT SPECIFIED	60	
99	INAP., CODED 0,7, TO 9 IN 37B	1919	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1199: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY:RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=771 /-] [Invalid=1990 /-]		
Universe	Q37D.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q37A, or refused to answer Q37B.		
Pre-question	Q37A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY? ; Q37B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q37D.1 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q37A, Q37B, Q37D.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	31	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	81	<div><div></div></div> 10.5%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	27	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	19	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
11	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
13	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
15	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
17	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
18	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	0	
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	32	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	21	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	14	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%

v1199: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY:RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	31	4.0%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	8	1.0%
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	5	0.6%
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	2	0.3%
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	3	0.4%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	17	2.2%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	70	9.1%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	9	1.2%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	16	2.1%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	7	0.9%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	11	1.4%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	4	0.5%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	1	0.1%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	6	0.8%
50	RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	2	0.3%
51	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	40	5.2%
52	"THE MAN"	14	1.8%
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL"	59	7.7%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	3	0.4%
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH/NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	11	1.4%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH /NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	10	1.3%
58	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	2	0.3%
59	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	1	0.1%
60	RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
61	WANTED MINORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
62	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED/NO ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY/ DEPENDS	55	7.1%
63	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. & LIBERAL	2	0.3%
64	MISCELLANEOUS N.D.P.	1	0.1%
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	81	
99	INAP., CODED 0,2, OR 8 IN Q37A	1909	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1200: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY:RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=789 /-] [Invalid=1972 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	REASON FOR CHANGING PARTISANSHIP. (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q37D.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	686	86.9%
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	2	0.3%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	5	0.6%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	2	0.3%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	1	0.1%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	4	0.5%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
11	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
13	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	2	0.3%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
15	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	2	0.3%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	0	
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	2	0.3%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	6	0.8%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	3	0.4%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	2	0.3%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	3	0.4%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	1	0.1%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	0	
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	2	0.3%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	6	0.8%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	0.3%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	0.3%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	1	0.1%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	0.1%
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	0	

# v1200: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY:RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	2	0.3%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	15	1.9%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	3	0.4%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	3	0.4%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	2	0.3%
50	RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
51	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	4	0.5%
52	"THE MAN"	0	
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL"	13	1.6%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH/NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	2	0.3%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH /NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	0	
58	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	0	
59	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	1	0.1%
60	RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
61	WANTED MINORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
62	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED/NO ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY/ DEPENDS	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. & LIBERAL	0	
64	MISCELLANEOUS N.D.P.	0	
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 0,2, OR 8 IN Q37A	1972	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1201: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY PREFERENCE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2220 /-] [Invalid=541 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		

# v1201: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY PREFERENCE?			
Notes		Q38A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1605	<div><div></div></div> 72.3%
2	NO	615	<div><div></div></div> 27.7%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	41	
8	D.K.	500	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1202: FATHER FED PARTY ID			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1537 /-] [Invalid=1224 /-]	
Universe		Q38B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q38A.	
Pre-question		Q38A. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?	
Literal question		Q38B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?	
Notes		Q38A, Q38B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	820	<div><div></div></div> 53.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	570	<div><div></div></div> 37.1%
3	N.D.P./C.C.F.	107	<div><div></div></div> 7.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	39	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
5	COMMUNIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	REFUSED	40	
8	D.K.	46	
9	INAP., CODED 0,2 OR 8 IN 38A	1138	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1203: FATHER FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1504 /-] [Invalid=1257 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q38A. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?	
Literal question		Q38C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q38B) WAS HE THEN?	
Notes		Q38A, Q38C in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONG	823	<div><div></div></div> 54.7%
2	FAIRLY STRONG	567	<div><div></div></div> 37.7%
3	NOT VERY STRONG	114	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
8	D.K.	33	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 8 OR 9 IN 38B	1224	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1204: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY PREFERENCE?			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2209 /-] [Invalid=552 /-]	

# v1204: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY PREFERENCE?			
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q39A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q39A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1256	<div><div></div></div> 56.9%
2	NO	953	<div><div></div></div> 43.1%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	39	
8	D.K.	513	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1205: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1201 /-] [Invalid=1560 /-]		
Universe	Q39B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q39A.		
Pre-question	Q39A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Literal question	Q39B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q39A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	658	<div><div></div></div> 54.8%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	440	<div><div></div></div> 36.6%
3	N.D.P./C.C.F.	70	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	32	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
5	COMMUNIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	41	
8	D.K.	32	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 2 OR 8 IN 39A	1487	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1206: MOTHER FEDERAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1179 /-] [Invalid=1582 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q39A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA?		
Literal question	Q39C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY MENTIONED IN Q39B) WAS SHE THEN?		
Notes	Q39A, Q39C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONG	531	<div><div></div></div> 45.0%
2	FAIRLY STRONG	501	<div><div></div></div> 42.5%
3	NOT VERY STRONG	147	<div><div></div></div> 12.5%
8	D.K.	22	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 8 OR 9 IN 39B	1560	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1207: PARENTS' INTEREST: FEDERAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2429 /-] [Invalid=332 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN FEDERAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED, SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?		
Notes	Q40 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	776	<div><div></div></div> 31.9%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	1280	<div><div></div></div> 52.7%
3	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	373	<div><div></div></div> 15.4%
8	D.K.	314	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1208: PARENTS WORK IN CAMPAIGN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2443 /-] [Invalid=318 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOUR MOTHER OR FATHER EVER WORK ACTIVELY FOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR CANDIDATE HERE IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q40B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	446	<div><div></div></div> 18.3%
2	NO	1997	<div><div></div></div> 81.7%
8	D.K.	300	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1209: DID R HAVE CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1342 /-] [Invalid=1419 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		
Notes	Q41A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	575	<div><div></div></div> 42.8%
2	NO	767	<div><div></div></div> 57.2%
8	D.K.	11	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1210: WHICH PARTY CONTACTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=563 /-] [Invalid=2198 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Q41B asked only to respondents who have been contacted by party workers.		

# v1210: WHICH PARTY CONTACTED				
Pre-question		Q41A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		
Literal question		Q41B. WHICH ONES? (PROBE) ANY OTHERS?		
Notes		Q41A, Q41B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	CONTACTED BUT NOT BY PARTY WORKERS	33	<div></div>	5.9%
1	LIBERAL ONLY	96	<div></div>	17.1%
2	P.C. ONLY	95	<div></div>	16.9%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	52	<div></div>	9.2%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	9	<div></div>	1.6%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	107	<div></div>	19.0%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	18	<div></div>	3.2%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	2	<div></div>	0.4%
8	LIBERAL & P.C. & N.D.P.	101	<div></div>	17.9%
9	LIBERAL & P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div></div>	0.2%
10	LIBERAL & N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div></div>	0.2%
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	16	<div></div>	2.8%
12	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
13	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	2	<div></div>	0.4%
14	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
15	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0		
16	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	2	<div></div>	0.4%
17	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	0		
18	LIB. & OTHER	1	<div></div>	0.2%
19	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	1	<div></div>	0.2%
20	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0		
21	P.C. & N.D.P.	21	<div></div>	3.7%
22	P.C. & S.C.	1	<div></div>	0.2%
23	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0		
24	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0		
25	N.D.P. & S.C.	1	<div></div>	0.2%
26	COMMUNIST ONLY	0		
27	OTHER ONLY (LIST) - INDEPENDENT, RHINOCEROS, LIBERTARIAN, M	2	<div></div>	0.4%
28	P.C. & COMMUNIST	1	<div></div>	0.2%
29	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0		
30	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
88	D.K.	13		
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q41A OR HALF SAMPLE 1	2185		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1211: WHICH PARTY CANDIDATE CONTACTED				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=562 /-] [Invalid=2199 /-]		
Universe		Q41C asked only to respondents who were contacted by candidates.		
Pre-question		Q41A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		

# v1211: WHICH PARTY CANDIDATE CONTACTED				
Literal question		Q41C. WHICH PARTY WAS HE/SHE (WERE THEY)?		
Notes		Q41A, Q41C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	CONTACTED BUT NOT BY CANDIDATES	394	<div></div>	70.1%
1	LIBERAL ONLY	40	<div></div>	7.1%
2	P.C. ONLY	56	<div></div>	10.0%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	10	<div></div>	1.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	3	<div></div>	0.5%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	30	<div></div>	5.3%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	5	<div></div>	0.9%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	2	<div></div>	0.4%
8	LIBERAL & P.C. & N.D.P.	14	<div></div>	2.5%
9	LIBERAL & P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0		
10	LIBERAL & N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0		
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0		
12	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
13	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	0		
14	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
15	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0		
16	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0		
17	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	0		
18	LIB. & OTHER	1	<div></div>	0.2%
19	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	0		
20	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0		
21	P.C. & N.D.P.	7	<div></div>	1.2%
22	P.C. & S.C.	0		
23	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0		
24	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0		
25	N.D.P. & S.C.	0		
26	COMMUNIST ONLY	0		
27	OTHER ONLY (LIST) - INDEPENDENT, RHINOCEROS, LIBERTARIAN, M	0		
28	P.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
29	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0		
30	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0		
88	D.K.	1		
99	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN Q41A OR HALF SAMPLE 1	2198		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1212: OTHER CAMPAIGN CONTACT				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1331 /-] [Invalid=1430 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question		WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Notes		Q42A in the documentation.		

# v1212: OTHER CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1082	<div><div></div></div> 81.3%
2	NO	249	<div><div></div></div> 18.7%
8	D.K.	22	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1213: WHICH PARTY CONTACTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1032 /-] [Invalid=1729 /-]		
Universe	Q42B asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who were indirectly contacted by candidates.		
Pre-question	Q42A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Literal question	Q42B. WHICH PARTY OR PARTIES?		
Notes	Q42A, Q42B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CONTACTED BUT NOT BY PARTY WORKERS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
1	LIBERAL ONLY	80	<div><div></div></div> 7.8%
2	P.C. ONLY	65	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	26	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	202	<div><div></div></div> 19.6%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	22	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
8	LIBERAL & P.C. & N.D.P.	401	<div><div></div></div> 38.9%
9	LIBERAL & P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	35	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
10	LIBERAL & N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	120	<div><div></div></div> 11.6%
12	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
13	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
14	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
15	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
16	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
17	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
18	LIB. & OTHER	0	
19	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
20	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
21	P.C. & N.D.P.	30	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
22	P.C. & S.C.	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
23	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
24	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
25	N.D.P. & S.C.	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
26	COMMUNIST ONLY	0	
27	OTHER ONLY (LIST) - INDEPENDENT, RHINOCEROS, LIBERTARIAN, M	0	
28	P.C. & COMMUNIST	0	

# v1213: WHICH PARTY CONTACTED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	2	0.2%
30	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	1	0.1%
88	D.K.	51	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q42A OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1678	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1214: HOW CONTACTED?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1078 /-] [Invalid=1683 /-]		
Universe	Q42C asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who were contacted in other ways during the campaign.		
Pre-question	Q42A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Literal question	Q42C. HOW DID THEY CONTACT YOU?		
Notes	Q42A, Q42C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MAIL ONLY (ANY LITERATURE LEFT AT DOOR OR IN MAILBOX = MAIL	852	79.0%
2	PHONE ONLY	37	3.4%
3	MAIL AND PHONE	189	17.5%
8	D.K.	4	
9	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q42A OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1679	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1215: ASKED FOR CONTRIBUTION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1046 /-] [Invalid=1715 /-]		
Universe	Q42D asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who were contacted in other ways during the campaign.		
Pre-question	Q42A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Literal question	Q42D. DID ANY OF THEM ASK FOR A CONTRIBUTION?		
Notes	Q42A, Q42D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	100	9.6%
2	NO	946	90.4%
8	D.K.	36	
9	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q42A OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1679	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1216: CAMPAIGN IN NEWSPAPER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1348 /-] [Invalid=1413 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU READ QUITE A BIT, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL ABOUT THE PARTIES, CANDIDATES, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q43A in the documentation.		

v1216: CAMPAIGN IN NEWSPAPER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A BIT	539	<div><div></div></div> 40.0%
2	SOMETHING	475	<div><div></div></div> 35.2%
3	NOT MUCH	334	<div><div></div></div> 24.8%
8	D.K.	5	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1408	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1217: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Literal question	WHICH NEWSPAPERS DO YOU READ REGULARLY?
Notes	Q43B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE READ REGULARLY	134	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
1	ALBERTAN - CALGARY, ALTA.	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
2	HERALD - CALGARY, ALTA.	30	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
3	EDMONTON SUN - EDMONTON, ALTA.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	JOURNAL - EDMONTON, ALTA.	19	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
5	SUN - VANCOUVER, B.C.	48	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
6	PROVINCE - VANCOUVER, B.C.	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
7	COLONIST - VICTORIA, B.C.	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
8	TIMES - VICTORIA, B.C.	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
9	TRIBUNE - WINNIPEG, MAN.	20	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
10	FREE PRESS - WINNIPEG, MAN.	25	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
11	GLEANER - FREDERICTON, N.B.	0	
12	L'EVANGELINE - MONCTON, N.B.	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
13	TIMES - MONCTON, N.B.	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
14	TRANSCRIPT - MONCTON, N.B.	0	
15	TELEGRAPH-JOURNAL - SAINT JOHN & LANCASTER, N.B.	18	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
16	TIMES-GLOBE - SAINT JOHN & LANCASTER, N.B.	18	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
17	THE DAILY NEWS - ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
18	TELEGRAM - ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
19	CHRONICLE-HERALD - HALIFAX, N.S.	42	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
20	MAIL-STAR - HALIFAX, N.S.	27	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
21	CAPE BRETON POST - SYDNEY, N.S.	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
22	SPECTATOR - HAMILTON, ONTARIO	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
23	WHIG-STANDARD - KINGSTON, ONTARIO	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
24	KITCHENER-WATERLOO RECORD - KITCHENER, ONT.	16	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
25	FREE PRESS - LONDON, ONT.	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
26	OSHAWA TIMES - OSHAWA, ONT.	0	
27	CITIZEN - OTTAWA, ONT.	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
28	LE DROIT - OTTAWA, ONT.	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
29	JOURNAL - OTTAWA, ONT.	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
30	EXAMINER - PETERBOROUGH, ONT.	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%

v1217: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
31	STANDARD - ST. CATHARINES, ONT.	0	
32	SUDBURY STAR - SUDBURY, ONT.	4	0.3%
33	TIMES-NEWS - THUNDER BAY, ONT.	1	0.1%
34	CHRONICLE-JOURNAL - THUNDER BAY, ONT.	8	0.6%
35	THE GLOBE AND MAIL - TORONTO, ONT.	45	3.3%
36	TORONTO STAR - TORONTO, ONT.	102	7.5%
37	THE TORONTO SUN - TORONTO, ONT.	31	2.3%
38	WINDSOR STAR - WINDSOR, ONT.	15	1.1%
39	GUARDIAN OR PATRIOT(2 PAPERS) - CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.	42	3.1%
40	JOURNAL-PIONEER - SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.	13	1.0%
41	LE DEVOIR - MONTREAL, QUE.	14	1.0%
42	GAZETTE - MONTREAL, QUE.	29	2.1%
43	LE JOURNAL DE MONTREAL - MONTREAL, QUE.	48	3.5%
44	MONTREAL MATIN - MONTREAL, QUE.	2	0.1%
45	LA PRESSE - MONTREAL, QUE.	56	4.1%
46	MONTREAL STAR - MONTREAL, QUE.	12	0.9%
47	LE JOURNAL DE QUEBEC - QUEBEC CITY, QUE.	21	1.6%
48	LE SOLEIL - QUEBEC CITY, QUE.	42	3.1%
49	RECORD - SHERBROOKE, QUE.	0	
50	LA TRIBUNE - SHERBROOKE, QUE.	17	1.3%
51	LE NOUVELLISTE - TROIS-RIVIERES, QUE.	23	1.7%
52	LEADER-POST - REGINA, SASK.	17	1.3%
53	STAR-PHOENIX - SASKATOON, SASK.	20	1.5%
54	FINANCIAL POST	5	0.4%
81	ALL OTHER LOCAL DAILY	120	8.9%
82	ALL OTHER CANADIAN DAILY (ENG. OR FRENCH) I.E. DAILY RACING	0	
83	ALL WEEKLY (ENGLISH) PUBLISHED IN CANADA	100	7.4%
84	ALL WEEKLY (FRENCH) PUBLISHED IN CANADA	29	2.1%
85	ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGES (DAILY, BI-WEEKLY) - PUBLISHED IN CAN	1	0.1%
86	ALL U.S.A.	0	
87	ALL U.K.	0	
88	ALL OTHER FOREIGN	2	0.1%
89	ALL OTHER	0	
99	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1407	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1218: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Literal question	WHICH NEWSPAPERS DO YOU READ REGULARLY?
Notes	Q43B.2 in the documentation.

v1218: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	857	63.3%
1	ALBERTAN - CALGARY, ALTA.	9	0.7%
2	HERALD - CALGARY, ALTA.	5	0.4%
3	EDMONTON SUN - EDMONTON, ALTA.	1	0.1%
4	JOURNAL - EDMONTON, ALTA.	1	0.1%
5	SUN - VANCOUVER, B.C.	7	0.5%
6	PROVINCE - VANCOUVER, B.C.	12	0.9%
7	COLONIST - VICTORIA, B.C.	0	
8	TIMES - VICTORIA, B.C.	0	
9	TRIBUNE - WINNIPEG, MAN.	7	0.5%
10	FREE PRESS - WINNIPEG, MAN.	4	0.3%
11	GLENER - FREDERICTON, N.B.	0	
12	L'EVANGELINE - MONCTON, N.B.	0	
13	TIMES - MONCTON, N.B.	2	0.1%
14	TRANSCRIPT - MONCTON, N.B.	1	0.1%
15	TELEGRAPH-JOURNAL - SAINT JOHN & LANCASTER, N.B.	7	0.5%
16	TIMES-GLOBE - SAINT JOHN & LANCASTER, N.B.	4	0.3%
17	THE DAILY NEWS - ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.	4	0.3%
18	TELEGRAM - ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.	4	0.3%
19	CHRONICLE-HERALD - HALIFAX, N.S.	5	0.4%
20	MAIL-STAR - HALIFAX, N.S.	7	0.5%
21	CAPE BRETON POST - SYDNEY, N.S.	1	0.1%
22	SPECTATOR - HAMILTON, ONTARIO	1	0.1%
23	WHIG-STANDARD - KINGSTON, ONTARIO	1	0.1%
24	KITCHENER-WATERLOO RECORD - KITCHENER, ONT.	1	0.1%
25	FREE PRESS - LONDON, ONT.	6	0.4%
26	OSHAWA TIMES - OSHAWA, ONT.	2	0.1%
27	CITIZEN - OTTAWA, ONT.	1	0.1%
28	LE DROIT - OTTAWA, ONT.	1	0.1%
29	JOURNAL - OTTAWA, ONT.	3	0.2%
30	EXAMINER - PETERBOROUGH, ONT.	1	0.1%
31	STANDARD - ST. CATHARINES, ONT.	0	
32	SUDBURY STAR - SUDBURY, ONT.	0	
33	TIMES-NEWS - THUNDER BAY, ONT.	1	0.1%
34	CHRONICLE-JOURNAL - THUNDER BAY, ONT.	2	0.1%
35	THE GLOBE AND MAIL - TORONTO, ONT.	26	1.9%
36	TORONTO STAR - TORONTO, ONT.	32	2.4%
37	THE TORONTO SUN - TORONTO, ONT.	25	1.8%
38	WINDSOR STAR - WINDSOR, ONT.	0	
39	GUARDIAN OR PATRIOT(2 PAPERS) - CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.	2	0.1%
40	JOURNAL-PIONEER - SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.	6	0.4%
41	LE DEVOIR - MONTREAL, QUE.	13	1.0%
42	GAZETTE - MONTREAL, QUE.	11	0.8%
43	LE JOURNAL DE MONTREAL - MONTREAL, QUE.	24	1.8%

# v1218: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	MONTREAL MATIN - MONTREAL, QUE.	3	0.2%
45	LA PRESSE - MONTREAL, QUE.	21	1.6%
46	MONTREAL STAR - MONTREAL, QUE.	16	1.2%
47	LE JOURNAL DE QUEBEC - QUEBEC CITY, QUE.	17	1.3%
48	LE SOLEIL - QUEBEC CITY, QUE.	7	0.5%
49	RECORD - SHERBROOKE, QUE.	0	
50	LA TRIBUNE - SHERBROOKE, QUE.	2	0.1%
51	LE NOUVELLISTE - TROIS-RIVIERES, QUE.	1	0.1%
52	LEADER-POST - REGINA, SASK.	4	0.3%
53	STAR-PHOENIX - SASKATOON, SASK.	3	0.2%
54	FINANCIAL POST	8	0.6%
81	ALL OTHER LOCAL DAILY	21	1.6%
82	ALL OTHER CANADIAN DAILY (ENG. OR FRENCH) I.E. DAILY RACING	1	0.1%
83	ALL WEEKLY (ENGLISH) PUBLISHED IN CANADA	107	7.9%
84	ALL WEEKLY (FRENCH) PUBLISHED IN CANADA	37	2.7%
85	ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGES (DAILY, BI-WEEKLY) - PUBLISHED IN CAN	0	
86	ALL U.S.A.	2	0.1%
87	ALL U.K.	1	0.1%
88	ALL OTHER FOREIGN	6	0.4%
89	ALL OTHER	0	
99	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1407	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1219: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHICH NEWSPAPERS DO YOU READ REGULARLY?		
Notes	Q43B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	1238	91.4%
1	ALBERTAN - CALGARY, ALTA.	1	0.1%
2	HERALD - CALGARY, ALTA.	0	
3	EDMONTON SUN - EDMONTON, ALTA.	1	0.1%
4	JOURNAL - EDMONTON, ALTA.	2	0.1%
5	SUN - VANCOUVER, B.C.	0	
6	PROVINCE - VANCOUVER, B.C.	2	0.1%
7	COLONIST - VICTORIA, B.C.	0	
8	TIMES - VICTORIA, B.C.	0	
9	TRIBUNE - WINNIPEG, MAN.	0	
10	FREE PRESS - WINNIPEG, MAN.	1	0.1%
11	GLEANER - FREDERICTON, N.B.	0	
12	L'EVANGELINE - MONCTON, N.B.	1	0.1%
13	TIMES - MONCTON, N.B.	0	

v1219: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	TRANSCRIPT - MONCTON, N.B.	0	
15	TELEGRAPH-JOURNAL - SAINT JOHN & LANCASTER, N.B.	0	
16	TIMES-GLOBE - SAINT JOHN & LANCASTER, N.B.	0	
17	THE DAILY NEWS - ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.	0	
18	TELEGRAM - ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.	0	
19	CHRONICLE-HERALD - HALIFAX, N.S.	2	0.1%
20	MAIL-STAR - HALIFAX, N.S.	0	
21	CAPE BRETON POST - SYDNEY, N.S.	0	
22	SPECTATOR - HAMILTON, ONTARIO	1	0.1%
23	WHIG-STANDARD - KINGSTON, ONTARIO	0	
24	KITCHENER-WATERLOO RECORD - KITCHENER, ONT.	0	
25	FREE PRESS - LONDON, ONT.	0	
26	OSHAWA TIMES - OSHAWA, ONT.	0	
27	CITIZEN - OTTAWA, ONT.	1	0.1%
28	LE DROIT - OTTAWA, ONT.	0	
29	JOURNAL - OTTAWA, ONT.	0	
30	EXAMINER - PETERBOROUGH, ONT.	0	
31	STANDARD - ST. CATHARINES, ONT.	0	
32	SUDBURY STAR - SUDBURY, ONT.	0	
33	TIMES-NEWS - THUNDER BAY, ONT.	0	
34	CHRONICLE-JOURNAL - THUNDER BAY, ONT.	1	0.1%
35	THE GLOBE AND MAIL - TORONTO, ONT.	4	0.3%
36	TORONTO STAR - TORONTO, ONT.	3	0.2%
37	THE TORONTO SUN - TORONTO, ONT.	9	0.7%
38	WINDSOR STAR - WINDSOR, ONT.	0	
39	GUARDIAN OR PATRIOT(2 PAPERS) - CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.	0	
40	JOURNAL-PIONEER - SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.	0	
41	LE DEVOIR - MONTREAL, QUE.	5	0.4%
42	GAZETTE - MONTREAL, QUE.	7	0.5%
43	LE JOURNAL DE MONTREAL - MONTREAL, QUE.	2	0.1%
44	MONTREAL MATIN - MONTREAL, QUE.	2	0.1%
45	LA PRESSE - MONTREAL, QUE.	5	0.4%
46	MONTREAL STAR - MONTREAL, QUE.	4	0.3%
47	LE JOURNAL DE QUEBEC - QUEBEC CITY, QUE.	1	0.1%
48	LE SOLEIL - QUEBEC CITY, QUE.	0	
49	RECORD - SHERBROOKE, QUE.	0	
50	LA TRIBUNE - SHERBROOKE, QUE.	1	0.1%
51	LE NOUVELLISTE - TROIS-RIVIERES, QUE.	0	
52	LEADER-POST - REGINA, SASK.	0	
53	STAR-PHOENIX - SASKATOON, SASK.	0	
54	FINANCIAL POST	8	0.6%
81	ALL OTHER LOCAL DAILY	10	0.7%
82	ALL OTHER CANADIAN DAILY (ENG. OR FRENCH) I.E. DAILY RACING	0	
83	ALL WEEKLY (ENGLISH) PUBLISHED IN CANADA	26	1.9%

v1219: WHICH PAPER READ: RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
84	ALL WEEKLY (FRENCH) PUBLISHED IN CANADA	13	1.0%
85	ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGES (DAILY, BI-WEEKLY) - PUBLISHED IN CAN	1	0.1%
86	ALL U.S.A.	1	0.1%
87	ALL U.K.	0	
88	ALL OTHER FOREIGN	0	
89	ALL OTHER	1	0.1%
99	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1407	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1220: CAMPAIGN ON TELEVISION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1346 /-] [Invalid=1415 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT TELEVISION? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAGIGN DID YOU WATCH PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?		
Notes	Q44A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A FEW	573	<div><div></div></div> 42.6%
2	SOME	493	<div><div></div></div> 36.6%
3	ALMOST NONE	280	<div><div></div></div> 20.8%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	21	
8	D.K.	4	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1221: WATCH LEADER TV DEBATES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1331 /-] [Invalid=1430 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DID YOU SEE THE DEBATES BETWEEN THE PARTY LEADERS ON TELEVISION ON SUNDAY, MAY 13TH?		
Notes	Q44B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	687	<div><div></div></div> 51.6%
2	NO	644	<div><div></div></div> 48.4%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	20	
8	D.K.	20	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1222: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=644 /-] [Invalid=2117 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who saw the debate.		
Pre-question	Q44B. DID YOU SEE THE DEBATES BETWEEN THE PARTY LEADERS ON TELEVISION ON SUNDAY, MAY 13TH?		
Literal question	Q44C.1. WHAT WERE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE DEBATES, IN GENERAL?		
Notes	Q44B, Q44C.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LIKE, IT WAS GOOD, QUITE GOOD, FAIRLY GOOD; ENJOYED	100	<div><div></div></div> 15.5%
2	VERY GOOD, VERY GOOD DEBATE	44	<div><div></div></div> 6.8%
3	INTERESTING	39	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
4	IT WAS INFORMATIVE	24	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
5	THEY WERE ALL GOOD SPEAKERS, ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL	15	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%

v1222: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	IT DIDN'T INFLUENCE ME / SWAY ME	14	<div></div> 2.2%
7	ALL ALIKE, CAME OUT EVEN, NO CLEAR WINNER	8	<div></div> 1.2%
8	GOOD CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSION	4	<div></div> 0.6%
9	IT WAS AMUSING, FUNNY	7	<div></div> 1.1%
10	GENERAL DISLIKE, POOR DEBATE	21	<div></div> 3.3%
11	VERY POOR DEBATE, VERY BAD, A DISASTER	11	<div></div> 1.7%
12	DISAPPOINTED, NOT IMPRESSED	49	<div></div> 7.6%
13	IT WAS A WASTE OF TIME, DIDN'T PROVE A THING	21	<div></div> 3.3%
14	IT WAS SILLY, CHILDISH, A BIG JOKE	17	<div></div> 2.6%
15	TOO MUCH FIGHTING / CONTROVERSY / ARGUMENTATIVE	20	<div></div> 3.1%
16	TOO MUCH SHOWMANSHIP, LIKE A T.V. SHOW	8	<div></div> 1.2%
17	NOT INFORMATIVE ENOUGH, DIDN'T CLARIFY ANY ISSUES, TOO EVASI	15	<div></div> 2.3%
18	IT WASN'T LONG ENOUGH, THEY DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH TIME	2	<div></div> 0.3%
19	TOO PERSONAL, TOO MUCH IN OWN INTEREST	3	<div></div> 0.5%
20	POORLY HANDLED BY T.V.	3	<div></div> 0.5%
21	MADE A LOT OF PROMISES	1	<div></div> 0.2%
22	THEY HANDLED THEMSELVES WELL, SELF-CONTROL	2	<div></div> 0.3%
23	WELL-HANDLED BY C.B.C.	0	
31	SHOWED P.C.'S AND LIBS ARE MORE ALIKE	0	
32	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN CLARK AND TRUDEAU MOST	3	<div></div> 0.5%
33	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN CLARK AND BROADBENT MOST	1	<div></div> 0.2%
34	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN TRUDEAU AND BROADBENT MOST	2	<div></div> 0.3%
35	CLARK WON, WAS BEST, OUTSTANDING	6	<div></div> 0.9%
36	CLARK DID VERY WELL, BETTER THAN EXPECTED	18	<div></div> 2.8%
37	CLARK WAS GOOD	6	<div></div> 0.9%
38	CLARK SEEMED TO SAY MORE, BROUGHT MOST OUT	0	
39	CLARK ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL, STOOD UP TO THE QUESTIONS WEL	3	<div></div> 0.5%
40	CLARK SEEMED AGGRESSIVE	0	
41	CLARK LOOKED MORE HONEST	1	<div></div> 0.2%
44	CLARK - FELT SORRY FOR HIM	1	<div></div> 0.2%
45	CLARK WAS TERRIBLE, HE LOST, REALLY BUNGLED	12	<div></div> 1.9%
46	CLARK - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM, DISAPPOINTED IN HIM	12	<div></div> 1.9%
47	CLARK'S LAUGHING, SNICKERING, SMERK ON HIS FACE, PHYSICALLY	2	<div></div> 0.3%
48	CLARK WAS NERVOUS, STAMMERED	1	<div></div> 0.2%
49	CLARK WAS WEAK, UNDECISIVE, CONTRADICTORY	4	<div></div> 0.6%
50	CLARK WAS A CHILD	1	<div></div> 0.2%
51	CLARK STATED PROPOSALS BUT NOTHING SOLID HE WOULD DO ABOUT I	1	<div></div> 0.2%
52	CLARK - NO LEADER	0	

# v1222: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	CLARK NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	0	
54	CLARK POOR SPEAKER	2	0.3%
55	TRUDEAU WON, STOLE THE SHOW, THE BEST, HAD UPPER HAND	34	5.3%
56	TRUDEAU DID VERY WELL	6	0.9%
57	TRUDEAU MADE A GOOD IMPRESSION, WAS GOOD	8	1.2%
58	TRUDEAU WAS SMOOTH, CHARMING, HANDLED HIMSELF WELL	4	0.6%
59	TRUDEAU ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL	0	
60	TRUDEAU MORE INTELLIGENT	1	0.2%
61	TRUDEAU MORE EXPERIENCED, MORE CONFIDENT	2	0.3%
62	TRUDEAU SPEAKS WELL	4	0.6%
65	TRUDEAU - LOST	3	0.5%
66	TRUDEAU - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM, DISAPPOINTED IN HIM	3	0.5%
67	TRUDEAU TRIED TO BE TOO SMART, TRICKY QUESTIONS, TOO ARROGAN	6	0.9%
68	TRUDEAU TOO AGGRESSIVE	0	
69	TRUDEAU - WAS VERY LOW KEY FOR HIM	2	0.3%
70	TRUDEAU NO LEADER (CAN'T EVEN MANAGE HIS WIFE)	0	
71	TRUDEAU WAS IGNORANT	0	
75	BROADBENT/N.D.P. WON, WAS BEST	29	4.5%
76	BROADBENT WAS VERY GOOD, IMPRESSED ME	17	2.6%
77	BROADBENT WAS GOOD	5	0.8%
78	BROADBENT SPOKE WELL, GOOD SPEECH	2	0.3%
79	BROADBENT STRONGEST ON PLATFORM, ISSUES	8	1.2%
80	BROADBENT INTELLIGENT, "DIDN'T REALIZE HE HAD SO MUCH ON THE	1	0.2%
81	BROADBENT WAS MORE NATURAL / CALM	1	0.2%
85	BROADBENT LOST	0	
86	BROADBENT SIDED WITH TRUDEAU	2	0.3%
87	BROADBENT - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM	1	0.2%
89	BROADBENT DIDN'T SPEAK WELL	0	
90	BROADBENT SEEMED UNSURE OF HIMSELF	1	0.2%
91	BROADBENT TOO EMOTIONAL	0	
92	BROADBENT - DON'T CARE FOR HIS PRINCIPLES	0	
97	DON'T REMEMBER, DON'T KNOW	25	
99	INAP., CODED 0,2, 8 OR 9 IN 44B, NO IMPRESSIONS	2092	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1223: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=645 /-] [Invalid=2116 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who saw the debate.		
Pre-question	Q44B. DID YOU SEE THE DEBATES BETWEEN THE PARTY LEADERS ON TELEVISION ON SUNDAY, MAY 13TH?		
Literal question	Q44C.2 WHAT WERE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE DEBATES, IN GENERAL? (SECOND MENTION)		

v1223: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 2

Notes

Q44B, Q44C.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	285	44.2%
1	GENERAL LIKE, IT WAS GOOD, QUITE GOOD, FAIRLY GOOD; ENJOYED	10	1.6%
2	VERY GOOD, VERY GOOD DEBATE	4	0.6%
3	INTERESTING	7	1.1%
4	IT WAS INFORMATIVE	25	3.9%
5	THEY WERE ALL GOOD SPEAKERS, ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL	16	2.5%
6	IT DIDN'T INFLUENCE ME / SWAY ME	15	2.3%
7	ALL ALIKE, CAME OUT EVEN, NO CLEAR WINNER	8	1.2%
8	GOOD CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSION	9	1.4%
9	IT WAS AMUSING, FUNNY	1	0.2%
10	GENERAL DISLIKE, POOR DEBATE	5	0.8%
11	VERY POOR DEBATE, VERY BAD, A DISASTER	0	
12	DISAPPOINTED, NOT IMPRESSED	5	0.8%
13	IT WAS A WASTE OF TIME, DIDN'T PROVE A THING	19	2.9%
14	IT WAS SILLY, CHILDISH, A BIG JOKE	8	1.2%
15	TOO MUCH FIGHTING / CONTROVERSY / ARGUMENTATIVE	15	2.3%
16	TOO MUCH SHOWMANSHIP, LIKE A T.V. SHOW	5	0.8%
17	NOT INFORMATIVE ENOUGH, DIDN'T CLARIFY ANY ISSUES, TOO EVASI	14	2.2%
18	IT WASN'T LONG ENOUGH, THEY DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH TIME	4	0.6%
19	TOO PERSONAL, TOO MUCH IN OWN INTEREST	5	0.8%
20	POORLY HANDLED BY T.V.	2	0.3%
21	MADE A LOT OF PROMISES	0	
22	THEY HANDLED THEMSELVES WELL, SELF-CONTROL	2	0.3%
23	WELL-HANDLED BY C.B.C.	1	0.2%
31	SHOWED P.C.'S AND LIBS ARE MORE ALIKE	0	
32	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN CLARK AND TRUDEAU MOST	0	
33	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN CLARK AND BROADBENT MOST	1	0.2%
34	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN TRUDEAU AND BROADBENT MOST	1	0.2%
35	CLARK WON, WAS BEST, OUTSTANDING	4	0.6%
36	CLARK DID VERY WELL, BETTER THAN EXPECTED	5	0.8%
37	CLARK WAS GOOD	5	0.8%
38	CLARK SEEMED TO SAY MORE, BROUGHT MOST OUT	2	0.3%
39	CLARK ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL, STOOD UP TO THE QUESTIONS WEL	3	0.5%
40	CLARK SEEMED AGGRESSIVE	1	0.2%
41	CLARK LOOKED MORE HONEST	0	
44	CLARK - FELT SORRY FOR HIM	0	
45	CLARK WAS TERRIBLE, HE LOST, REALLY BUNGLED	8	1.2%

v1223: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	CLARK - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM, DISAPPOINTED IN HIM	17	2.6%
47	CLARK'S LAUGHING, SNICKERING, SMERK ON HIS FACE, PHYSICALLY	4	0.6%
48	CLARK WAS NERVOUS, STAMMERED	5	0.8%
49	CLARK WAS WEAK, UNDECISIVE, CONTRADICTORY	4	0.6%
50	CLARK WAS A CHILD	1	0.2%
51	CLARK STATED PROPOSALS BUT NOTHING SOLID HE WOULD DO ABOUT I	2	0.3%
52	CLARK - NO LEADER	0	
53	CLARK NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	4	0.6%
54	CLARK POOR SPEAKER	1	0.2%
55	TRUDEAU WON, STOLE THE SHOW, THE BEST, HAD UPPER HAND	7	1.1%
56	TRUDEAU DID VERY WELL	3	0.5%
57	TRUDEAU MADE A GOOD IMPRESSION, WAS GOOD	11	1.7%
58	TRUDEAU WAS SMOOTH, CHARMING, HANDLED HIMSELF WELL	5	0.8%
59	TRUDEAU ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL	1	0.2%
60	TRUDEAU MORE INTELLIGENT	2	0.3%
61	TRUDEAU MORE EXPERIENCED, MORE CONFIDENT	1	0.2%
62	TRUDEAU SPEAKS WELL	2	0.3%
65	TRUDEAU - LOST	1	0.2%
66	TRUDEAU - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM, DISAPPOINTED IN HIM	10	1.6%
67	TRUDEAU TRIED TO BE TOO SMART, TRICKY QUESTIONS, TOO ARROGAN	13	2.0%
68	TRUDEAU TOO AGGRESSIVE	3	0.5%
69	TRUDEAU - WAS VERY LOW KEY FOR HIM	0	
70	TRUDEAU NO LEADER (CAN'T EVEN MANAGE HIS WIFE)	0	
71	TRUDEAU WAS IGNORANT	1	0.2%
75	BROADBENT/N.D.P. WON, WAS BEST	12	1.9%
76	BROADBENT WAS VERY GOOD, IMPRESSED ME	15	2.3%
77	BROADBENT WAS GOOD	11	1.7%
78	BROADBENT SPOKE WELL, GOOD SPEECH	1	0.2%
79	BROADBENT STRONGEST ON PLATFORM, ISSUES	3	0.5%
80	BROADBENT INTELLIGENT, "DIDN'T REALIZE HE HAD SO MUCH ON THE	2	0.3%
81	BROADBENT WAS MORE NATURAL / CALM	0	
85	BROADBENT LOST	1	0.2%
86	BROADBENT SIDED WITH TRUDEAU	2	0.3%
87	BROADBENT - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM	2	0.3%
89	BROADBENT DIDN'T SPEAK WELL	1	0.2%
90	BROADBENT SEEMED UNSURE OF HIMSELF	0	
91	BROADBENT TOO EMOTIONAL	1	0.2%
92	BROADBENT - DON'T CARE FOR HIS PRINCIPLES	1	0.2%
97	DON'T REMEMBER, DON'T KNOW	0	
99	INAP., CODED 0,2, 8 OR 9 IN 44B, NO IMPRESSIONS	2116	

# v1223: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 2			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1224: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=645 /-] [Invalid=2116 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who saw the debate.		
Pre-question	Q44B. DID YOU SEE THE DEBATES BETWEEN THE PARTY LEADERS ON TELEVISION ON SUNDAY, MAY 13TH?		
Literal question	Q44C.3 WHAT WERE YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE DEBATES, IN GENERAL? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q44B, Q44C.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO THIRD MENTION	506	78.4%
1	GENERAL LIKE, IT WAS GOOD, QUITE GOOD, FAIRLY GOOD; ENJOYED	3	0.5%
2	VERY GOOD, VERY GOOD DEBATE	0	
3	INTERESTING	2	0.3%
4	IT WAS INFORMATIVE	5	0.8%
5	THEY WERE ALL GOOD SPEAKERS, ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL	4	0.6%
6	IT DIDN'T INFLUENCE ME / SWAY ME	3	0.5%
7	ALL ALIKE, CAME OUT EVEN, NO CLEAR WINNER	2	0.3%
8	GOOD CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSION	0	
9	IT WAS AMUSING, FUNNY	2	0.3%
10	GENERAL DISLIKE, POOR DEBATE	1	0.2%
11	VERY POOR DEBATE, VERY BAD, A DISASTER	1	0.2%
12	DISAPPOINTED, NOT IMPRESSED	3	0.5%
13	IT WAS A WASTE OF TIME, DIDN'T PROVE A THING	1	0.2%
14	IT WAS SILLY, CHILDISH, A BIG JOKE	2	0.3%
15	TOO MUCH FIGHTING / CONTROVERSY / ARGUMENTATIVE	2	0.3%
16	TOO MUCH SHOWMANSHIP, LIKE A T.V. SHOW	1	0.2%
17	NOT INFORMATIVE ENOUGH, DIDN'T CLARIFY ANY ISSUES, TOO EVASI	3	0.5%
18	IT WASN'T LONG ENOUGH, THEY DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH TIME	2	0.3%
19	TOO PERSONAL, TOO MUCH IN OWN INTEREST	2	0.3%
20	POORLY HANDLED BY T.V.	2	0.3%
21	MADE A LOT OF PROMISES	0	
22	THEY HANDLED THEMSELVES WELL, SELF-CONTROL	0	
23	WELL-HANDLED BY C.B.C.	0	
31	SHOWED P.C.'S AND LIBS ARE MORE ALIKE	0	
32	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN CLARK AND TRUDEAU MOST	0	
33	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN CLARK AND BROADBENT MOST	0	
34	ENJOYED DEBATE BETWEEN TRUDEAU AND BROADBENT MOST	0	
35	CLARK WON, WAS BEST, OUTSTANDING	0	
36	CLARK DID VERY WELL, BETTER THAN EXPECTED	1	0.2%

v1224: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	CLARK WAS GOOD	2	0.3%
38	CLARK SEEMED TO SAY MORE, BROUGHT MOST OUT	0	
39	CLARK ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL, STOOD UP TO THE QUESTIONS WEL	0	
40	CLARK SEEMED AGGRESSIVE	1	0.2%
41	CLARK LOOKED MORE HONEST	1	0.2%
44	CLARK - FELT SORRY FOR HIM	0	
45	CLARK WAS TERRIBLE, HE LOST, REALLY BUNGLED	8	1.2%
46	CLARK - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM, DISAPPOINTED IN HIM	10	1.6%
47	CLARK'S LAUGHING, SNICKERING, SMERK ON HIS FACE, PHYSICALLY	1	0.2%
48	CLARK WAS NERVOUS, STAMMERED	3	0.5%
49	CLARK WAS WEAK, UNDECISIVE, CONTRADICTIONARY	3	0.5%
50	CLARK WAS A CHILD	1	0.2%
51	CLARK STATED PROPOSALS BUT NOTHING SOLID HE WOULD DO ABOUT I	0	
52	CLARK - NO LEADER	2	0.3%
53	CLARK NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	3	0.5%
54	CLARK POOR SPEAKER	0	
55	TRUDEAU WON, STOLE THE SHOW, THE BEST, HAD UPPER HAND	4	0.6%
56	TRUDEAU DID VERY WELL	3	0.5%
57	TRUDEAU MADE A GOOD IMPRESSION, WAS GOOD	5	0.8%
58	TRUDEAU WAS SMOOTH, CHARMING, HANDLED HIMSELF WELL	2	0.3%
59	TRUDEAU ANSWERED QUESTIONS WELL	0	
60	TRUDEAU MORE INTELLIGENT	0	
61	TRUDEAU MORE EXPERIENCED, MORE CONFIDENT	2	0.3%
62	TRUDEAU SPEAKS WELL	1	0.2%
65	TRUDEAU - LOST	0	
66	TRUDEAU - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM, DISAPPOINTED IN HIM	5	0.8%
67	TRUDEAU TRIED TO BE TOO SMART, TRICKY QUESTIONS, TOO ARROGAN	6	0.9%
68	TRUDEAU TOO AGGRESSIVE	0	
69	TRUDEAU - WAS VERY LOW KEY FOR HIM	0	
70	TRUDEAU NO LEADER (CAN'T EVEN MANAGE HIS WIFE)	1	0.2%
71	TRUDEAU WAS IGNORANT	0	
75	BROADBENT/N.D.P. WON, WAS BEST	5	0.8%
76	BROADBENT WAS VERY GOOD, IMPRESSED ME	9	1.4%
77	BROADBENT WAS GOOD	6	0.9%
78	BROADBENT SPOKE WELL, GOOD SPEECH	3	0.5%
79	BROADBENT STRONGEST ON PLATFORM, ISSUES	5	0.8%
80	BROADBENT INTELLIGENT, "DIDN'T REALIZE HE HAD SO MUCH ON THE	1	0.2%
81	BROADBENT WAS MORE NATURAL / CALM	0	
85	BROADBENT LOST	0	

# v1224: DEBATE IMPRESSION: RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	BROADBENT SIDED WITH TRUDEAU	1	0.2%
87	BROADBENT - NOT IMPRESSED WITH HIM	1	0.2%
89	BROADBENT DIDN'T SPEAK WELL	1	0.2%
90	BROADBENT SEEMED UNSURE OF HIMSELF	0	
91	BROADBENT TOO EMOTIONAL	1	0.2%
92	BROADBENT - DON'T CARE FOR HIS PRINCIPLES	0	
97	DON'T REMEMBER, DON'T KNOW	0	
99	INAP., CODED 0,2, 8 OR 9 IN 44B, NO IMPRESSIONS	2116	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1225: CAMPAIGN ON RADIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1330 /-] [Invalid=1431 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT RADIO? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN DID YOU HEAR PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HEARD QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?		
Notes	Q45 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A FEW	349	26.2%
2	SOME	468	35.2%
3	ALMOST NONE	513	38.6%
0	REFUSED, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	20	
8	D.K.	21	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1226: MOST IMPORT MEDIA?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1344 /-] [Invalid=1417 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHICH WOULD YOU SAY IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU IN GETTING INFORMATION ABOUT POLITICS, RADIO, TELEVISION, OR THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q46 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	RADIO	85	6.3%
2	TELEVISION	449	33.4%
3	NEWSPAPERS	420	31.2%
4	RADIO & TELEVISION	53	3.9%
5	RADIO & NEWSPAPERS	27	2.0%
6	TELEVISION & NEWSPAPERS	157	11.7%
7	ALL EQUALLY	109	8.1%
8	NONE ARE IMPORTANT	44	3.3%
0	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1407	
9	D.K.	8	
10	REFUSED	2	

# v1226: MOST IMPORT MEDIA?			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1227: WATCH COMMONS TV DEBATES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1340 /-] [Invalid=1421 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	SINCE PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS HAVE BEEN SHOWN ON TELEVISION, HAVE YOU SEEN THESE FREQUENTLY, OCCASIONALLY, OR NOT AT ALL?		
Notes	Q47A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FREQUENTLY	173	<div><div></div></div> 12.9%
2	OCCASIONALLY	666	<div><div></div></div> 49.7%
3	NOT AT ALL	501	<div><div></div></div> 37.4%
0	REFUSED	3	
8	D.K.	11	
9	HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1407	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1228: TV: CHANGED OPINION OF PARLIAMENT?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=819 /-] [Invalid=1942 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	FROM WHAT YOU HAVE SEEN ON TELEVISION, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOUR OPINION ABOUT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT HAS GONE UP, GONE DOWN, OR REMAINED THE SAME?		
Notes	Q47B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GONE UP	106	<div><div></div></div> 12.9%
2	GONE DOWN	232	<div><div></div></div> 28.3%
3	ABOUT THE SAME	481	<div><div></div></div> 58.7%
8	D.K.	20	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 3, 8 OR 9 IN Q47A	1922	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1229: VOTE FREQUENCY-FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2737 /-] [Invalid=24 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE IN CANADA, INCLUDING THE ONE HELD THIS MAY, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM, SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?		
Notes	Q48A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ALL	1606	<div><div></div></div> 58.7%
2	MOST	566	<div><div></div></div> 20.7%
3	SOME	210	<div><div></div></div> 7.7%
4	NONE	40	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
5	NOT ELIGIBLE BEFORE	315	<div><div></div></div> 11.5%

# v1229: VOTE FREQUENCY-FEDERAL ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	6	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1230: ALWAYS VOTE SAME-FEDERAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2356 /-] [Invalid=405 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have voted in at least some previous elections.		
Literal question	HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Notes	Q48B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME	1089	<div><div></div></div> 46.2%
2	DIFFERENT	1252	<div><div></div></div> 53.1%
7	REFUSED	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	26	
9	INAP., CODED 4,5, OR 8 IN Q48A	361	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1231: FEDERAL PARTY ALWAYS VOTED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1054 /-] [Invalid=1707 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have always voted for the same parties in for previous elections.		
Pre-question	Q48B. HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Literal question	Q48C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q48B, Q48C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	617	<div><div></div></div> 58.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	314	<div><div></div></div> 29.8%
3	N.D.P.	111	<div><div></div></div> 10.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	REFUSED	31	
8	D.K.	5	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q48B	1671	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1232: CHOICE OR NO CONTEST-FEDERAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1236 /-] [Invalid=1525 /-]		
Universe	Q48D asked only to respondents who have voted for different parties in previous elections.		
Pre-question	Q48B. HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		

# v1232: CHOICE OR NO CONTEST-FEDERAL			
Literal question	Q48D. DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE, OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?		
Notes	Q48B, Q48D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CHOICE	1199	<div><div></div></div> 97.0%
2	PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST	37	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
8	D.K.	16	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 2 IN Q48B	1509	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1233: VOTED IN 1979 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2697 /-] [Invalid=64 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S MAY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Notes	Q49A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	2409	<div><div></div></div> 89.3%
2	DID NOT VOTE	288	<div><div></div></div> 10.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	D.K.	6	
9	N.A.	41	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1234: HOW VOTE IN 1979 ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2234 /-] [Invalid=527 /-]		
Universe	Q49B asked only to respondents who voted in this federal election.		
Pre-question	Q49A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S MAY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q49B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?		
Notes	Q49A, Q49B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	955	<div><div></div></div> 42.7%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	856	<div><div></div></div> 38.3%
3	N.D.P.	331	<div><div></div></div> 14.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	66	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
5	OTHER	26	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
7	REFUSED	155	
8	D.K.	20	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN 49A	352	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1235: HOW WOULD VOTE-79			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=251 /-] [Invalid=2510 /-]		
Universe	Q49C asked only to respondents who did not vote in this federal election.		
Pre-question	Q49A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S MAY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q49C. IF YOU HAD VOTED, WHO WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?		
Notes	Q49A, Q49C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	108	<div></div> 43.0%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	88	<div></div> 35.1%
3	N.D.P.	37	<div></div> 14.7%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	14	<div></div> 5.6%
5	OTHER	4	<div></div> 1.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
7	REFUSED	20	
8	D.K.	57	
9	INAP., CODED 1 OR 8 IN Q49A	2415	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1236: MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2572 /-] [Invalid=189 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q50A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	962	<div></div> 37.4%
2	CANDIDATES	597	<div></div> 23.2%
3	THE PARTIES	1013	<div></div> 39.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	88	
9	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q49A OR 7 OR 8 IN Q49C	83	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1237: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2474 /-] [Invalid=287 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q50B. WHICH WOULD SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?		
Notes	Q50A, Q50B in the documentation.		

# v1237: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	887	<div></div> 35.9%
2	CANDIDATES	916	<div></div> 37.0%
3	THE PARTIES	671	<div></div> 27.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	186	
9	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q49A OR 7 OR 8 IN Q49C	83	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1238: 3RD MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2441 /-] [Invalid=320 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q50C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS LEAST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?		
Notes	Q50A, Q50C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	645	<div></div> 26.4%
2	CANDIDATES	991	<div></div> 40.6%
3	THE PARTIES	805	<div></div> 33.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	219	
9	INAP.; 8 IN Q49A OR 7 OR 8 IN Q49C	83	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1239: ISSUE OR PERSONAL STAND ON ISSUES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1496 /-] [Invalid=1265 /-]		
Universe	Q50D asked only to respondents who mentioned party, leader, or candidate as most important in Q50A.		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q50D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q50A, Q50D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STAND ON ISSUES	765	<div></div> 51.1%
2	PERSONAL QUALITIES	731	<div></div> 48.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	63	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 OR 2 IN Q50A	1184	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1240: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=629 /-] [Invalid=2132 /-]		

# v1240: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE			
Universe	Q50E.1 asked only to respondents who answered "stand on issues" for Q50D.		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q50D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q50E.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q50A, Q50D, Q50E.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	40	6.4%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	3	0.5%
3	INTEREST RATES	1	0.2%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	37	5.9%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	6	1.0%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	1	0.2%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.6%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	9	1.4%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, ETC.)	0	
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	1	0.2%
12	THE BUDGET	3	0.5%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT	51	8.1%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	10	1.6%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	8	1.3%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	0	
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS	1	0.2%
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	7	1.1%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	1	0.2%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL)	21	3.3%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	10	1.6%
23	TRANSPORTATION	7	1.1%
24	EDUCATION	1	0.2%
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED)	14	2.2%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT	15	2.4%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY	82	13.0%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	9	1.4%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	4	0.6%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	1	0.2%
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	2	0.3%
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	10	1.6%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	3	0.5%
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	23	3.7%
35	REFERENDUM	6	1.0%

v1240: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	0	
37	GOVERNMENT RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT, PAST	8	<div></div> 1.3%
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKE PROMISES	1	<div></div> 0.2%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	3	<div></div> 0.5%
40	THE FISHERIES	3	<div></div> 0.5%
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	7	<div></div> 1.1%
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	3	<div></div> 0.5%
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE	4	<div></div> 0.6%
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZ	2	<div></div> 0.3%
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	0	
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	1	<div></div> 0.2%
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	1	<div></div> 0.2%
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	1	<div></div> 0.2%
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	13	<div></div> 2.1%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	13	<div></div> 2.1%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	3	<div></div> 0.5%
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	0	
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	<div></div> 0.2%
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	1	<div></div> 0.2%
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	15	<div></div> 2.4%
69	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	2	<div></div> 0.3%
71	TRUDEAU	23	<div></div> 3.7%
72	CLARK	7	<div></div> 1.1%
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	20	<div></div> 3.2%
74	THE PARTY	3	<div></div> 0.5%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	13	<div></div> 2.1%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	<div></div> 0.2%
77	QUEBEC ISSUES	20	<div></div> 3.2%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	24	<div></div> 3.8%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	23	<div></div> 3.7%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	2	<div></div> 0.3%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	2	<div></div> 0.3%
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	0	
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	

# v1240: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	METRIC SYSTEM	1	0.2%
86	GUN CONTROL	1	0.2%
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	16	2.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	133	
98	REFUSED	3	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q50D	1978	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1241: WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=629 /-] [Invalid=2132 /-]		
Universe	Q50E.2 asked only to respondents who answered "stand on issues" for Q50D.		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q50D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q50E.2 (IF STAND ON ISSUES) WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q50A, Q50D, Q50E.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	36	5.7%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	2	0.3%
3	INTEREST RATES	2	0.3%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	24	3.8%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	1	0.2%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	0	
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED)	5	0.8%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	5	0.8%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, ETC.)	0	
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	1	0.2%
12	THE BUDGET	0	
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT	24	3.8%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	6	1.0%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	3	0.5%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	1	0.2%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	7	1.1%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	5	0.8%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL)	8	1.3%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	7	1.1%
23	TRANSPORTATION	1	0.2%
24	EDUCATION	3	0.5%

v1241: WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.5%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT	3	0.5%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY	20	3.2%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	5	0.8%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	2	0.3%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	1	0.2%
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	2	0.3%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	0	
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	8	1.3%
35	REFERENDUM	2	0.3%
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	1	0.2%
37	GOVERNMENT RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT, PAST	1	0.2%
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKE PROMISES	2	0.3%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	0	
40	THE FISHERIES	1	0.2%
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	1	0.2%
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	0	
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE	0	
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZ	0	
49	MONARCHY	1	0.2%
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	1	0.2%
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	2	0.3%
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	0	
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	0	
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	4	0.6%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	5	0.8%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	1	0.2%
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	2	0.3%
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	1	0.2%
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	7	1.1%
69	NUCLEAR POWER	2	0.3%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	0	
71	TRUDEAU	5	0.8%
72	CLARK	0	
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	5	0.8%

# v1241: WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
74	THE PARTY	2	0.3%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	3	0.5%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
77	QUEBEC ISSUES	7	1.1%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	8	1.3%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	4	0.6%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	1	0.2%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	4	0.6%
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.2%
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	3	0.5%
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	1	0.2%
86	GUN CONTROL	0	
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	3	0.5%
97	NO SECOND MENTION	363	57.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q50D	2115	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1242: ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=975 /-] [Invalid=1786 /-]		
Universe	Q50F asked only to respondents who mentioned party as most important in Q50A.		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q50F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q50A, Q50F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITION ON ISSUES	410	42.1%
2	GENERAL APPROACH	565	57.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	D.K.	38	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 3 IN Q50A	1731	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1243: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=361 /-] [Invalid=2400 /-]		
Universe	Q50G.1 asked only to respondents who selected position on issues for Q50F.		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q50F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO		

# v1243: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE			
	YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q50G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q50A, Q50F, Q50G.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	31	8.6%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	2	0.6%
3	INTEREST RATES	1	0.3%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	37	10.2%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	3	0.8%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	2	0.6%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED)	7	1.9%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	8	2.2%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, ETC.)	1	0.3%
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	0	
12	THE BUDGET	1	0.3%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT	28	7.8%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	4	1.1%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	6	1.7%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	1	0.3%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	4	1.1%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	5	1.4%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL)	12	3.3%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	1	0.3%
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	1	0.3%
23	TRANSPORTATION	4	1.1%
24	EDUCATION	1	0.3%
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.3%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT	10	2.8%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY	33	9.1%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	7	1.9%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	2	0.6%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	0	
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	10	2.8%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	0	
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	3	0.8%
35	REFERENDUM	5	1.4%
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	1	0.3%
37	GOVERNMENT RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT, PAST	4	1.1%

v1243: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKE PROMISES	2	0.6%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	0	
40	THE FISHERIES	1	0.3%
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	0	
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	1	0.3%
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE	1	0.3%
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZ	6	1.7%
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	0	
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	0	
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	0	
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	0	
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	12	3.3%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	18	5.0%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	2	0.6%
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	1	0.3%
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	0	
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	14	3.9%
69	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.3%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	0	
71	TRUDEAU	3	0.8%
72	CLARK	0	
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	1	0.3%
74	THE PARTY	7	1.9%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	9	2.5%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
77	QUEBEC ISSUES	12	3.3%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	19	5.3%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	6	1.7%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	8	2.2%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	1	0.3%
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	0	
86	GUN CONTROL	0	
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	

# v1243: WHICH ISSUE: 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	49	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q50D	2333	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1244: WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=379 /-] [Invalid=2382 /-]		
Universe	Q50G.2 asked only to respondents who selected position on issues for Q50F.		
Pre-question	Q50A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q50F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q50G.2 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q50A, Q50F, Q50G.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	194	51.2%
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	19	5.0%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	1	0.3%
3	INTEREST RATES	0	
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	7	1.8%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	2	0.5%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	1	0.3%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED)	7	1.8%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	1	0.3%
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	5	1.3%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, ETC.)	0	
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	0	
12	THE BUDGET	0	
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT	25	6.6%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	2	0.5%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	1	0.3%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	0	
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	2	0.5%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	4	1.1%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL)	11	2.9%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	3	0.8%
23	TRANSPORTATION	1	0.3%
24	EDUCATION	0	
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT	0	

v1244: WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY	19	5.0%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	2	0.5%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	2	0.5%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	0	
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	2	0.5%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	0	
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	1	0.3%
35	REFERENDUM	0	
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	1	0.3%
37	GOVERNMENT RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT, PAST	2	0.5%
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKE PROMISES	0	
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	0	
40	THE FISHERIES	0	
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	1	0.3%
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	0	
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE	1	0.3%
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZ	0	
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	0	
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	3	0.8%
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	0	
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	0	
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	13	3.4%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	11	2.9%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	3	0.8%
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	1	0.3%
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	1	0.3%
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	0	
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	6	1.6%
69	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	1	0.3%
71	TRUDEAU	1	0.3%
72	CLARK	0	
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	0	
74	THE PARTY	0	
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	2	0.5%

# v1244: WHICH ISSUE: 2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.3%
77	QUEBEC ISSUES	5	1.3%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	5	1.3%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	2	0.5%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	0	
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	3	0.8%
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	1	0.3%
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	1	0.3%
86	GUN CONTROL	1	0.3%
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.3%
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q50D	2382	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1245: VOTED IN BY-ELECTION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=313 /-] [Invalid=2448 /-]		
Universe	Asked only if federal by-election was held in this constituency.		
Literal question	THERE WAS A FEDERAL BY-ELECTION IN THIS AREA IN (MONTH & YEAR). DID YOU VOTE IN THAT BY-ELECTION?		
Notes	Q51A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	219	70.0%
2	DID NOT VOTE	73	23.3%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE	21	6.7%
0	INAP., NO BY-ELECTION OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2370	
8	D.K.	71	
9	R CLAIMS NO BY-ELECTION	7	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1253: 2ND CHOICE PARTY-79 ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2215 /-] [Invalid=546 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IF, FOR SOME REASON, YOU HAD BEEN UNABLE TO VOTE FOR THE FEDERAL PARTY THAT YOU MOST PREFERRED IN THE RECENT ELECTION, WHICH OTHER FEDERAL PARTY WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?		
Notes	Q54A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	445	20.1%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	497	22.4%
3	N.D.P.	541	24.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	109	4.9%

# v1253: 2ND CHOICE PARTY-79 ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	OTHER	29	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
6	WOULD NOT VOTE	594	<div><div></div></div> 26.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
7	REFUSED	105	
8	D.K.	423	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1254: PARTY LEAST PREFERENCE-79 ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2295 /-] [Invalid=466 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHICH OF THE FEDERAL PARTIES WOULD YOU LEAST WANT TO VOTE FOR?		
Notes	Q54B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	343	<div><div></div></div> 14.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	343	<div><div></div></div> 14.9%
3	N.D.P.	654	<div><div></div></div> 28.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	946	<div><div></div></div> 41.2%
5	NONE OF THE ABOVE	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
7	REFUSED	105	
8	D.K.	343	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1255: WHEN DECIDE HOW TO VOTE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1162 /-] [Invalid=1599 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q49A.		
Literal question	AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON MAY 22, 1979. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?		
Notes	Q55A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	KNEW ALL ALONG, ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE SAME PARTY	294	<div><div></div></div> 25.3%
2	QUITE AWHILE BEFORE THE ELECTION WAS CALLED	132	<div><div></div></div> 11.4%
3	WHEN THE ELECTION WAS CALLED	152	<div><div></div></div> 13.1%
4	6 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
5	5 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	4 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	111	<div><div></div></div> 9.6%
7	3 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	27	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
8	2 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	98	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
9	1 WEEK BEFORE ELECTION DAY	147	<div><div></div></div> 12.7%
10	AT POLL; ELECTION DAY	82	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
11	REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC EVENT (UNDATED)	29	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
12	OTHER	0	

# v1255: WHEN DECIDE HOW TO VOTE?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	SEVERAL OR A FEW WEEKS BEFORE	76	<div><div></div></div> 6.5%
88	D.K.	51	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q49A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1979 INTERVI	1548	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1256: SURE ALL ALONG HOW TO VOTE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1170 /-] [Invalid=1591 /-]		
Universe	Q55B asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents who voted.		
Pre-question	Q55A. AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON MAY 22, 1979. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?		
Literal question	Q55B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?		
Notes	Q55A, Q55B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SURE ALL ALONG	875	<div><div></div></div> 74.8%
2	CONSIDERED OTHER	295	<div><div></div></div> 25.2%
8	D.K.	43	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q49A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1979 INTERVI	1548	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1257: WHICH OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=* /0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=237 /-] [Invalid=2524 /-]		
Universe	Q55C asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents who voted and considered another party.		
Pre-question	Q55A. AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON MAY 22, 1979. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE? ; Q55B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?		
Literal question	Q55C. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q55A, Q55B, Q55C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	79	<div><div></div></div> 33.3%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	82	<div><div></div></div> 34.6%
3	N.D.P.	58	<div><div></div></div> 24.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT/CREDITISTE	14	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
5	OTHER	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
0	REFUSED	22	
8	D.K.	37	
9	INAP., 1, 8 OR 9 IN Q55B, HALF SAMPLE 2	2465	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1258: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=* /0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1125 /-] [Invalid=1636 /-]		

v1258: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 1

Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents who voted as in Q49A.
Literal question	SOMETIMES, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q56.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE	34	3.0%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	45	4.0%
3	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - PRO	11	1.0%
4	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - CON	0	
5	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - PRO	1	0.1%
6	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CON	0	
7	SELL PETROCAN - PRO	0	
8	DON'T SELL PETOCAN - CON	5	0.4%
9	EDUCATION	2	0.2%
10	LIBERALS - PRO	65	5.8%
11	LIBERALS - CON	28	2.5%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	30	2.7%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	8	0.7%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	29	2.6%
15	N.D.P. - CON	0	
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	3	0.3%
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	15	1.3%
19	WANTED A CHANGE, TIME FOR A CHANGE	118	10.5%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	58	5.2%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	83	7.4%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	56	5.0%
23	CLARK - PRO	11	1.0%
24	CLARK - CON	18	1.6%
25	BROADBENT - PRO	8	0.7%
26	BROADBENT - CON	0	
27	WOMEN'S RIGHTS	2	0.2%
28	LANGUAGE RIGHTS, NOT JUST FRENCH/ENGLISH	1	0.1%
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	54	4.8%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	3	0.3%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	2	0.2%
33	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - PRO	0	
34	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - CON	0	
35	GUN LEGISLATION	1	0.1%
36	USE/CONTROL OWN NATIONAL RESOURCES - PRO	1	0.1%
37	MORE FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.1%
38	STAND ON BUSINESS	1	0.1%
39	METRIC SYSTEM - CON	1	0.1%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	11	1.0%

v1258: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	43	<div></div> 3.8%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	2	<div></div> 0.2%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	22	<div></div> 2.0%
44	STRIKES - CON	1	<div></div> 0.1%
45	TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT RATES	1	<div></div> 0.1%
46	FISHERIES PROGRAM	1	<div></div> 0.1%
47	YOUTH PROGRAMS	0	
48	SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION)	2	<div></div> 0.2%
49	BILINGUALISM	14	<div></div> 1.2%
50	SEPARTISM, REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNITY ASSOCIATION	23	<div></div> 2.0%
51	CANADAIAN UNITY	65	<div></div> 5.8%
52	THE CONSTITUTION	5	<div></div> 0.4%
53	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	<div></div> 0.2%
54	DEFENCE DEPARTMENT, ARMED FORCES	0	
55	FAVOUR MORE IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES - PRO	0	
56	FAVOUR LESS IMMIGRATION - CON	0	
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	1	<div></div> 0.1%
58	AGRICULTURE	7	<div></div> 0.6%
59	HEALTH CARE	5	<div></div> 0.4%
60	THE ECONOMY, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	54	<div></div> 4.8%
61	TAXES	4	<div></div> 0.4%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	13	<div></div> 1.2%
63	WELFARE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
64	HOUSING	6	<div></div> 0.5%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
66	ENERGY POLICY	18	<div></div> 1.6%
67	PENSIONS	15	<div></div> 1.3%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	0	
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	45	<div></div> 4.0%
70	PROTEST VOTE	4	<div></div> 0.4%
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	4	<div></div> 0.4%
72	GIVE US OUR RIGHTS	2	<div></div> 0.2%
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	4	<div></div> 0.4%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	4	<div></div> 0.4%
77	PARTY REPRESENTS THE LOCAL INTERESTS	0	
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	5	<div></div> 0.4%
81	CIVIC DUTY	46	<div></div> 4.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	D.K.	82	
89	REFUSED	5	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q49A: HALF SAMPLE 2	1531	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1259: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*0/89/99]
-------------	--

# v1259: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 2			
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1213 /-] [Invalid=1548 /-]	
Universe		Q56.2 asked only to respondents who voted as in Q49A.	
Pre-question		Q56.1 SOMETIMES, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU?	
Literal question		Q56.2 MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID (SECOND MENTION)	
Notes		Q56.1, Q56.2 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE	8	0.7%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	5	0.4%
3	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - PRO	7	0.6%
4	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - CON	5	0.4%
5	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - PRO	2	0.2%
6	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CON	2	0.2%
7	SELL PETROCAN - PRO	1	0.1%
8	DON'T SELL PETOCAN - CON	7	0.6%
9	EDUCATION	2	0.2%
10	LIBERALS - PRO	21	1.7%
11	LIBERALS - CON	21	1.7%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	22	1.8%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	5	0.4%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	12	1.0%
15	N.D.P. - CON	0	
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	0	
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	1	0.1%
18	PARTY	4	0.3%
19	WANTED A CHANGE, TIME FOR A CHANGE	30	2.5%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	21	1.7%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	25	2.1%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	24	2.0%
23	CLARK - PRO	9	0.7%
24	CLARK - CON	17	1.4%
25	BROADBENT - PRO	4	0.3%
26	BROADBENT - CON	0	
27	WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
28	LANGUAGE RIGHTS, NOT JUST FRENCH/ENGLISH	0	
29		1	0.1%
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	17	1.4%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	2	0.2%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	7	0.6%
33	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - PRO	1	0.1%
34	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - CON	4	0.3%
35	GUN LEGISLATION	2	0.2%
36	USE/CONTROL OWN NATIONAL RESOURCES - PRO	7	0.6%

v1259: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	MORE FREE ENTERPRISE	2	0.2%
38	STAND ON BUSINESS	1	0.1%
39	METRIC SYSTEM - CON	2	0.2%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	12	1.0%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	25	2.1%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	0	
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	19	1.6%
44	STRIKES - CON	1	0.1%
45	TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT RATES	1	0.1%
46	FISHERIES PROGRAM	1	0.1%
47	YOUTH PROGRAMS	0	
48	SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION)	0	
49	BILINGUALISM	10	0.8%
50	SEPARTISM, REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	27	2.2%
51	CANADAIAN UNITY	38	3.1%
52	THE CONSTITUTION	4	0.3%
53	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	4	0.3%
54	DEFENCE DEPARTMENT, ARMED FORCES	1	0.1%
55	FAVOUR MORE IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES - PRO	1	0.1%
56	FAVOUR LESS IMMIGRATION - CON	3	0.2%
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	6	0.5%
58	AGRICULTURE	7	0.6%
59	HEALTH CARE	6	0.5%
60	THE ECONOMY, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	42	3.5%
61	TAXES	7	0.6%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	12	1.0%
63	WELFARE	5	0.4%
64	HOUSING	1	0.1%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
66	ENERGY POLICY	13	1.1%
67	PENSIONS	13	1.1%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	1	0.1%
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	46	3.8%
70	PROTEST VOTE	1	0.1%
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	1	0.1%
72	GIVE US OUR RIGHTS	3	0.2%
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	7	0.6%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	4	0.3%
77	PARTY REPRESENTS THE LOCAL INTERESTS	2	0.2%
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	2	0.2%
81	CIVIC DUTY	3	0.2%
88	D.K.	0	
90	NO SECOND MENTION	583	48.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	

# v1259: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
89	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q49A: HALF SAMPLE 2	1531	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1260: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/89/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1213 /-] [Invalid=1548 /-]		
Universe	Q56.3 asked only to respondents who voted as in Q49A.		
Pre-question	Q56.1 SOMETIMES, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU?		
Literal question	Q56.3 MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q56.1, Q56.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE	5	0.4%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	1	0.1%
3	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - PRO	1	0.1%
4	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - CON	0	
5	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - PRO	0	
6	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CON	1	0.1%
7	SELL PETROCAN - PRO	2	0.2%
8	DON'T SELL PETOCAN - CON	3	0.2%
9	EDUCATION	0	
10	LIBERALS - PRO	3	0.2%
11	LIBERALS - CON	7	0.6%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	5	0.4%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	6	0.5%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	7	0.6%
15	N.D.P. - CON	2	0.2%
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	1	0.1%
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	4	0.3%
19	WANTED A CHANGE, TIME FOR A CHANGE	11	0.9%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	7	0.6%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	6	0.5%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	5	0.4%
23	CLARK - PRO	5	0.4%
24	CLARK - CON	5	0.4%
25	BROADBENT - PRO	1	0.1%
26	BROADBENT - CON	0	
27	WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
28	LANGUAGE RIGHTS, NOT JUST FRENCH/ENGLISH	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	8	0.7%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	1	0.1%

v1260: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	2	0.2%
33	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - PRO	0	
34	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - CON	0	
35	GUN LEGISLATION	0	
36	USE/CONTROL OWN NATIONAL RESOURCES - PRO	1	0.1%
37	MORE FREE ENTERPISE	2	0.2%
38	STAND ON BUSINESS	0	
39	METRIC SYSTEM - CON	1	0.1%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	3	0.2%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	15	1.2%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	1	0.1%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	8	0.7%
44	STRIKES - CON	1	0.1%
45	TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT RATES	1	0.1%
46	FISHERIES PROGRAM	0	
47	YOUTH PROGRAMS	0	
48	SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION)	0	
49	BILINGUALISM	7	0.6%
50	SEPARTISM, REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNITY ASSOCIATION	9	0.7%
51	CANADAIAAN UNITY	14	1.2%
52	THE CONSTITUTION	1	0.1%
53	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	0.1%
54	DEFENCE DEPARTMENT, ARMED FORCES	1	0.1%
55	FAVOUR MORE IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES - PRO	1	0.1%
56	FAVOUR LESS IMMIGRATION - CON	1	0.1%
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	7	0.6%
58	AGRICULTURE	2	0.2%
59	HEALTH CARE	5	0.4%
60	THE ECONOMY, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	12	1.0%
61	TAXES	1	0.1%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	7	0.6%
63	WELFARE	6	0.5%
64	HOUSING	4	0.3%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
66	ENERGY POLICY	7	0.6%
67	PENSIONS	2	0.2%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	2	0.2%
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	26	2.1%
70	PROTEST VOTE	0	
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT - PRO	1	0.1%
72	GIVE US OUR RIGHTS	0	
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	2	0.2%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	1	0.1%
77	PARTY REPRESENTS THE LOCAL INTERESTS	1	0.1%

# v1260: REAL REASON 79 VOTE:RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	0	
81	CIVIC DUTY	0	
88	D.K.	0	
90	NO THIRD MENTION	960	<div><div></div></div> 79.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
89	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q49A: HALF SAMPLE 2	1531	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1246: HOW VOTE IN BY-ELECT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=207 /-] [Invalid=2554 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted in by-election.		
Pre-question	Q51A. THERE WAS A FEDERAL BY-ELECTION IN THIS AREA IN (MONTH & YEAR). DID YOU VOTE IN THAT BY-ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q51B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR THEN?		
Notes	Q51A, Q51B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	75	<div><div></div></div> 36.2%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	81	<div><div></div></div> 39.1%
3	N.D.P.	27	<div><div></div></div> 13.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	8	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
5	OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
7	REFUSED	15	<div><div></div></div> 7.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1	
8	D.K./DON'T REMEMBER	12	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q51A	2541	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1247: VOTED IN 1974 FEDERAL ELECTION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2653 /-] [Invalid=108 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THE LAST FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THIS ONE WAS IN JULY, 1974. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER OR NOT YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q52A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	2161	<div><div></div></div> 81.5%
2	DIDN'T VOTE	159	<div><div></div></div> 6.0%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE	333	<div><div></div></div> 12.6%
8	DON'T REMEMBER	90	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1248: HOW VOTED IN 1974 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		

# v1248: HOW VOTED IN 1974 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2069 -] [Invalid=692 -]		
Universe	Q52B asked only to respondents who voted in 1974.		
Pre-question	Q52A. THE LAST FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THIS ONE WAS IN JULY, 1974. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER OR NOT YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q52B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR THEN?		
Notes	Q52A, Q52B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	1142	<div><div></div></div> 55.2%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	540	<div><div></div></div> 26.1%
3	N.D.P.	222	<div><div></div></div> 10.7%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	48	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
5	OTHER	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
7	REFUSED	107	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K., DON'T REMEMBER	92	
9	INAP., CODED 2, 3 OR 8 IN Q52A	582	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1249: WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPNOSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*0/88/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=433 -] [Invalid=2328 -]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents voted for a different party in 1979 than in 1974.		
Literal question	Q52C.1 I NOTICED THAT YOU CHANGED YOUR VOTE FROM 1974 TO 1979. WAS THERE ANY SPECIAL REASON FOR CHANGING THE PARTY YOU VOTED FOR?		
Notes	Q52C.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WANTED A MAJORITY/STABLE GOVERNMENT, STRONG GOVERNMENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
2	DIDN'T WANT A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, WANTED TO KEEP MINORITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
3	LIKE LIBERALS, WOULD DO A GOOD JOB, HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB, A	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
4	LIKE LIBERALS' PLATFORM, STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEAL/ DEALT W	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
5	DISLIKED LIBERALS, DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB, GET RID OF GOVERNMENT	33	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
6	DISLIKED LIBERALS; THEIR STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, WAY DEEA	14	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
7	LIKED TRUDEAU; GOOD LEADER, HAS DONE HIS BEST, A GOOD JOB	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
8	LIKED TRUDEAU; STAND ON ISSUES/HIS PLATFORM 09 DISLIKED TRU	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
9		37	<div><div></div></div> 8.5%
10	DISLIKED TRUDEAU'S STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEALT OR DIDN'T DEEA	13	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
11	LIKED CANDIDATE, POSITIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	38	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
12	DISLIKED CANDIDATE, NEGATIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	11	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%

v1249: WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPNOSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	TIME FOR A CHANGE, WANTED A CHANGE, CHANGE NEEDED, CHANGE M	88	20.3%
14	LIKED CONSERVATIVES (GENERAL), MORE FAITH IN THEM, GIVE THE	7	1.6%
15	LIKED CONSERVATIVES, STAND ON ISSUES, PLATFORM	4	0.9%
16	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES, GENERAL PERFORMANCE, LOST FAITH IN	3	0.7%
17	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES/STAND ON ISSUES/POLICIES	0	
18	LIKED CLARK, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER, BETTER LEADER	3	0.7%
19	LIKED CLARK, HIS STAND ON ISSUES	4	0.9%
20	DISLIKED CLARK, WOULD NOT BE GOOD LEADER/ EFFECTIVE LEADER,	0	
21	DISLIKED CLARK'S STAND ON ISSUES/POLICIES	1	0.2%
22	LIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), GIVE THEM A CHANCE	16	3.7%
23	LIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORM	14	3.2%
24	DISLIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), WEREN'T DOING A GOOD JOB	1	0.2%
25	DISLIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORMS	3	0.7%
26	DISILLUSIONED WITH ALL PARTIES, DOESN'T MATTER WHO FORMS GO	8	1.8%
27	FORMER PARTY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO FORM A GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
28	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T, WOULDN'T KEEP/FULFILL PROMISES	6	1.4%
29	BECAUSE OF SPECIFIC ISSUES/POLICIES	24	5.5%
30	BECAUSE OF ISSUES/POLICIES UNSPECIFIED	7	1.6%
31	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	10	2.3%
32	BECAUSE OF CANDIDATE (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	15	3.5%
33	BECAUSE OF LEADER (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	22	5.1%
34	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TO PROVINCIAL FACTOR	2	0.5%
35	BECAUSE OF LOCAL ISSUES/LOCAL NEEDS	1	0.2%
36	MADE UP MY OWN MIND, DECIDED TO IGNORE FAMILY TRADITION, OR	2	0.5%
37	PARTY LEADER WAS TOO OLD, TIME HE SHOULD BE RETIRED	0	
38	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED), THE PEOPLE IN THE PARTY (UNSPECIF	0	
39	IN 1979 SWITCHED BACK TO FORMER (1972) PARTY, HAD DECIDED T	0	
40	ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE MAN (BEST CANDIDATE)	2	0.5%
41	DISLIKED BROADBENT'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	0	
42	NO STRONG ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY, LIKE THINGS ABOUT MORE T	0	
43	FORMER PARTY DEVIATING FROM THEIR IDEALS, POLICIES	1	0.2%
44	N.D.P. CAUSING HAVOC (ELECTION), POLITICAL BLACKMAIL, HAD G	0	
45	LIKED MRS. TRUDEAU	1	0.2%

v1249: WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPNOSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	LIKED BROADBENT, HIS CONTROL OVER THE PARTY, PROVIDED GOOD	4	0.9%
47	FELT SORRY FOR CLARK, DIDN'T WANT HIM TO HAVE TO CLEAN UP L	0	
48	SOCIAL CREDIT DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	2	0.5%
49		2	0.5%
50	WANTED TRUDEAU (LIBERALS) TO HAVE MORE OPPOSITION, SMARTEN	1	0.2%
51	LIKED POLICIES/PROGRAMS/IDEAS OF CREDITISTE/ SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
52	WANTED SAME PARTY FEDERALLY AND PROVINCIALY	0	
53	NOT SATISFIED WITH SOCIAL CREDIT	2	0.5%
54	THOUGHT SOCIAL CREDIT WOULD DO GOOD JOB, WANTED TO GIVE THE	0	
55	VOTED FOR THE MAN	5	1.2%
56	N.D.P. DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	4	0.9%
57	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T RUN A CANDIDATE	4	0.9%
89	NO, NOT REALLY, NO REAL REASON	2	0.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, NOT STATED	8	
99	INAP., IF VOTE IN 1974 IS EQUAL TO VOTE IN 1979	2302	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1250: WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*0/88/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=431 /-] [Invalid=2330 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q52C.1 I NOTICED THAT YOU CHANGED YOUR VOTE FROM 1974 TO 1979. WAS THERE ANY SPECIAL REASON FOR CHANGING THE PARTY YOU VOTED FOR?
Literal question	Q52C.2 WERE THERE ANY OTHER REASONS?
Notes	Q52C.1, Q52C.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	WANTED A MAJORITY/STABLE GOVERNMENT, STRONG GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
2	DIDN'T WANT A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, WANTED TO KEEP MINORITY	0	
3	LIKE LIBERALS, WOULD DO A GOOD JOB, HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB, A	1	0.2%
4	LIKE LIBERALS' PLATFORM, STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEAL/ DEALT W	1	0.2%
5	DISLIKED LIBERALS, DIDN'T DO A GOOD JOB, GET RID OF GOVERNMENT	14	3.2%
6	DISLIKED LIBERALS; THEIR STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, WAY DEA	11	2.6%
7	LIKED TRUDEAU; GOOD LEADER, HAS DONE HIS BEST, A GOOD JOB	0	
8	LIKED TRUDEAU; STAND ON ISSUES/HIS PLATFORM 09 DISLIKED TRU	2	0.5%
9		12	2.8%

v1250: WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	DISLIKED TRUDEAU'S STAND ON ISSUES, WAY DEALT OR DIDN'T DEA	4	0.9%
11	LIKED CANDIDATE, POSITIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	4	0.9%
12	DISLIKED CANDIDATE, NEGATIVE CANDIDATE RESPONSE	4	0.9%
13	TIME FOR A CHANGE, WANTED A CHANGE, CHANGE NEEDED, CHANGE M	26	6.0%
14	LIKED CONSERVATIVES (GENERAL), MORE FAITH IN THEM, GIVE THE	4	0.9%
15	LIKED CONSERVATIVES, STAND ON ISSUES, PLATFORM	3	0.7%
16	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES, GENERAL PERFORMANCE, LOST FAITH IN T	3	0.7%
17	DISLIKED CONSERVATIVES/STAND ON ISSUES/POLICIES	1	0.2%
18	LIKED CLARK, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER, BETTER LEADER	2	0.5%
19	LIKED CLARK, HIS STAND ON ISSUES	0	
20	DISLIKED CLARK, WOULD NOT BE GOOD LEADER/ EFFECTIVE LEADER,	3	0.7%
21	DISLIKED CLARK'S STAND ON ISSUES/POLICIES	0	
22	LIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), GIVE THEM A CHANCE	1	0.2%
23	LIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORM	5	1.2%
24	DISLIKED N.D.P. (GENERAL), WEREN'T DOING A GOOD JOB	0	
25	DISLIKED N.D.P.'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES, PLATFORMS	0	
26	DISILLUSIONED WITH ALL PARTIES, DOESN'T MATTER WHO FORMS GO	0	
27	FORMER PARTY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO FORM A GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
28	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T, WOULDN'T KEEP/FULFILL PROMISES	1	0.2%
29	BECAUSE OF SPECIFIC ISSUES/POLICIES	20	4.6%
30	BECAUSE OF ISSUES/POLICIES UNSPECIFIED	2	0.5%
31	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	0	
32	BECAUSE OF CANDIDATE (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	0	
33	BECAUSE OF LEADER (UNSPECIFIED, LIKE OR DISLIKE)	6	1.4%
34	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TO PROVINCIAL FACTOR	3	0.7%
35	BECAUSE OF LOCAL ISSUES/LOCAL NEEDS	1	0.2%
36	MADE UP MY OWN MIND, DECIDED TO IGNORE FAMILY TRADITION, OR	0	
37	PARTY LEADER WAS TOO OLD, TIME HE SHOULD BE RETIRED	0	
38	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED), THE PEOPLE IN THE PARTY (UNSPECIF	0	
39	IN 1979 SWITCHED BACK TO FORMER (1972) PARTY, HAD DECIDED T	0	
40	ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE MAN (BEST CANDIDATE)	0	
41	DISLIKED BROADBENT'S STAND ON ISSUES, POLICIES	0	
42	NO STRONG ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY, LIKE THINGS ABOUT MORE T	0	

# v1250: WHY SWITCH 74-79:RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	FORMER PARTY DEVIATING FROM THEIR IDEALS, POLICIES	1	0.2%
44	N.D.P. CAUSING HAVOC (ELECTION), POLITICAL BLACKMAIL, HAD G	0	
45	LIKED MRS. TRUDEAU	0	
46	LIKED BROADBENT, HIS CONTROL OVER THE PARTY, PROVIDED GOOD	2	0.5%
47	FELT SORRY FOR CLARK, DIDN'T WANT HIM TO HAVE TO CLEAN UP L	0	
48	SOCIAL CREDIT DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	0	
50	WANTED TRUDEAU (LIBERALS) TO HAVE MORE OPPOSITION, SMARTEN	2	0.5%
51	LIKED POLICIES/PROGRAMS/IDEAS OF CREDITISTE/ SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
52	WANTED SAME PARTY FEDERALLY AND PROVINCIALY	0	
53	NOT SATISFIED WITH SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
54	THOUGHT SOCIAL CREDIT WOULD DO GOOD JOB, WANTED TO GIVE THE	0	
55	VOTED FOR THE MAN	0	
56	N.D.P. DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE	2	0.5%
57	FORMER PARTY DIDN'T RUN A CANDIDATE	0	
89	NO SECOND MENTION	288	66.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER, NOT STATED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 88 TO 99 IN Q52C.1	2312	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1251: VOTED IN 1972 FEDERAL ELECTION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2517 /-] [Invalid=244 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THE FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN 1972. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q53A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	1890	75.1%
2	DIDN'T VOTE	168	6.7%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE THEN	459	18.2%
8	DON'T REMEMBER	226	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1252: HOW VOTED IN 1972 ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1630 /-] [Invalid=1131 /-]		
Universe	Q53B asked only to respondents who voted in 1972.		
Pre-question	Q53A. THE FEDERAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN 1972. DO YOU REMEMBER FOR SURE WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		

# v1252: HOW VOTED IN 1972 ELECTION			
Literal question	Q53B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR?		
Notes	Q53A, Q53B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	974	<div></div> 59.8%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	432	<div></div> 26.5%
3	N.D.P.	166	<div></div> 10.2%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	49	<div></div> 3.0%
5	OTHER	9	<div></div> 0.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
7	REFUSED	96	
8	D.K., DON'T REMEMBER	164	
9	INAP., CODED 2, 3 OR 8 IN Q53A	853	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1261: TRUDEAU THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2689 /-] [Invalid=72 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	LET'S START WITH THE LIBERALS, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. TRUDEAU? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Interviewer's instructions	INTERVIEWER: HAND CARD NO. 3; THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED		
Notes	Q57A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	268	<div></div> 10.0%
2	2 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.0%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	5	<div></div> 0.2%
6	6 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.0%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	131	<div></div> 4.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	

v1261: TRUDEAU THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
20	20 SCORE	94	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	118	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	158	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	350	<div><div></div></div> 13.0%
51	51 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
52	52 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	235	<div><div></div></div> 8.7%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
63	63 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
64	64 SCORE	0	

v1261: TRUDEAU THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
65	65 SCORE	17	0.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	291	10.8%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	64	2.4%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	353	13.1%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	23	0.9%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	290	10.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	8	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	2	0.1%
98	98 SCORE	3	0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	237	8.8%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	72	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1262: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2319 /-] [Invalid=442 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

v1262: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Literal question		Q57B. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?	
Notes		Q57A, Q57B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	144	<div></div> 6.2%
2	2 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.0%
3	3 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.0%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	94	<div></div> 4.1%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	97	<div></div> 4.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	9	<div></div> 0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	97	<div></div> 4.2%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	132	<div></div> 5.7%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	

v1262: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	1	0.0%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	606	26.1%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.0%
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	4	0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	237	10.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	19	0.8%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	262	11.3%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	45	1.9%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	254	11.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	9	0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	

v1262: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	156	6.7%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	2	0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	133	5.7%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	442	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1263: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2643 /-] [Invalid=118 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q57C. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE LIBERAL PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
Notes	Q57A, Q57C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	114	4.3%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	1	0.0%
4	4 SCORE	1	0.0%
5	5 SCORE	2	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	69	2.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	5	0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	76	2.9%

v1263: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	21 SCORE	1	0.0%
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	15	0.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	149	5.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	5	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	192	7.3%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	1	0.0%
50	NEUTRAL	566	21.4%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	2	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	1	0.0%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	7	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	360	13.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	22	0.8%

v1263: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	344	13.0%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	1	0.0%
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	72	2.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	302	11.4%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	11	0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	183	6.9%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	4	0.2%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	134	5.1%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	118	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1264: CLARK THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2611 /-] [Invalid=150 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

v1264: CLARK THERMOMETER

Literal question	Q57D. NOW, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. CLARK? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
Notes	Q57A, Q57D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	186	7.1%
2	2 SCORE	1	0.0%
3	3 SCORE	1	0.0%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	4	0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	106	4.1%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	110	4.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	21	0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	166	6.4%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	1	0.0%
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	4	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	217	8.3%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	1	0.0%

v1264: CLARK THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	11	0.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	624	23.9%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.0%
52	52 SCORE	3	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	17	0.7%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	356	13.6%
61	61 SCORE	1	0.0%
62	62 SCORE	1	0.0%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	29	1.1%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	1	0.0%
70	70 SCORE	301	11.5%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	51	2.0%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	229	8.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	1	0.0%
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	14	0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	

v1264: CLARK THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	90	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	58	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	150	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1265: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2218 /-] [Invalid=543 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q57E. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
Notes	Q57A, Q57E in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	120	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
2	2 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
4	4 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
5	5 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	82	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	

v1265: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	81	<div></div> 3.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	15	<div></div> 0.7%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	101	<div></div> 4.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.0%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	132	<div></div> 6.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	591	<div></div> 26.6%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	6	<div></div> 0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	272	<div></div> 12.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	

v1265: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	24	1.1%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	239	10.8%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	42	1.9%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	235	10.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	10	0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	157	7.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	90	4.1%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	543	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1266: PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2571 /-] [Invalid=190 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING

v1266: PC PARTY THERMOMETER

	IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q57F. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
Notes	Q57A, Q57F in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	95	<div></div> 3.7%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	1	0.0%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	0.0%
6	6 SCORE	1	0.0%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	70	<div></div> 2.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.0%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	81	<div></div> 3.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	15	0.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	144	<div></div> 5.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	1	0.0%
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	204	<div></div> 7.9%

v1266: PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	15	0.6%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	651	25.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	1	0.0%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	12	0.5%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	1	0.0%
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	388	15.1%
61	61 SCORE	1	0.0%
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	33	1.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	289	11.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	63	2.5%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	291	11.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	11	0.4%

# v1266: PC PARTY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	123	4.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	7	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	68	2.6%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	190	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1267: BROADBENT THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2446 /-] [Invalid=315 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	Q57G. HOW ABOUT THE N.D.P.? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. BROADBENT? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q57A, Q57G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	149	6.1%
2	2 SCORE	2	0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	72	2.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	

v1267: BROADBENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	88	3.6%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	18	0.7%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	131	5.4%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	2	0.1%
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	4	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	161	6.6%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	9	0.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	524	21.4%
51	51 SCORE	2	0.1%
52	52 SCORE	2	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	13	0.5%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	338	13.8%
61	61 SCORE	0	

v1267: BROADBENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
62	62 SCORE	2	0.1%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	31	1.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	1	0.0%
70	70 SCORE	327	13.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	2	0.1%
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	62	2.5%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	284	11.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	9	0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	147	6.0%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	3	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	60	2.5%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	315	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1268: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1872 /-] [Invalid=889 /-]
Universe	All respondents

v1268: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q57H. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL N.D.P. CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
Notes	Q57A, Q57H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	209	11.2%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	6	0.3%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	110	5.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	98	5.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	13	0.7%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	114	6.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	1	0.1%
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	

v1268: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
40	40 SCORE	161	<div></div> 8.6%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	640	<div></div> 34.2%
51	51 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
52	52 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	145	<div></div> 7.7%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	8	<div></div> 0.4%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	134	<div></div> 7.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	23	<div></div> 1.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	99	<div></div> 5.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	

# v1268: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	85 SCORE	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	54	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	36	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	889	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1269: NDP THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	Q57I. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE N.D.P. PARTY TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q57A, Q57I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	336	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	210	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
2	2 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	110	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%

v1269: NDP THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	118	4.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	21	0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	191	6.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	1	0.0%
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	9	0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	251	9.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	10	0.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	619	22.4%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.0%
52	52 SCORE	2	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	17	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	310	11.2%

v1269: NDP THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	27	1.0%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	200	7.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	32	1.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	148	5.4%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	7	0.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	85	3.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	4	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	43	1.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1270: ROY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=640 /-] [Invalid=2121 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	Q57J. HOW ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. ROY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q57A, Q58J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	86	13.4%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	0.5%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	53	8.3%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	39	6.1%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	5	0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	56	8.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	0.3%

v1270: ROY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	51	8.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	0	
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	167	26.1%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	3	0.5%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	63	9.8%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	3	0.5%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	47	7.3%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	4	0.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	35	5.5%








# v1270: ROY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	0	
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	11	1.7%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	11	1.7%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	94	
999	INAP., NON-QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2027	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1271: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=456 /-] [Invalid=2305 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec. Asked only if Social Credit had local candidate in this riding.		
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	Q57K. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q57A, Q57K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	83	18.2%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	35	7.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	

v1271: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	34	7.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.2%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	28	6.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	24	5.3%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	1	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	147	32.2%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.4%
56	56 SCORE	0	

v1271: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	30	6.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	0	
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	26	5.7%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	2	0.4%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	20	4.4%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	1	0.2%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	10	2.2%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	9	2.0%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	278	
999	INAP., NON-QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2027	

# v1271: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1272: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=634 /-] [Invalid=2127 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q57A. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	Q57L. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q57A, Q57L in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	87	 13.7%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	 0.3%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	67	 10.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	55	 8.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	4	 0.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	67	 10.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	

v1272: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	41	6.5%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	1	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	184	29.0%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	3	0.5%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	46	7.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	4	0.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	26	4.1%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	3	0.5%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	

# v1272: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	24	<div></div> 3.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	0	
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	7	<div></div> 1.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	10	<div></div> 1.6%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	100	
999	INAP., NON-QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2027	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1273: LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1345 /-] [Invalid=1416 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q58A.1 NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	226	<div></div> 16.8%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, INTEGRITY	67	<div></div> 5.0%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	54	<div></div> 4.0%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	68	<div></div> 5.1%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	11	<div></div> 0.8%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	27	<div></div> 2.0%

v1273: LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	93	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HAS SETTLED DOWN, GOOD FATHER	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
12	BILINGUAL	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS, MAN OF ACTION	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	0	
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES' MAN	0	
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESS ONWARD, TRYING TO CHANGE THINGS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	16	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	14	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING, FRIENDLY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
29	AGGRESIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	27	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q./LA PORTE AFFAIR	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE/FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION,	0	
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE/EVERYONE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%

v1273: LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNETI	16	1.2%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND', HIS ARROGA	4	0.3%
44	NOT PATRONIZING	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	2	0.1%
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS/CRISES WELL	3	0.2%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	13	1.0%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	10	0.7%
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	0	
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	4	0.3%
52	HIS AMBITION	1	0.1%
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT O	4	0.3%
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKE COMPROMISES	0	
55	LIKE THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT	6	0.4%
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	0	
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	1	0.1%
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING	1	0.1%
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR DI	1	0.1%
61	HE IS STRONG	8	0.6%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT/STATESMAN	7	0.5%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	0	
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, PICKS BEST PEOPLE FOR JOBS	0	
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	1	0.1%
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS/MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	2	0.1%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT/WHEN HE HAD A LOT	2	0.1%
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	1	0.1%
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.1%
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	0	
72	GOOD IMAGE	0	
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	11	0.8%
74	HE TRAVELS	0	
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	0	
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING, SENSITIVE (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.2%

# v1273: LIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	1	0.1%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	3	0.2%
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	2	0.1%
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS OR	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	0	
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	1	0.1%
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS/ENERGY CRISIS	1	0.1%
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	2	0.1%
87	MORE EXPERIENCED	19	1.4%
89	HANDLES FAMILY PROBLEMS WITH CLASS	10	0.7%
90	GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	2	0.1%
91	HE IS A FEDERALIST	0	
92	HE IS CATHOLIC	0	
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	61	4.5%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	280	20.8%
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	57	4.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	8	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1274: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q58A.1 NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q58A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A.1, Q58A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	76	5.6%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, INTEGRITY	25	1.8%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	22	1.6%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	38	2.8%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	4	0.3%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	25	1.8%

v1274: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	53	3.9%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	7	0.5%
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HAS SETTLED DOWN, GOOD FATHER	1	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	3	0.2%
12	BILINGUAL	5	0.4%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	2	0.1%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS, MAN OF ACTION	15	1.1%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	1	0.1%
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	15	1.1%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	20	1.5%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES' MAN	0	
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESS ONWARD, TRYING TO CHANGE THINGS	0	
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	8	0.6%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	2	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	14	1.0%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	1	0.1%
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING, FRIENDLY	3	0.2%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	5	0.4%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	25	1.8%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	3	0.2%
29	AGGRESIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	22	1.6%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	32	2.4%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q./LA PORTE AFFAIR	2	0.1%
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING	12	0.9%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE/FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	2	0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS	13	1.0%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	1	0.1%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	3	0.2%
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION,	2	0.1%
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE/EVERYONE	3	0.2%
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	3	0.2%
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	2	0.1%

v1274: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNETI	19	1.4%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND', HIS ARROGA	1	0.1%
44	NOT PATRONIZING	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	2	0.1%
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS/CRISES WELL	2	0.1%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	6	0.4%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	0	
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING	0	
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	1	0.1%
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	1	0.1%
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT O	1	0.1%
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKE COMPROMISES	2	0.1%
55	LIKE THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	0	
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	1	0.1%
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING	0	
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR DI	1	0.1%
61	HE IS STRONG	5	0.4%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT/STATESMAN	17	1.3%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	1	0.1%
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, PICKS BEST PEOPLE FOR JOBS	1	0.1%
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	1	0.1%
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS/MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	7	0.5%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT/WHEN HE HAD A LOT	0	
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	1	0.1%
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.3%
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	2	0.1%
72	GOOD IMAGE	2	0.1%
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	9	0.7%
74	HE TRAVELS	0	
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	1	0.1%
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING, SENSITIVE (UNSPECIFIED)	5	0.4%

# v1274: LIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	2	0.1%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	1	0.1%
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	0	
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS OR	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	1	0.1%
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	0	
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS/ENERGY CRISIS	1	0.1%
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	0	
87	MORE EXPERIENCED	11	0.8%
89	HANDLES FAMILY PROBLEMS WITH CLASS	5	0.4%
90	GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	3	0.2%
91	HE IS A FEDERALIST	1	0.1%
92	HE IS CATHOLIC	1	0.1%
94	NO SECOND MENTION	759	56.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1275: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q58A.1 NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q58A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q58A.1, Q58A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	22	1.6%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, INTEGRITY	5	0.4%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	12	0.9%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	15	1.1%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	3	0.2%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	9	0.7%

v1275: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	17	1.3%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	2	0.1%
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HAS SETTLED DOWN, GOOD FATHER	2	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	1	0.1%
12	BILINGUAL	4	0.3%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	2	0.1%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS, MAN OF ACTION	6	0.4%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	0	
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	7	0.5%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	12	0.9%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES' MAN	1	0.1%
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESS ONWARD, TRYING TO CHANGE THINGS	1	0.1%
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	12	0.9%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	10	0.7%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	1	0.1%
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING, FRIENDLY	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	2	0.1%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	6	0.4%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	2	0.1%
29	AGGRESIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	12	0.9%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	23	1.7%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q./LA PORTE AFFAIR	3	0.2%
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING	0	
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE/FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	3	0.2%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS	7	0.5%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	4	0.3%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	4	0.3%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	1	0.1%
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION,	1	0.1%
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE/EVERYONE	0	
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	3	0.2%
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	2	0.1%

v1275: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNETI	9	0.7%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND', HIS ARROGA	0	
44	NOT PATRONIZING	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	1	0.1%
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS/CRISES WELL	1	0.1%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	4	0.3%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	0	
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING	0	
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	0	
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	1	0.1%
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT O	0	
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKE COMPROMISES	0	
55	LIKE THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT	0	
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	1	0.1%
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	0	
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING	0	
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR DI	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	1	0.1%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT/STATESMAN	3	0.2%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	1	0.1%
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, PICKS BEST PEOPLE FOR JOBS	0	
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	0	
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS/MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	3	0.2%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT/WHEN HE HAD A LOT	3	0.2%
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	0	
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.1%
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	1	0.1%
72	GOOD IMAGE	0	
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	3	0.2%
74	HE TRAVELS	1	0.1%
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	2	0.1%
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING, SENSITIVE (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.3%

# v1275: LIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	1	0.1%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	0	
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	0	
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS OR	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	0	
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	0	
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS/ENERGY CRISIS	0	
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	2	0.1%
87	MORE EXPERIENCED	3	0.2%
89	HANDLES FAMILY PROBLEMS WITH CLASS	5	0.4%
90	GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	0	
91	HE IS A FEDERALIST	0	
92	HE IS CATHOLIC	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	1083	80.0%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1276: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1344 /-] [Invalid=1417 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	Q58B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	215	16.0%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	6	0.4%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE/ANTICS	5	0.4%
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO	4	0.3%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN	13	1.0%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE/WORKI	0	
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY/CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED IN	7	0.5%

v1276: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT C	3	0.2%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	7	0.5%
11	EVERYTHING	27	2.0%
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	2	0.1%
13	GIVES/LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AID	3	0.2%
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUNCIL)	1	0.1%
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY ON (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	1	0.1%
16	SPENDS/WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	16	1.2%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC/FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH CANADA	19	1.4%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FR	10	0.7%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO/OTTAWA	3	0.2%
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	5	0.4%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFORE	4	0.3%
22	HE IS FRENCH	3	0.2%
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	17	1.3%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	21	1.6%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, RUDE	17	1.3%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	7	0.5%
27	SARCASTIC, RIDICULES	8	0.6%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	23	1.7%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	7	0.5%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPECIFIED)	32	2.4%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	4	0.3%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	12	0.9%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	8	0.6%
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS	54	4.0%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	2	0.1%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	1	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	8	0.6%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	2	0.1%
39	COOL, ALLOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	5	0.4%
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	7	0.5%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	9	0.7%

v1276: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HI	7	0.5%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	3	0.2%
45	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATLANTIC AND THE PRAIRIES	1	0.1%
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	4	0.3%
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC	10	0.7%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	4	0.3%
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL, MARGRET, HIS SEPARATION	15	1.1%
51	POOR CABINET, UNABLE TO KEEP GOOD MEMBERS, POOR CHOICE OF ME	8	0.6%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	1	0.1%
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	6	0.4%
54	HIS STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS	0	
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	5	0.4%
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	1	0.1%
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	0	
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	1	0.1%
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM, CANADIAN UNITY	18	1.3%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	1	0.1%
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	1	0.1%
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	2	0.1%
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE/FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FARME	3	0.2%
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUA	4	0.3%
67	HANDLING OF OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES	2	0.1%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	8	0.6%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	3	0.2%
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL/SMART, TALKS DOWN TO PEOPLE	6	0.4%
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	8	0.6%
73	POOR SPEAKER	1	0.1%
74	HIS TEMPER	7	0.5%
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	4	0.3%
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO	16	1.2%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY, HIS PERSONAL LIFE	1	0.1%
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	2	0.1%
83	TOO STUBBORN, NOT FLEXIBLE	7	0.5%
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	2	0.1%

# v1276: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.3%
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	1	0.1%
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	0	
90	HE WAS IN TOO LONG, SHOULDN'T HAVE RUN AGAIN	6	0.4%
91	HE/HIS PARTY LOST TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE	6	0.4%
93	MADE A MESS OF THINGS, LEFT A MESS FOR CLARK TO CLEAN UP	2	0.1%
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	85	6.3%
95	NO NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	422	31.4%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	58	4.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	9	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1277: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q58B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Literal question	Q58B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B.1, Q58B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	24	1.8%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	5	0.4%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE/ANTICS	0	
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO	2	0.1%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN	15	1.1%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE/WORKI	4	0.3%
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	2	0.1%
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY/CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED IN	4	0.3%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT C	2	0.1%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.1%
11	EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	2	0.1%
13	GIVES/LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AID	2	0.1%

v1277: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUNC	1	0.1%
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY ON (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	2	0.1%
16	SPENDS/WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	5	0.4%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC/FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH CANA	6	0.4%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FR	3	0.2%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO/OTTAWA	1	0.1%
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	3	0.2%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFOR	4	0.3%
22	HE IS FRENCH	0	
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	6	0.4%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	4	0.3%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, RUDE	11	0.8%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.1%
27	SARCASTIC, RIDICULES	10	0.7%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	22	1.6%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	4	0.3%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPEC	13	1.0%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	4	0.3%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	8	0.6%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	0	
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIS	30	2.2%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	5	0.4%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	1	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	4	0.3%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	1	0.1%
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	5	0.4%
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	3	0.2%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	5	0.4%
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HI	2	0.1%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	4	0.3%
45	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATLANTIC AND THE PRAIRIES	0	
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	2	0.1%
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC	8	0.6%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	3	0.2%

v1277: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL, MARGRET, HIS SEPARATION	5	0.4%
51	POOR CABINET, UNABLE TO KEEP GOOD MEMBERS, POOR CHOICE OF ME	4	0.3%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	0	
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	0	
54	HIS STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.1%
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS	0	
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	0	
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	1	0.1%
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	0	
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM, CANADIAN UNITY	8	0.6%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	2	0.1%
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	1	0.1%
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	1	0.1%
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE/FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FARMER	0	
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUA	0	
67	HANDLING OF OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES	0	
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.3%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	1	0.1%
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL/SMART, TALKS DOWN TO PEOPLE	7	0.5%
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	1	0.1%
73	POOR SPEAKER	0	
74	HIS TEMPER	3	0.2%
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	0	
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO	3	0.2%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY, HIS PERSONAL LIFE	1	0.1%
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.1%
83	TOO STUBBORN, NOT FLEXIBLE	5	0.4%
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	1	0.1%
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	1	0.1%
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	1	0.1%
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	1	0.1%
90	HE WAS IN TOO LONG, SHOULDN'T HAVE RUN AGAIN	4	0.3%
91	HE/HIS PARTY LOST TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE	4	0.3%

# v1277: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
93	MADE A MESS OF THINGS, LEFT A MESS FOR CLARK TO CLEAN UP	2	0.1%
94	NO SECOND MENTION	1042	77.0%
95	NO NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1278: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 /-] [Invalid=17 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q58B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Literal question	Q58B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q58B.1, Q58B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	2	0.1%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	3	0.1%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE/ANTICS	0	
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO	2	0.1%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN	2	0.1%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE/WORKIN	3	0.1%
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY/CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED IN	0	
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT C	1	0.0%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.1%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	1	0.0%
13	GIVES/LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AID	0	
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUNC	0	
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY ON (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	0	
16	SPENDS/WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.1%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC/FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH CANA	1	0.0%

v1278: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FR	3	0.1%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO/OTTAWA	0	
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	1	0.0%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFOR	0	
22	HE IS FRENCH	1	0.0%
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	2	0.1%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	1	0.0%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, RUDE	2	0.1%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
27	SARCASTIC, RIDICULES	0	
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	5	0.2%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	0	
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPEC	2	0.1%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	1	0.0%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	2	0.1%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	0	
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIS	8	0.3%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	1	0.0%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	4	0.1%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	2	0.1%
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	1	0.0%
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	1	0.0%
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HI	0	
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	1	0.0%
45	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATLANTIC AND THE PRAIRIES	0	
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	0	
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC	2	0.1%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	0	
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL, MARGRET, HIS SEPARATION	0	
51	POOR CABINET, UNABLE TO KEEP GOOD MEMBERS, POOR CHOICE OF ME	3	0.1%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	1	0.0%
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	0	

v1278: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
54	HIS STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS	0	
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	0	
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	0	
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	0	
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM, CANADIAN UNITY	4	0.1%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	0	
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	0	
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	0	
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE/FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FARMER	0	
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUA	0	
67	HANDLING OF OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES	1	0.0%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	0	
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL/SMART, TALKS DOWN TO PEOPLE	3	0.1%
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	2	0.1%
73	POOR SPEAKER	0	
74	HIS TEMPER	0	
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	1	0.0%
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO	1	0.0%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY, HIS PERSONAL LIFE	0	
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.0%
83	TOO STUBBORN, NOT FLEXIBLE	1	0.0%
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	1	0.0%
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0	
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	0	
90	HE WAS IN TOO LONG, SHOULDN'T HAVE RUN AGAIN	0	
91	HE/HIS PARTY LOST TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
93	MADE A MESS OF THINGS, LEFT A MESS FOR CLARK TO CLEAN UP	1	0.0%
94	NO THIRD MENTION	1267	46.2%
95	NO NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	50.7%

# v1278: DISLIKE TRUDEAU-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1279: LIKE CLARK- 1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2735 /-] [Invalid=26 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	Q59A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q59A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT, SMART, KNOWS WHAT	28	1.0%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIOUS	78	2.9%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	28	1.0%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	11	0.4%
5	GOOD MAN	11	0.4%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST (SEE ALSO CODES 29 AND	36	1.3%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	10	0.4%
8	CALM, COOL	4	0.1%
9	HE IS A FAMILY (SEE MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY (SEE ALSO 13)	2	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	6	0.2%
11	NICE/GOOD LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	7	0.3%
12	BILINGUAL	15	0.5%
13	LIKE HIS WIFE, GOOD LOOKING WIFE, SHE SUPPORTS HIM (ALSO SEE	5	0.2%
14	ENERGETIC, HAS VITALITY, ENTHUSIASTIC	4	0.1%
15	HE IS YOUNG	64	2.3%
16	HE IS CONFIDENT, ASSERTIVE	6	0.2%
17	HE IS HUMBLE, HOME STYLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF	8	0.3%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	24	0.9%
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	4	0.1%
20	HE IS A GOOD MAN, MORE FAVOURABLE TO BUSINESS	2	0.1%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	3	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	9	0.3%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	4	0.1%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	1	0.0%
25	FRIENDLY, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	5	0.2%
26	HIS COURAGE	4	0.1%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	3	0.1%
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	3	0.1%

v1279: LIKE CLARK- 1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSIST	17	0.6%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH, CAN MAKE MISTAKES	7	0.3%
31	WELL THOUGHT INTERNATIONALLY, DID WELL ON HIS TRIP TO AFRIC	0	
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/ HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND	1	0.0%
33	WILL CLEAN UP THE MESS, PUT CANADA ON FEET AGAIN, EVERYTHIN	1	0.0%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	1	0.0%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/ CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WITH	18	0.7%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE/DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOPL	3	0.1%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	3	0.1%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHA	119	4.4%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, WILLING TO TRY (ALSO SEE 06 + 29)	15	0.5%
41	HIS PROMISES, GOOD PROMISES	3	0.1%
42	HE IS RESPECTED/ADMIRE, I RESPECT/ADMIRE HIM, PROUD OF HIM	1	0.0%
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER,	5	0.2%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, NEW IDEAS	17	0.6%
45	A NICE CHANGE, FRESH APPROACH, NEW BLOOD, IT WAS TIME TO GI	14	0.5%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (NOT SPECIFIED)	0	
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	2	0.1%
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD PLATFORM	8	0.3%
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSU	5	0.2%
50	UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY, TAKES HIS TIME	10	0.4%
52	HIS AMBITION	5	0.2%
53	HIS MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY PLAN	2	0.1%
54	LOYAL TO THE PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	3	0.1%
55	HIS PARTY, HE IS P.C.	2	0.1%
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	7	0.3%
57	HE IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR/ORGANIZER	1	0.0%
58	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, SELECTED GOOD PEOPLE	3	0.1%
59	NOT A ONE MAN SHOW, A TEAM MAN, CONSULTS WITH MINISTERS, AC	13	0.5%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY, RESTRAINT ON SPENDING	4	0.1%
61	HE IS A WESTERNER, ALBERTAN	9	0.3%
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST, KNOWS PROBLEMS OF THE WEST, WILL DO	2	0.1%
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN, DEMOCRATIC, DOES NOT FAVOUR ONE	4	0.1%

# v1279: LIKE CLARK- 1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY/STYLE (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.1%
65	REMINDS ME OF DIEFENBAKER	2	0.1%
66	HE IS A CATHOLIC	1	0.0%
67	HANDLING QUEBEC PROBLEM WELL	1	0.0%
68	HANDLES PROVINCES BETTER, READY TO DISCUSS WITH THEM	1	0.0%
69	HIS DISREGARD OF THE MEDIA	0	
70	HIS VIEW ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
71	HIS VIEW ON PETRO-CAN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	2	0.1%
73	HIS VIEW ON EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM	0	
74	HIS LAUGH, BELLY LAUGH	2	0.1%
75	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	111	4.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	454	16.6%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	61	2.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	15	0.5%
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	50.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	8	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1280: LIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 /-] [Invalid=17 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q59A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q59A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q59A.1, Q59A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT, SMART, KNOWS WHAT H	11	0.4%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIOUS	34	1.2%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	11	0.4%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	7	0.3%
5	GOOD MAN	1	0.0%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST (SEE ALSO CODES 29 AND	23	0.8%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	4	0.1%
8	CALM, COOL	1	0.0%
9	HE IS A FAMILY (SEE MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY (SEE ALSO 13)	3	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	0.1%
11	NICE/GOOD LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	3	0.1%

v1280: LIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	BILINGUAL	6	0.2%
13	LIKE HIS WIFE, GOOD LOOKING WIFE, SHE SUPPORTS HIM (ALSO SEE	2	0.1%
14	ENERGETIC, HAS VITALITY, ENTHUSIASTIC	5	0.2%
15	HE IS YOUNG	13	0.5%
16	HE IS CONFIDENT, ASSERTIVE	4	0.1%
17	HE IS HUMBLE, HOME STYLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF	3	0.1%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	1	0.0%
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	0	
20	HE IS A GOOD MAN, MORE FAVOURABLE TO BUSINESS	1	0.0%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	2	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	3	0.1%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	2	0.1%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	0	
25	FRIENDLY, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	4	0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE	1	0.0%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	1	0.0%
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	1	0.0%
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSIST	16	0.6%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH, CAN MAKE MISTAKES	5	0.2%
31	WELL THOUGHT INTERNATIONALLY, DID WELL ON HIS TRIP TO AFRIC	2	0.1%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/ HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND	1	0.0%
33	WILL CLEAN UP THE MESS, PUT CANADA ON FEET AGAIN, EVERYTHIN	3	0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	15	0.5%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/ CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WITH	11	0.4%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE/DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOPL	1	0.0%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	2	0.1%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHA	16	0.6%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, WILLING TO TRY (ALSO SEE 06 + 29)	5	0.2%
41	HIS PROMISES, GOOD PROMISES	4	0.1%
42	HE IS RESPECTED/ADMIRE, I RESPECT/ADMIRE HIM, PROUD OF HIM	2	0.1%
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER	5	0.2%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, NEW IDEAS	14	0.5%
45	A NICE CHANGE, FRESH APPROACH, NEW BLOOD, IT WAS TIME TO GI	5	0.2%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (NOT SPECIFIED)	1	0.0%

# v1280: LIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	1	0.0%
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD PLATFORM	4	0.1%
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSU	3	0.1%
50	UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE	1	0.0%
51	PLANS CAREFULLY, TAKES HIS TIME	1	0.0%
52	HIS AMBITION	2	0.1%
53	HIS MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY PLAN	1	0.0%
54	LOYAL TO THE PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	2	0.1%
55	HIS PARTY, HE IS P.C.	2	0.1%
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	1	0.0%
57	HE IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR/ORGANIZER	4	0.1%
58	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, SELECTED GOOD PEOPLE	2	0.1%
59	NOT A ONE MAN SHOW, A TEAM MAN, CONSULTS WITH MINISTERS, AC	10	0.4%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY, RESTRAINT ON SPENDING	3	0.1%
61	HE IS A WESTERNER, ALBERTAN	1	0.0%
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST, KNOWS PROBLEMS OF THE WEST, WILL DO	4	0.1%
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN, DEMOCRATIC, DOES NOT FAVOUR ONE	0	
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY/STYLE (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.1%
65	REMINDS ME OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
66	HE IS A CATHOLIC	0	
67	HANDLING QUEBEC PROBLEM WELL	1	0.0%
68	HANDLES PROVINCES BETTER, READY TO DISCUSS WITH THEM	0	
69	HIS DISREGARD OF THE MEDIA	0	
70	HIS VIEW ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
71	HIS VIEW ON PETRO-CAN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	3	0.1%
73	HIS VIEW ON EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM	0	
74	HIS LAUGH, BELLY LAUGH	0	
75	EVERYTHING	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
94	NO SECOND MENTION	1049	38.2%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	50.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1281: LIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 /-] [Invalid=17 /-]		

# v1281: LIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q59A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q59A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q59A.1, Q59A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT, SMART, KNOWS WHAT H	5	0.2%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIOUS	8	0.3%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	0	
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	2	0.1%
5	GOOD MAN	3	0.1%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST (SEE ALSO CODES 29 AND	8	0.3%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	4	0.1%
8	CALM, COOL	0	
9	HE IS A FAMILY (SEE MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY (SEE ALSO 13)	1	0.0%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	0.0%
11	NICE/GOOD LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	0	
12	BILINGUAL	1	0.0%
13	LIKE HIS WIFE, GOOD LOOKING WIFE, SHE SUPPORTS HIM (ALSO SEE	1	0.0%
14	ENERGETIC, HAS VITALITY, ENTHUSIASTIC	3	0.1%
15	HE IS YOUNG	5	0.2%
16	HE IS CONFIDENT, ASSERTIVE	0	
17	HE IS HUMBLE, HOME STYLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF	4	0.1%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	2	0.1%
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	0	
20	HE IS A GOOD MAN, MORE FAVOURABLE TO BUSINESS	2	0.1%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	2	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	3	0.1%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	0	
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	0	
25	FRIENDLY, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	2	0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE	1	0.0%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	0	
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSIST	3	0.1%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH, CAN MAKE MISTAKES	2	0.1%
31	WELL THOUGHT INTERNATIONALLY, DID WELL ON HIS TRIP TO AFRIC	2	0.1%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/ HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND	0	

v1281: LIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	WILL CLEAN UP THE MESS, PUT CANADA ON FEET AGAIN, EVERYTHIN	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	4	0.1%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/ CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WITH	2	0.1%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE/DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOPL	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE	1	0.0%
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	2	0.1%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHA	2	0.1%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, WILLING TO TRY (ALSO SEE 06 + 29)	4	0.1%
41	HIS PROMISES, GOOD PROMISES	0	
42	HE IS RESPECTED/ADMIRE, I RESPECT/ADMIRE HIM, PROUD OF HIM	1	0.0%
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER,	3	0.1%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, NEW IDEAS	4	0.1%
45	A NICE CHANGE, FRESH APPROACH, NEW BLOOD, IT WAS TIME TO GI	4	0.1%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (NOT SPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD PLATFORM	0	
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSU	0	
50	UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY, TAKES HIS TIME	2	0.1%
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HIS MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY PLAN	0	
54	LOYAL TO THE PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	0	
55	HIS PARTY, HE IS P.C.	1	0.0%
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	1	0.0%
57	HE IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR/ORGANIZER	1	0.0%
58	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, SELECTED GOOD PEOPLE	0	
59	NOT A ONE MAN SHOW, A TEAM MAN, CONSULTS WITH MINISTERS, AC	6	0.2%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY, RESTRAINT ON SPENDING	0	
61	HE IS A WESTERNER, ALBERTAN	2	0.1%
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST, KNOWS PROBLEMS OF THE WEST, WILL DO	1	0.0%
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN, DEMOCRATIC, DOES NOT FAVOUR ONE	2	0.1%
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY/STYLE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
65	REMINDS ME OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
66	HE IS A CATHOLIC	0	
67	HANDLING QUEBEC PROBLEM WELL	0	
68	HANDLES PROVINCES BETTER, READY TO DISCUSS WITH THEM	0	

# v1281: LIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
69	HIS DISREGARD OF THE MEDIA	0	
70	HIS VIEW ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
71	HIS VIEW ON PETRO-CAN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	HIS VIEW ON EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM	0	
74	HIS LAUGH, BELLY LAUGH	0	
75	EVERYTHING	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	1244	45.3%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	50.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1282: DISLIKE CLARK-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2732 /-] [Invalid=29 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	Q59B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q59B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW	8	0.3%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	69	2.5%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	18	0.7%
4	POOR SPEAKER, LACK OF SPEAKING ABILITY, MANNER OF SPEAKING	44	1.6%
5	DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH	12	0.4%
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	6	0.2%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, LACKS LEADERSHIP	47	1.7%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM	9	0.3%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	26	1.0%
10	TOO YOUNG, NOT MATURE ENOUGH	30	1.1%
11	NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	71	2.6%
12	HASTY DECISIONS, SPEAKS AND THINKS LATER, CHANGES HIS MIND	35	1.3%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM (UNSPECIFIED)	5	0.2%
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	2	0.1%
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES	11	0.4%

v1282: DISLIKE CLARK-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	LACKS "SAVOIR-FAIRE", LACKS FINISHING TOUCHES, CLUMSY	8	0.3%
17	BUNGLES, MAKES MISTAKES	7	0.3%
18	HIS IMPATIENCE, NOT CONSERVATIVE ENOUGH	0	
19	HELPING QUEBEC TO SEPARATE	0	
20	ANTI-FRENCH	1	0.0%
21	HIS ATTITUDES TOWARDS HANDLING OF QUEBEC (GENERAL)	8	0.3%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, IRISH	3	0.1%
23	TOO MANY PROMISES, UNREALISTIC PROMISES, WON'T BE ABLE TO K	37	1.4%
24	NOT SINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM, DISHONEST	14	0.5%
25	HE IS RUDE	2	0.1%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	5	0.2%
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	4	0.1%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL, POMPOUS, CONCEITED	9	0.3%
29	TOO STUBBORN	1	0.0%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, STYLE, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	33	1.2%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE IN HIM/HIS ABILITY, DOESN'T IMPRE	9	0.3%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER	0	
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	21	0.8%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	4	0.1%
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL, NOT WELL KNOWN	10	0.4%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, LEAVES YOU FLAT, WISHY-WASHY	8	0.3%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, WALK	14	0.5%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T.V.	0	
39	HIS NERVOUS LAUGH	8	0.3%
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	8	0.3%
41	HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE NOT USING HIS NAME, HIS WIFE IS TOO DOMIN	8	0.3%
42	NOT A CANADIAN	2	0.1%
43	EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM (ANY MENTION)	15	0.5%
44	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN, ANY MENTION OF PETRO-CAN	8	0.3%
45	CUTTING DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE, LAY-OFFS	3	0.1%
46	TOO MANY REFUGEES	2	0.1%
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, HASN'T TAKEN OVER	3	0.1%
48	HE DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS, TOO INDEPENDENT	0	
49	TRAVELS TOO MUCH	1	0.0%
50	HE IS OUT FOR HIMSELF, IN POLITICS FOR EASY INCOME	1	0.0%
51	NO BETTER THAN TRUDEAU	1	0.0%
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY/BIG BUSINESS	2	0.1%

v1282: DISLIKE CLARK-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIGH PRICES	1	0.0%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	1	0.0%
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	3	0.1%
56	HASN'T DONE ANYTHING/MUCH ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	2	0.1%
57	VIEWS ON MEDICARE, WELFARE, OLD AGE PENSION	1	0.0%
58	TOO AMBITIOUS	1	0.0%
59	OIL/GAS POLICIES, PRICES	4	0.1%
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WHA	45	1.6%
61	SHOULD HAVE OPENED PARLIAMENT SOONER	1	0.0%
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	3	0.1%
63	SELECTION OF CABINET -- FLORA	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	100	3.7%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	491	18.0%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	25	0.9%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	11	0.4%
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	50.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	11	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1283: DISLIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	Q59B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?
Literal question	Q59B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)
Notes	Q59B.1, Q59B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW	3	0.2%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	23	1.7%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	6	0.4%
4	POOR SPEAKER, LACK OF SPEAKING ABILITY, MANNER OF SPEAKING	13	1.0%
5	DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH	2	0.1%
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	3	0.2%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, LACKS LEADERSHIP	19	1.4%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM	5	0.4%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	21	1.6%
10	TOO YOUNG, NOT MATURE ENOUGH	11	0.8%
11	NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	19	1.4%

v1283: DISLIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	HASTY DECISIONS, SPEAKS AND THINKS LATER, CHANGES HIS MIND	13	1.0%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.3%
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	0	
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES	17	1.3%
16	LACKS "SAVOIR-FAIRE", LACKS FINISHING TOUCHES, CLUMSY	3	0.2%
17	BUNGLES, MAKES MISTAKES	4	0.3%
18	HIS IMPATIENCE, NOT CONSERVATIVE ENOUGH	0	
19	HELPING QUEBEC TO SEPARATE	0	
20	ANTI-FRENCH	1	0.1%
21	HIS ATTITUDES TOWARDS HANDLING OF QUEBEC (GENERAL)	4	0.3%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, IRISH	1	0.1%
23	TOO MANY PROMISES, UNREALISTIC PROMISES, WON'T BE ABLE TO K	16	1.2%
24	NOT SINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM, DISHONEST	12	0.9%
25	HE IS RUDE	1	0.1%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	3	0.2%
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	1	0.1%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL, POMPOUS, CONCEITED	5	0.4%
29	TOO STUBBORN	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, STYLE, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	8	0.6%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE IN HIM/HIS ABILITY, DOESN'T IMPRE	5	0.4%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER	0	
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	9	0.7%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	1	0.1%
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL, NOT WELL KNOWN	7	0.5%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, LEAVES YOU FLAT, WISHY-WASHY	5	0.4%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, WALK	3	0.2%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T.V.	0	
39	HIS NERVOUS LAUGH	3	0.2%
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	1	0.1%
41	HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE NOT USING HIS NAME, HIS WIFE IS TOO DOMIN	5	0.4%
42	NOT A CANADIAN	0	
43	EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM (ANY MENTION)	10	0.7%
44	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN, ANY MENTION OF PETRO-CAN	6	0.4%
45	CUTTING DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE, LAY-OFFS	1	0.1%
46	TOO MANY REFUGEES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, HASN'T TAKEN OVER	1	0.1%
48	HE DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS, TOO INDEPENDENT	3	0.2%

# v1283: DISLIKE CLARK-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	TRAVELS TOO MUCH	0	
50	HE IS OUT FOR HIMSELF, IN POLITICS FOR EASY INCOME	3	0.2%
51	NO BETTER THAN TRUDEAU	2	0.1%
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY/BIG BUSINESS	0	
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIGH PRICES	2	0.1%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	2	0.1%
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	0	
56	HASN'T DONE ANYTHING/MUCH ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	2	0.1%
57	VIEWS ON MEDICARE, WELFARE, OLD AGE PENSION	1	0.1%
58	TOO AMBITIOUS	1	0.1%
59	OIL/GAS POLICIES, PRICES	0	
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WHA	5	0.4%
61	SHOULD HAVE OPENED PARLIAMENT SOONER	0	
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	5	0.4%
63	SELECTION OF CABINET -- FLORA	1	0.1%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
94	NO SECOND MENTION	1052	77.7%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1284: DISLIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q59B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q59B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q59B.1, Q59B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW	1	0.1%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	7	0.5%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
4	POOR SPEAKER, LACK OF SPEAKING ABILITY, MANNER OF SPEAKING	6	0.4%
5	DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH	0	
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	2	0.1%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, LACKS LEADERSHIP	7	0.5%

v1284: DISLIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM	1	0.1%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	2	0.1%
10	TOO YOUNG, NOT MATURE ENOUGH	1	0.1%
11	NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	6	0.4%
12	HASTY DECISIONS, SPEAKS AND THINKS LATER, CHANGES HIS MIND	4	0.3%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	1	0.1%
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES	3	0.2%
16	LACKS "SAVOIR-FAIRE", LACKS FINISHING TOUCHES, CLUMSY	2	0.1%
17	BUNGLES, MAKES MISTAKES	1	0.1%
18	HIS IMPATIENCE, NOT CONSERVATIVE ENOUGH	0	
19	HELPING QUEBEC TO SEPARATE	0	
20	ANTI-FRENCH	0	
21	HIS ATTITUDES TOWARDS HANDLING OF QUEBEC (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, IRISH	0	
23	TOO MANY PROMISES, UNREALISTIC PROMISES, WON'T BE ABLE TO K	4	0.3%
24	NOT SINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM, DISHONEST	1	0.1%
25	HE IS RUDE	0	
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	3	0.2%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL, POMPOUS, CONCEITED	0	
29	TOO STUBBORN	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, STYLE, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.1%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE IN HIM/HIS ABILITY, DOESN'T IMPRE	1	0.1%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER	0	
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	8	0.6%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	0	
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL, NOT WELL KNOWN	1	0.1%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, LEAVES YOU FLAT, WISHY-WASHY	4	0.3%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, WALK	4	0.3%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T.V.	2	0.1%
39	HIS NERVOUS LAUGH	0	
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	0	
41	HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE NOT USING HIS NAME, HIS WIFE IS TOO DOMIN	1	0.1%
42	NOT A CANADIAN	0	
43	EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM (ANY MENTION)	5	0.4%
44	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN, ANY MENTION OF PETRO-CAN	4	0.3%

# v1284: DISLIKE CLARK-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	CUTTING DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE, LAY-OFFS	1	0.1%
46	TOO MANY REFUGEES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, HASN'T TAKEN OVER	2	0.1%
48	HE DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS, TOO INDEPENDENT	1	0.1%
49	TRAVELS TOO MUCH	0	
50	HE IS OUT FOR HIMSELF, IN POLITICS FOR EASY INCOME	1	0.1%
51	NO BETTER THAN TRUDEAU	0	
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY/BIG BUSINESS	1	0.1%
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIGH PRICES	1	0.1%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	0	
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	0	
56	HASN'T DONE ANYTHING/MUCH ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
57	VIEWS ON MEDICARE, WELFARE, OLD AGE PENSION	1	0.1%
58	TOO AMBITIOUS	2	0.1%
59	OIL/GAS POLICIES, PRICES	0	
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WHA	1	0.1%
61	SHOULD HAVE OPENED PARLIAMENT SOONER	0	
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	1	0.1%
63	SELECTION OF CABINET -- FLORA	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	1255	92.7%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1285: LIKE BROADBENT-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1342 /-] [Invalid=1419 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q60A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, CAPABLE, SMART	90	6.7%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, INTEGRITY	97	7.2%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM	47	3.5%

v1285: LIKE BROADBENT-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	GOOD SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF SPEAKING, ENJOY LISTENI	96	<div></div> 7.2%
5	GOOD MAN	19	<div></div> 1.4%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	19	<div></div> 1.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	26	<div></div> 1.9%
8	CALM, COOL	3	<div></div> 0.2%
9	HIS WIFE, GOOD FAMILY MAN	1	<div></div> 0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	<div></div> 0.1%
11	HIS APPEARENCE, ANY MENTION	1	<div></div> 0.1%
12	EFFORTS MADE TO IMPROVE HIS FRENCH/SPEAKING FRENCH	3	<div></div> 0.2%
13	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROBLEMS, HANDLES PROBLEMS WELL	3	<div></div> 0.2%
14	A LONER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	9	<div></div> 0.7%
16	THE WAY HE CONDUCTS HIMSELF, CONTROLS HIMSELF	5	<div></div> 0.4%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	10	<div></div> 0.7%
18	CHARMING, GENTLEMAN	1	<div></div> 0.1%
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, FRESH IDEAS	24	<div></div> 1.8%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	6	<div></div> 0.4%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	15	<div></div> 1.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	9	<div></div> 0.7%
23	EVERYTHING	5	<div></div> 0.4%
24	DOWN TO EARTH TYPE, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SENSE	20	<div></div> 1.5%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, PLEASANT	6	<div></div> 0.4%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	8	<div></div> 0.6%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	3	<div></div> 0.2%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE, DEMOCRATIC	6	<div></div> 0.4%
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS	24	<div></div> 1.8%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, TALKS TO BOTH PARTIES	10	<div></div> 0.7%
31	STEADY, CONSTANT, STABLE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND T	2	<div></div> 0.1%
33	MEDICARE, HEALTH CARE ISSUES	1	<div></div> 0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	5	<div></div> 0.4%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON/ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN	18	<div></div> 1.3%
36	HE IS YOUNG	2	<div></div> 0.1%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, POLICIES FOR AGED	2	<div></div> 0.1%
38	HE IS FOR WORKING PEOPLE (SEE CODES 40 + 41)	18	<div></div> 1.3%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	60	<div></div> 4.5%
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR (SEE CODE 38)	1	<div></div> 0.1%
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS (SEE CODE 38)	1	<div></div> 0.1%

# v1285: LIKE BROADBENT-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	OPINION ON UNIONS	2	0.1%
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	2	0.1%
44	TRYING TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR NATURAL RESOURCES	1	0.1%
45	WORKS FOR POOR/UNDERPRIVILEGED	0	
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES/BIG CORPORATIONS	1	0.1%
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	3	0.2%
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	9	0.7%
49	NOT TOO RADICAL	0	
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES, KEEPS PEOPLE INFORMED	5	0.4%
51	HE WANTS CLARK OUT	1	0.1%
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM	4	0.3%
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING, AMBITIOUS	3	0.2%
54	WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISES	1	0.1%
55	I WOULD LIKE HIM TO RUN FOR OTHER PARTY	0	
56	WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS, DO MORE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	3	0.2%
57	ATTITUDE TOWARD PETRO-CAN	1	0.1%
58	LIKE TRUDEAU	1	0.1%
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG, IMPRESSIVE	8	0.6%
64	POLICY ON TAXES	1	0.1%
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	3	0.2%
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST, HELPED THE WEST	1	0.1%
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW	4	0.3%
72	GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
74	HIS STYLE	3	0.2%
75	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC	3	0.2%
76	EXPERIENCED, MATURE, A PROFESSIONAL	2	0.1%
77	CONFIDENT	2	0.1%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	122	9.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	333	24.8%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	23	1.7%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	122	9.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	11	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1286: LIKE BROADBENT-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 /-] [Invalid=17 /-]		

# v1286: LIKE BROADBENT-2ND RESPONSE			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q60A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q60A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q60A.1, Q60A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, CAPABLE, SMART	36	1.3%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, INTEGRITY	46	1.7%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM	7	0.3%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF SPEAKING, ENJOY LISTEN	44	1.6%
5	GOOD MAN	7	0.3%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	18	0.7%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	7	0.3%
8	CALM, COOL	1	0.0%
9	HIS WIFE, GOOD FAMILY MAN	4	0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	0.0%
11	HIS APPEARENCE, ANY MENTION	3	0.1%
12	EFFORTS MADE TO IMPROVE HIS FRENCH/SPEAKING FRENCH	5	0.2%
13	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROBLEMS, HANDLES PROBLEMS WELL	1	0.0%
14	A LONER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	4	0.1%
16	THE WAY HE CONDUCTS HIMSELF, CONTROLS HIMSELF	2	0.1%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	7	0.3%
18	CHARMING, GENTLEMAN	0	
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, FRESH IDEAS	21	0.8%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	8	0.3%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	8	0.3%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	4	0.1%
23	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
24	DOWN TO EARTH TYPE, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SENSE	10	0.4%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, PLEASANT	4	0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	4	0.1%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	1	0.0%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE, DEMOCRATIC	3	0.1%
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS	18	0.7%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, TALKS TO BOTH PARTIES	4	0.1%
31	STEADY, CONSTANT, STABLE	0	
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND T	2	0.1%
33	MEDICARE, HEALTH CARE ISSUES	1	0.0%

v1286: LIKE BROADBENT-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	6	0.2%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON/ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN	26	0.9%
36	HE IS YOUNG	1	0.0%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, POLICIES FOR AGED	2	0.1%
38	HE IS FOR WORKING PEOPLE (SEE CODES 40 + 41)	7	0.3%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	1	0.0%
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR (SEE CODE 38)	0	
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS (SEE CODE 38)	3	0.1%
42	OPINION ON UNIONS	1	0.0%
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	2	0.1%
44	TRYING TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR NATURAL RESOURCES	0	
45	WORKS FOR POOR/UNDERPRIVILEGED	2	0.1%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES/BIG CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	2	0.1%
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	1	0.0%
49	NOT TOO RADICAL	2	0.1%
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES, KEEPS PEOPLE INFORMED	19	0.7%
51	HE WANTS CLARK OUT	0	
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING, AMBITIOUS	3	0.1%
54	WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISES	1	0.0%
55	I WOULD LIKE HIM TO RUN FOR OTHER PARTY	1	0.0%
56	WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS, DO MORE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	2	0.1%
57	ATTITUDE TOWARD PETRO-CAN	1	0.0%
58	LIKE TRUDEAU	0	
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG, IMPRESSIVE	5	0.2%
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST, HELPED THE WEST	0	
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW	3	0.1%
72	GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
74	HIS STYLE	3	0.1%
75	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC	1	0.0%
76	EXPERIENCED, MATURE, A PROFESSIONAL	1	0.0%
77	CONFIDENT	2	0.1%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO SECOND MENTION	971	35.4%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	

# v1286: LIKE BROADBENT-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	50.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1287: LIKE BROADBENT-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q60A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q60A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q60A.1, Q60A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, CAPABLE, SMART	9	0.7%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, INTEGRITY	14	1.0%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM	6	0.4%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF SPEAKING, ENJOY LISTEN	10	0.7%
5	GOOD MAN	2	0.1%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	5	0.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	9	0.7%
8	CALM, COOL	2	0.1%
9	HIS WIFE, GOOD FAMILY MAN	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	
11	HIS APPEARENCE, ANY MENTION	2	0.1%
12	EFFORTS MADE TO IMPROVE HIS FRENCH/SPEAKING FRENCH	1	0.1%
13	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROBLEMS, HANDLES PROBLEMS WELL	0	
14	A LONER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	3	0.2%
16	THE WAY HE CONDUCTS HIMSELF, CONTROLS HIMSELF	4	0.3%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	3	0.2%
18	CHARMING, GENTLEMAN	1	0.1%
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, FRESH IDEAS	3	0.2%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	1	0.1%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	4	0.3%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	2	0.1%
23	EVERYTHING	0	
24	DOWN TO EARTH TYPE, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SENSE	6	0.4%

v1287: LIKE BROADBENT-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, PLEASANT	1	0.1%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	1	0.1%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	4	0.3%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE, DEMOCRATIC	0	
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS	4	0.3%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, TALKS TO BOTH PARTIES	4	0.3%
31	STEADY, CONSTANT, STABLE	2	0.1%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND T	4	0.3%
33	MEDICARE, HEALTH CARE ISSUES	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	3	0.2%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON/ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN	12	0.9%
36	HE IS YOUNG	3	0.2%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, POLICIES FOR AGED	1	0.1%
38	HE IS FOR WORKING PEOPLE (SEE CODES 40 + 41)	5	0.4%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR (SEE CODE 38)	0	
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS (SEE CODE 38)	0	
42	OPINION ON UNIONS	0	
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	5	0.4%
44	TRYING TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR NATURAL RESOURCES	0	
45	WORKS FOR POOR/UNDERPRIVILEGED	1	0.1%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES/BIG CORPORATIONS	3	0.2%
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	0	
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	2	0.1%
49	NOT TOO RADICAL	0	
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES, KEEPS PEOPLE INFORMED	5	0.4%
51	HE WANTS CLARK OUT	0	
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING, AMBITIOUS	2	0.1%
54	WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISES	1	0.1%
55	I WOULD LIKE HIM TO RUN FOR OTHER PARTY	1	0.1%
56	WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS, DO MORE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
57	ATTITUDE TOWARD PETRO-CAN	0	
58	LIKE TRUDEAU	0	
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG, IMPRESSIVE	4	0.3%
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	0	

# v1287: LIKE BROADBENT-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST, HELPED THE WEST	1	0.1%
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW	2	0.1%
72	GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
74	HIS STYLE	0	
75	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC	0	
76	EXPERIENCED, MATURE, A PROFESSIONAL	0	
77	CONFIDENT	1	0.1%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	1195	88.3%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1288: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1340 /-] [Invalid=1421 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q60B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	69	5.1%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES, HIS PROGRAM	21	1.6%
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	22	1.6%
4	RADICAL CHANGES/IDEAS	7	0.5%
5	HE HASN'T DONE/DOESN'T DO MUCH	1	0.1%
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	18	1.3%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	4	0.3%
8	LACKS POISE	5	0.4%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	7	0.5%
10	UNABLE TO CARRY OUT POLICIES BECAUSE PARTY TOO WEAK	2	0.1%
11	EVERYTHING	8	0.6%
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	26	1.9%
13		1	0.1%
14	SUPPORTS THE LIBERALS TOO MUCH, MORE LIBERAL THAN N.D.P.	4	0.3%
15	NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH	2	0.1%
16	HIS PERSONALITY	2	0.1%

v1288: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	0	
18	HIS TEMPER, IMPATIENCE	5	0.4%
19	AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS ARGUING/FIGHTING	8	0.6%
20	TOO ENGLISH	1	0.1%
21	NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY ANY CREDIT	8	0.6%
22	TOO SERIOUS	1	0.1%
23	DOESN'T SUPPORT INDUSTRY	0	
24	INSINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM	3	0.2%
25	NOT INFORMED ENOUGH, IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS	3	0.2%
26	POOR SPEAKER, HIS VOICE	4	0.3%
27	SENSATIONALIST, EXCITEABLE	2	0.1%
28	TOO ARROGANT, EGOTISTICAL	6	0.4%
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	3	0.2%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS STYLE/WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIE	5	0.4%
31	ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE	1	0.1%
32	FEARS HIS OWN PARTY	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, LACK OF POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	3	0.2%
34	OVER ESTIMATES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS PARTY	1	0.1%
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND TOO EASY	5	0.4%
36	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	4	0.3%
38	AGAINST LEGALIZING MARIJUANA	1	0.1%
39	HASN'T ENOUGH GOOD PEOPLE WORKING FOR HIM	1	0.1%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	44	3.3%
41	DOESN'T ACT ON UNPOPULAR ISSUES	1	0.1%
42	INTERFERES TOO MUCH, GIVE CLARK A CHANCE	0	
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	6	0.4%
44	HE SUPPORTS THE SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	1	0.1%
45	POOR RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC	6	0.4%
47	HE IS BORING	1	0.1%
51	MORE FOR WEST, NOTHING FOR EAST	3	0.2%
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	0	
57	HE LOST THE ELECTION	1	0.1%
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V., IN T.V. DEBATE	4	0.3%
59	DON'T LIKE WAY HE CAMPAIGNED	1	0.1%
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM, DON'T AGREE WITH HIM	0	
66	TOO EASILY LED BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	1	0.1%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	151	11.3%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	714	53.3%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	43	3.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	99	7.4%

# v1288: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	N.A.	13	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1289: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q60B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q60B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q60B.1, Q60B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	4	0.3%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES, HIS PROGRAM	4	0.3%
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	3	0.2%
4	RADICAL CHANGES/IDEAS	1	0.1%
5	HE HASN'T DONE/DOESN'T DO MUCH	0	
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	1	0.1%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	0	
8	LACKS POISE	1	0.1%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
10	UNABLE TO CARRY OUT POLICIES BECAUSE PARTY TOO WEAK	1	0.1%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	8	0.6%
14	SUPPORTS THE LIBERALS TOO MUCH, MORE LIBERAL THAN N.D.P.	0	
15	NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH	0	
16	HIS PERSONALITY	1	0.1%
17	CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	1	0.1%
18	HIS TEMPER, IMPATIENCE	2	0.1%
19	AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS ARGUING/FIGHTING	2	0.1%
20	TOO ENGLISH	0	
21	NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY ANY CREDIT	0	
22	TOO SERIOUS	1	0.1%
23	DOESN'T SUPPORT INDUSTRY	1	0.1%
24	INSINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM	2	0.1%
25	NOT INFORMED ENOUGH, IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS	0	
26	POOR SPEAKER, HIS VOICE	0	
27	SENSATIONALIST, EXCITEABLE	1	0.1%
28	TOO ARROGANT, EGOTISTICAL	4	0.3%

# v1289: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	1	0.1%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS STYLE/WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIE	1	0.1%
31	ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE	1	0.1%
32	FEARS HIS OWN PARTY	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, LACK OF POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	0	
34	OVER ESTIMATES THE IMPRORTANCE OF HIS PARTY	0	
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND TOO EASY	1	0.1%
36	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	0	
38	AGAINST LEGALIZING MARIJUANA	0	
39	HASN'T ENOUGH GOOD PEOPLE WORKING FOR HIM	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
41	DOESN'T ACT ON UNPOPULAR ISSUES	1	0.1%
42	INTERFERS TOO MUCH, GIVE CLARK A CHANCE	1	0.1%
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	0	
44	HE SUPPORTS THE SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	0	
45	POOR RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC	0	
47	HE IS BORING	1	0.1%
51	MORE FOR WEST, NOTHING FOR EAST	0	
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	2	0.1%
57	HE LOST THE ELECTION	0	
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V., IN T.V. DEBATE	0	
59	DON'T LIKE WAY HE CAMPAIGNED	0	
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	1	0.1%
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM, DON'T AGREE WITH HIM	0	
66	TOO EASILY LED BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	2	0.1%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO SECOND MENTION	1303	96.2%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	N.A.	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1290: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1354 /-] [Invalid=1407 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q60B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q60B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)		

v1290: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3

Notes

Q60B.1, Q60B.3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	1	0.1%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES, HIS PROGRAM	1	0.1%
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	1	0.1%
4	RADICAL CHANGES/IDEAS	0	
5	HE HASN'T DONE/DOESN'T DO MUCH	0	
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	0	
8	LACKS POISE	0	
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
10	UNABLE TO CARRY OUT POLICIES BECAUSE PARTY TOO WEAK	0	
11	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	1	0.1%
13		1	0.1%
14	SUPPORTS THE LIBERALS TOO MUCH, MORE LIBERAL THAN N.D.P.	0	
15	NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH	0	
16	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
17	CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	0	
18	HIS TEMPER, IMPATIENCE	0	
19	AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS ARGUING/FIGHTING	0	
20	TOO ENGLISH	0	
21	NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY ANY CREDIT	0	
22	TOO SERIOUS	0	
23	DOESN'T SUPPORT INDUSTRY	0	
24	INSINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM	1	0.1%
25	NOT INFORMED ENOUGH, IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS	0	
26	POOR SPEAKER, HIS VOICE	0	
27	SENSATIONALIST, EXCITEABLE	0	
28	TOO ARROGANT, EGOTISTICAL	1	0.1%
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS STYLE/WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIC)	0	
31	ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE	0	
32	FEARS HIS OWN PARTY	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, LACK OF POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	0	
34	OVER ESTIMATES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS PARTY	0	
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND TOO EASY	0	
36	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	1	0.1%
38	AGAINST LEGALIZING MARIJUANA	0	

# v1290: DISLIKE BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
39	HASN'T ENOUGH GOOD PEOPLE WORKING FOR HIM	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
41	DOESN'T ACT ON UNPOPULAR ISSUES	0	
42	INTERFERS TOO MUCH, GIVE CLARK A CHANCE	1	0.1%
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	0	
44	HE SUPPORTS THE SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	0	
45	POOR RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC	0	
47	HE IS BORING	0	
51	MORE FOR WEST, NOTHING FOR EAST	0	
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	0	
57	HE LOST THE ELECTION	0	
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V., IN T.V. DEBATE	1	0.1%
59	DON'T LIKE WAY HE CAMPAIGNED	0	
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM, DON'T AGREE WITH HIM	0	
66	TOO EASILY LED BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	1342	99.1%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
98	N.A.	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1390	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1291: LIKE ROY-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=352 /-] [Invalid=2409 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q61A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART	1	0.3%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT	19	5.4%
3	LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE, NICE PERSONALITY	2	0.6%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	9	2.6%
5	GOOD MAN	5	1.4%
6	HARD WORKER, TRIES HARD	5	1.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	2	0.6%
8	WOULD REPRESENT COUNTRY WELL	0	
9	TRIES TO HELP FARMERS	0	
10	HE IS CONFIDENT, POSITIVE	3	0.9%
11	CAN HELP THE CONSERVATIVES	0	

# v1291: LIKE ROY-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	3	0.9%
14	DYNAMIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, ENERGETIC	4	1.1%
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY/	2	0.6%
16	HIS DETERMINATION, PERSISTENT, TENACIOUS	7	2.0%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	1	0.3%
18	NEW IDEAS, DIFFERENT IDEAS	0	
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	2	0.6%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	1	0.3%
21	GOOD POLICIES	1	0.3%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	1	0.3%
24	COMICAL, ENTERTAINING	1	0.3%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	2	0.6%
26	HIS COURAGE, HIS GUTS	3	0.9%
29	FIGHTER	2	0.6%
30	DOWN-TO-EARTH, REALISTIC	1	0.3%
31	A SIMPLE MAN	1	0.3%
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE IS FOR QUEBEC, GOOD FOR Q	8	2.3%
34	NEW OUTLOOK ON QUEBEC IN RELATION TO REST OF CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE	2	0.6%
39	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHANC	17	4.8%
45	HE WORKS FOR/UNDERSTANDS/WANTS TO HELP THE POOR	1	0.3%
46	WELL INFORMED, KNOWS THE PROBLEMS	0	
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	1	0.3%
52	SYMPATHETIC	1	0.3%
57	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	0	
64	LIKE TO SEE HIM GET IN TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD DO	0	
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	48	13.6%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	130	36.9%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	24	6.8%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	42	11.9%
0		18	
98	N.A.	4	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NOT QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2387	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1292: LIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=374 /-] [Invalid=2387 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q61A. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?		

v1292: LIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE

Literal question		Q61A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)	
Notes		Q61A, Q61A.2 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	4.8%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART	2	0.5%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT	5	1.3%
3	LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE, NICE PERSONALITY	1	0.3%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	0	
5	GOOD MAN	1	0.3%
6	HARD WORKER, TRIES HARD	3	0.8%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	1	0.3%
8	WOULD REPRESENT COUNTRY WELL	0	
9	TRIES TO HELP FARMERS	1	0.3%
10	HE IS CONFIDENT, POSITIVE	0	
11	CAN HELP THE CONSERVATIVES	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	1	0.3%
14	DYNAMIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, ENERGETIC	1	0.3%
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY/	2	0.5%
16	HIS DETERMINATION, PERSISTENT, TENACIOUS	1	0.3%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	1	0.3%
18	NEW IDEAS, DIFFERENT IDEAS	0	
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	3	0.8%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	0	
21	GOOD POLICIES	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
24	COMICAL, ENTERTAINING	0	
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, HIS GUTS	0	
29	FIGHTER	0	
30	DOWN-TO-EARTH, REALISTIC	0	
31	A SIMPLE MAN	0	
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE IS FOR QUEBEC, GOOD FOR Q	1	0.3%
34	NEW OUTLOOK ON QUEBEC IN RELATION TO REST OF CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE	3	0.8%
39	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHANC	3	0.8%
45	HE WORKS FOR/UNDERSTANDS/WANTS TO HELP THE POOR	0	
46	WELL INFORMED, KNOWS THE PROBLEMS	1	0.3%
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0	
52	SYMPATHETIC	1	0.3%
57	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	1	0.3%
64	LIKE TO SEE HIM GET IN TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD DO	0	

# v1292: LIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO SECOND MENTION	323	86.4%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NOT QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2387	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1293: LIKE ROY-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=374 /-] [Invalid=2387 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q61A. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q61A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q61A, Q61A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	4.8%
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART	0	
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT	2	0.5%
3	LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE, NICE PERSONALITY	0	
4	GOOD SPEAKER, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	0	
5	GOOD MAN	0	
6	HARD WORKER, TRIES HARD	0	
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	0	
8	WOULD REPRESENT COUNTRY WELL	0	
9	TRIES TO HELP FARMERS	0	
10	HE IS CONFIDENT, POSITIVE	0	
11	CAN HELP THE CONSERVATIVES	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	0	
14	DYNAMIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, ENERGETIC	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY/	0	
16	HIS DETERMINATION, PERSISTENT, TENACIOUS	0	
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	0	
18	NEW IDEAS, DIFFERENT IDEAS	0	
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	0	
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	0	
21	GOOD POLICIES	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	1	0.3%
24	COMICAL, ENTERTAINING	0	
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, HIS GUTS	1	0.3%
29	FIGHTER	0	

# v1293: LIKE ROY-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	DOWN-TO-EARTH, REALISTIC	0	
31	A SIMPLE MAN	2	0.5%
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE IS FOR QUEBEC, GOOD FOR Q	1	0.3%
34	NEW OUTLOOK ON QUEBEC IN RELATION TO REST OF CANADA	1	0.3%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE	1	0.3%
39	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHANC	0	
45	HE WORKS FOR/UNDERSTANDS/WANTS TO HELP THE POOR	0	
46	WELL INFORMED, KNOWS THE PROBLEMS	0	
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0	
52	SYMPATHETIC	0	
57	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	0	
64	LIKE TO SEE HIM GET IN TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD DO	1	0.3%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	346	92.5%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	N.A.	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NOT QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2387	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1294: DISLIKE ROY-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=370 /-] [Invalid=2391 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q61B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	4.9%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	9	2.4%
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAMME	3	0.8%
3	HIS IDEAS	0	
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	1	0.3%
5	INCOMPETENT, NOT CAPABLE	1	0.3%
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS	3	0.8%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	11	3.0%
8	CHANGES POLITICAL AFFILIATION/PARTY TOO OFTEN	15	4.1%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.3%
10	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	4	1.1%
11	EVERYTHING	3	0.8%

# v1294: DISLIKE ROY-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	NOT EXPERIENCED	3	0.8%
13	LACKS ORGANIZATION	1	0.3%
14	HE IS CRAZY, NO BRAINS	2	0.5%
15	JUST A COMMON MAN	1	0.3%
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	2	0.5%
17	NOT WELL EDUCATED	1	0.3%
18	THIS ASSOCIATION WITH LEVESQUE, HELP FROM LEVESQUE	2	0.5%
19	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETRO-CAN	1	0.3%
21	HIS PERSONALITY	4	1.1%
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP/ PARTY	2	0.5%
23	VERY ARROGANT	0	
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	1	0.3%
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER	2	0.5%
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	2	0.5%
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	2	0.5%
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.8%
32	TOO CRITICAL OF OTHERS	0	
33	SPEAKS AGAINST CAQUETTE	1	0.3%
34	NOT AGRESSIVE ENOUGH	3	0.8%
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	5	1.4%
37	HIS APPEARANCE	1	0.3%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	17	4.6%
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
52	URNS HIS HAT ON ISSUES	3	0.8%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	54	14.6%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	139	37.6%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	16	4.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	33	8.9%
98	REFUSED	4	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NOT QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2387	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1295: DISLIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=374 -/] [Invalid=2387 -/]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q61B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q61B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q61B.1, Q61B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	4.8%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	1	0.3%

v1295: DISLIKE ROY-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAMME	2	0.5%
3	HIS IDEAS	0	
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	0	
5	INCOMPETENT, NOT CAPABLE	1	0.3%
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS	1	0.3%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	4	1.1%
8	CHANGES POLITICAL AFFILIATION/PARTY TOO OFTEN	2	0.5%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.3%
10	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	3	0.8%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	NOT EXPERIENCED	0	
13	LACKS ORGANIZATION	0	
14	HE IS CRAZY, NO BRAINS	0	
15	JUST A COMMON MAN	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	0	
17	NOT WELL EDUCATED	1	0.3%
18	THIS ASSOCIATION WITH LEVESQUE, HELP FROM LEVESQUE	1	0.3%
19	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETRO-CAN	0	
21	HIS PERSONALITY	3	0.8%
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP/ PARTY	0	
23	VERY ARROGANT	0	
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER	0	
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	1	0.3%
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	0	
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
32	TOO CRITICAL OF OTHERS	0	
33	SPEAKS AGAINST CAOUCETTE	0	
34	NOT AGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	2	0.5%
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	0	
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
52	URNS HIS HAT ON ISSUES	1	0.3%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO SECOND MENTION	332	88.8%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NOT QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2387	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1296: DISLIKE ROY-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=374 /-] [Invalid=2387 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q61B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q61B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q61B.1, Q61B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	4.8%
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	0	
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAMME	0	
3	HIS IDEAS	0	
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	0	
5	INCOMPETENT, NOT CAPABLE	0	
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	1	0.3%
8	CHANGES POLITICAL AFFILIATION/PARTY TOO OFTEN	0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
10	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	NOT EXPERIENCED	0	
13	LACKS ORGANIZATION	0	
14	HE IS CRAZY, NO BRAINS	0	
15	JUST A COMMON MAN	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	0	
17	NOT WELL EDUCATED	1	0.3%
18	THIS ASSOCIATION WITH LEVESQUE, HELP FROM LEVESQUE	0	
19	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETRO-CAN	0	
21	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP/ PARTY	0	
23	VERY ARROGANT	0	
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER	0	
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	0	
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	0	
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
32	TOO CRITICAL OF OTHERS	1	0.3%
33	SPEAKS AGAINST CAOUETTE	0	
34	NOT AGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	0	
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	

# v1296: DISLIKE ROY-3RD RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	TURNES HIS HAT ON ISSUES	0	<div><div></div></div> 94.4%
88	D.K., NO OPINION, NOT STATED	0	
94	NO THIRD MENTION	353	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1 OR NOT QUEBEC INTERVIEW	2387	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2724 /-] [Invalid=37 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q62A.1 in the documentation. 001 TO 097 REFER TO LEADERSHIP. 120 TO 298 REFER TO POLICIES. 330 TO 419 REFER TO AREA AND GROUP. 500 TO 575 REFER TO STYLE. 600 TO 625 REFER TO IDEOLOGY. 700 TO 780 REFER TO PARTY RESPONSES. 900 TO 000 REFER TO GENERAL RESPONSES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	91	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	31	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	25	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	1	0.0%
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	1	0.0%
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	2	0.1%
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	4	0.1%
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	7	0.3%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	7	0.3%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	23	0.8%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	5	0.2%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	12	0.4%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	2	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	21	0.8%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	9	0.3%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	47	1.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	2	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	3	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	3	0.1%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	7	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	4	0.1%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	3	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	5	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	12	0.4%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	4	0.1%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	4	0.1%
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	6	0.2%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	2	0.1%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	22	0.8%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	15	0.6%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	47	1.7%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	3	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	8	0.3%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	10	0.4%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	9	0.3%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	18	0.7%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	13	0.5%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	2	0.1%
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	3	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	10	0.4%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	3	0.1%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	5	0.2%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	4	0.1%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	1	0.0%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	71	2.6%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	2	0.1%

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	2	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	4	0.1%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	9	0.3%
223	FOREIGN AID	1	0.0%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	2	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	19	0.7%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	2	0.1%
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	1	0.0%
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.0%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	1	0.0%
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	15	0.6%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	1	0.0%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	3	0.1%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	1	0.0%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	2	0.1%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	11	0.4%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	7	0.3%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	2	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	10	0.4%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	1	0.0%
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBEC'S NEEDS	12	0.4%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBEC'S NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	1	0.0%
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	1	0.0%
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	30	1.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	126	4.6%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	5	0.2%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	14	0.5%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	39	1.4%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	3	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	12	0.4%
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	15	0.6%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	11	0.4%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	16	0.6%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	6	0.2%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	4	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	3	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	2	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	3	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	1	0.0%

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	13	0.5%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	6	0.2%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	14	0.5%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	6	0.2%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	7	0.3%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
601	LIBERALISM	10	0.4%
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	8	0.3%
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	4	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	2	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		59	2.2%
701		1	0.0%
703		8	0.3%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	4	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	3	0.1%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	1	0.0%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	2	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	2	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	10	0.4%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	3	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	4	0.1%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	12	0.4%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	6	0.2%
900	EVERYTHING	8	0.3%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	2	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	5	0.2%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	10	0.4%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	24	0.9%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	110	4.0%

v1297: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	4	0.1%
948	NOTHING	265	9.7%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	637	23.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	119	4.4%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	13	0.5%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	208	7.6%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	51	1.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	20	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2741 /-] [Invalid=20 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q62A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY?
Literal question	Q62A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY?
Notes	Q62A.1, Q62A.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	25	0.9%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	3	0.1%
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	3	0.1%
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	2	0.1%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	2	0.1%
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	9	0.3%
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	1	0.0%
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	4	0.1%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	8	0.3%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	2	0.1%
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	2	0.1%
66	EUGENE WHELAN	1	0.0%
67	JEAN CHRETIE	1	0.0%
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	6	0.2%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	8	0.3%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	13	0.5%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	23	0.8%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	1	0.0%
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	3	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	4	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	6	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	9	0.3%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	4	0.1%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	1	0.0%
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	2	0.1%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	4	0.1%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	16	0.6%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	44	1.6%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	2	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	3	0.1%
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	5	0.2%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	5	0.2%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	4	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	15	0.5%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	7	0.3%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	4	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	2	0.1%
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	6	0.2%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	1	0.0%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	32	1.2%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	4	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	5	0.2%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	3	0.1%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	5	0.2%
223	FOREIGN AID	1	0.0%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	2	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	20	0.7%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	1	0.0%
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	1	0.0%
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	2	0.1%

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.0%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	1	0.0%
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	6	0.2%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	3	0.1%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	12	0.4%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	3	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	1	0.0%
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	9	0.3%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	3	0.1%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	2	0.1%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	2	0.1%
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	5	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	31	1.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	4	0.1%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	4	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	24	0.9%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	4	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	14	0.5%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	2	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	2	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	8	0.3%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	2	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	3	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	2	0.1%

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	4	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	4	0.1%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.0%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	8	0.3%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	2	0.1%
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	2	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		19	0.7%
703		4	0.1%

v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
704		2	0.1%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.0%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	2	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	4	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.0%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	3	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	4	0.1%

# v1298: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	7	0.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	2	0.1%
948	NOTHING	79	2.9%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	582	21.2%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	23	0.8%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	2	0.1%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	32	1.2%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	1392	50.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2727 /-] [Invalid=34 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q62B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	74	2.7%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	28	1.0%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	8	0.3%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	4	0.1%
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	6	0.2%
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	4	0.1%
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	3	0.1%
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	3	0.1%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	37	1.4%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	2	0.1%
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	4	0.1%
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	3	0.1%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	11	0.4%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	2	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	8	0.3%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	5	0.2%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	4	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	17	0.6%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	7	0.3%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	2	0.1%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	12	0.4%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	13	0.5%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	5	0.2%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	13	0.5%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	18	0.7%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.1%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	22	0.8%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	2	0.1%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	1	0.0%
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	5	0.2%

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	11	0.4%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	4	0.1%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	3	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	4	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	4	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	1	0.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	6	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	13	0.5%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	33	1.2%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	4	0.1%
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	3	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	8	0.3%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	10	0.4%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	13	0.5%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	3	0.1%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	9	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	6	0.2%

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	7	0.3%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	10	0.4%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	6	0.2%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	3	0.1%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	13	0.5%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	27	1.0%
223	FOREIGN AID	3	0.1%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	4	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	1	0.0%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	2	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	4	0.1%
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	2	0.1%
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.0%
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	1	0.0%
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	3	0.1%
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	3	0.1%
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	1	0.0%

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	GUN CONTROL	1	0.0%
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.0%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	5	0.2%
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	2	0.1%
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	10	0.4%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	1	0.0%
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	5	0.2%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	12	0.4%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	10	0.4%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	1	0.0%
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	1	0.0%
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.0%
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	1	0.0%
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	2	0.1%
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	2	0.1%
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	31	1.1%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	3	0.1%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	1	0.0%
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	6	0.2%
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	10	0.4%
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	5	0.2%
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	3	0.1%
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	2	0.1%
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	9	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	27	1.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.0%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	21	0.8%

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	2	0.1%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	32	1.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	8	0.3%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	2	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	3	0.1%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	11	0.4%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	10	0.4%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	34	1.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	7	0.3%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	3	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	4	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	4	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	6	0.2%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	9	0.3%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	7	0.3%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	10	0.4%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	4	0.1%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	58	2.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	2	0.1%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	2	0.1%

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	67	2.5%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	5	0.2%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	10	0.4%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	5	0.2%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	3	0.1%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	3	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	2	0.1%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	8	0.3%
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	6	0.2%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	3	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
601	LIBERALISM	3	0.1%
602	SOCIALISM	3	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	3	0.1%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	7	0.3%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	4	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		27	1.0%
704		35	1.3%

v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	4	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	4	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	10	0.4%
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	5	0.2%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	4	0.1%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	3	0.1%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	10	0.4%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	36	1.3%
733	POWER HUNGRY	5	0.2%
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	13	0.5%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	4	0.1%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	6	0.2%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	23	0.8%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	4	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	7	0.3%

# v1299: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	65	<div></div>	2.4%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	4	<div></div>	0.1%
948	NOTHING	208	<div></div>	7.6%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	735	<div></div>	27.0%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	89	<div></div>	3.3%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	8	<div></div>	0.3%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	194	<div></div>	7.1%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	75	<div></div>	2.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17		
950	REFUSAL	17		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q62B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY?			
Literal question	Q62B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY?			
Notes	Q62B.1, Q62B.2 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	8	<div></div>	0.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0		
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0		
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	8	<div></div>	0.3%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	3	<div></div>	0.1%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0		
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	1	<div></div>	0.0%
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	3	<div></div>	0.1%
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	1	<div></div>	0.0%
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	2	<div></div>	0.1%
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	1	<div></div>	0.0%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0		
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	8	<div></div>	0.3%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0		
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0		
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0		
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0		
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0		
26	CLARK, POLICY	0		
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0		

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	1	0.0%
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	1	0.0%
68	JACK HORNER	3	0.1%
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	6	0.2%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	7	0.3%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	4	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	2	0.1%

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	3	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	10	0.4%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	7	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	5	0.2%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	5	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.0%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	17	0.6%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	1	0.0%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	1	0.0%
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	2	0.1%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	4	0.1%

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	1	0.0%
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.0%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	2	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	2	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	5	0.2%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	4	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	7	0.3%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	3	0.1%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	17	0.6%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	5	0.2%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	11	0.4%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	3	0.1%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	3	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	3	0.1%

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	3	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	6	0.2%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	4	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	13	0.5%
223	FOREIGN AID	1	0.0%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	3	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.1%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.0%
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	2	0.1%
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	1	0.0%
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	2	0.1%
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	12	0.4%
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	GUN CONTROL	1	0.0%
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	2	0.1%
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	11	0.4%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	1	0.0%
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	2	0.1%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	1	0.0%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	4	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	1	0.0%
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.0%
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	2	0.1%
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	2	0.1%
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	2	0.1%
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	8	0.3%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	3	0.1%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	2	0.1%
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	3	0.1%
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	10	0.4%
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	1	0.0%
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	5	0.2%
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	3	0.1%
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	2	0.1%
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	4	0.1%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	2	0.1%
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	8	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	10	0.4%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	10	0.4%

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	17	0.6%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	3	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	9	0.3%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	14	0.5%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	3	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	4	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	9	0.3%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	6	0.2%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	8	0.3%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	6	0.2%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	3	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	2	0.1%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	21	0.8%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	21	0.8%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	4	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	3	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	5	0.2%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	3	0.1%
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	1	0.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.0%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	2	0.1%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	1	0.0%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	2	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	3	0.1%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		8	0.3%
704		9	0.3%

v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	3	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	2	0.1%
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	2	0.1%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	1	0.0%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	5	0.2%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	15	0.5%
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	11	0.4%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	2	0.1%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	

# v1300: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	5	0.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	76	2.8%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	594	21.7%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	15	0.5%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	19	0.7%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	1413	51.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2726 /-] [Invalid=35 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q63A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	19	0.7%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	4	0.1%
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	9	0.3%
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	1	0.0%
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	4	0.1%
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	5	0.2%
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	2	0.1%

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	17	0.6%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	14	0.5%
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	5	0.2%
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	1	0.0%
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	1	0.0%
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIE	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	9	0.3%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	9	0.3%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	7	0.3%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	3	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	8	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	9	0.3%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	3	0.1%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	9	0.3%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	3	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	3	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	13	0.5%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	40	1.5%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	2	0.1%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	5	0.2%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	22	0.8%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	11	0.4%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	4	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	6	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	8	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.1%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.0%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	19	0.7%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	34	1.2%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	1	0.0%
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.0%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	2	0.1%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	2	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	2	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	3	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	2	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	4	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	1	0.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	14	0.5%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	8	0.3%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	3	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	3	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	3	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.0%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	3	0.1%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	19	0.7%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	2	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	4	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.0%
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	6	0.2%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	2	0.1%

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	1	0.0%
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	1	0.0%
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	5	0.2%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	4	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	4	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	1	0.0%
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	3	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	2	0.1%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	1	0.0%
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	3	0.1%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	1	0.0%
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	10	0.4%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	2	0.1%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	12	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	13	0.5%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	60	2.2%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	11	0.4%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	13	0.5%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	65	2.4%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	26	1.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	3	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	2	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	2	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	10	0.4%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	20	0.7%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	5	0.2%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	15	0.6%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	7	0.3%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	1	0.0%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	4	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	1	0.0%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	5	0.2%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	36	1.3%

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	8	0.3%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	21	0.8%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	3	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	3	0.1%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	17	0.6%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	1	0.0%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		60	2.2%
701		1	0.0%

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
703		3	0.1%
704		1	0.0%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	32	1.2%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	3	0.1%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	5	0.2%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	32	1.2%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	6	0.2%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	10	0.4%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	8	0.3%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	7	0.3%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	181	6.6%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	6	0.2%
900	EVERYTHING	3	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	3	0.1%

v1301: LIKE FEDERAL PC- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	7	0.3%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	24	0.9%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	85	3.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.1%
948	NOTHING	244	9.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	705	25.9%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	134	4.9%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	7	0.3%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	226	8.3%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	87	3.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	18	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q63A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?
Literal question	Q63A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?
Notes	Q63A.1, Q63A.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	7	0.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	2	0.1%
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	3	0.1%
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	1	0.0%

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	4	0.1%
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	1	0.0%
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	6	0.2%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	5	0.2%
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	1	0.0%
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	1	0.0%
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	1	0.0%
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	6	0.2%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	9	0.3%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	3	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	2	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	8	0.3%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	4	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	12	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	2	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	8	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	2	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	3	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	10	0.4%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	13	0.5%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.0%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	2	0.1%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	2	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	1	0.0%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	3	0.1%
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	3	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	3	0.1%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	2	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	5	0.2%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	11	0.4%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	5	0.2%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	3	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	3	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	1	0.0%
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	12	0.4%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	1	0.0%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	2	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	2	0.1%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
223	FOREIGN AID	3	0.1%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	1	0.0%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	4	0.1%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	2	0.1%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	2	0.1%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	1	0.0%
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	3	0.1%
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	1	0.0%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	5	0.2%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	3	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	3	0.1%

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	7	0.3%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	3	0.1%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	5	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	8	0.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	26	0.9%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	6	0.2%

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	2	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	11	0.4%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	9	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	2	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	4	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	2	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	5	0.2%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	5	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	3	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	3	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	11	0.4%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	6	0.2%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	1	0.0%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	2	0.1%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	4	0.1%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	2	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	

v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700		7	0.3%
703		2	0.1%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	7	0.3%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	3	0.1%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	10	0.4%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	4	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	1	0.0%
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	4	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	46	1.7%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%

# v1302: LIKE FEDEARL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	3	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	5	0.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	2	0.1%
948	NOTHING	106	3.9%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	617	22.5%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	23	0.8%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	31	1.1%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	1462	53.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2727 /-] [Invalid=34 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q63B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	119	4.4%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	56	2.1%
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	15	0.6%

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
26	CLARK, POLICY	6	0.2%
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	27	1.0%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	7	0.3%
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	1	0.0%
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	6	0.2%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	1	0.0%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	13	0.5%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.1%

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	2	0.1%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	16	0.6%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	6	0.2%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	2	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	9	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	3	0.1%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	3	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	1	0.0%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	4	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	4	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.1%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	10	0.4%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	8	0.3%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	1	0.0%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	8	0.3%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	3	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	2	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	11	0.4%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	49	1.8%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	9	0.3%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	2	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	5	0.2%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	3	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	3	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	1	0.0%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	1	0.0%

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	3	0.1%
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	7	0.3%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	2	0.1%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	3	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	1	0.0%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	10	0.4%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	49	1.8%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	2	0.1%
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	1	0.0%

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.0%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	1	0.0%
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	3	0.1%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	12	0.4%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	1	0.0%
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	12	0.4%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	25	0.9%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	5	0.2%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	1	0.0%
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	5	0.2%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	1	0.0%
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	3	0.1%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	1	0.0%
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	13	0.5%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	17	0.6%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	2	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	11	0.4%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	33	1.2%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	61	2.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	7	0.3%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	17	0.6%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	5	0.2%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	6	0.2%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	2	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	9	0.3%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	18	0.7%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	9	0.3%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	3	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	2	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	6	0.2%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	7	0.3%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	2	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	3	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	1	0.0%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	4	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	5	0.2%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	2	0.1%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	4	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	2	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	2	0.1%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	8	0.3%
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	1	0.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	1	0.0%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	13	0.5%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	4	0.1%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	4	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	2	0.1%
700		36	1.3%

v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
702		1	0.0%
703		1	0.0%
704		90	3.3%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	2	0.1%
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.0%
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	9	0.3%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.0%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	3	0.1%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	8	0.3%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	5	0.2%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	156	5.7%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	10	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	

# v1303: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	2	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	34	1.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	215	7.9%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	842	30.9%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	100	3.7%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	5	0.2%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	194	7.1%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	97	3.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	17	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q63B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Literal question	Q63B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Notes	Q63B.1, Q63B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	11	0.4%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	8	0.3%

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	9	0.3%
26	CLARK, POLICY	2	0.1%
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	1	0.0%
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	12	0.4%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	3	0.1%
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	1	0.0%
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	4	0.1%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	5	0.2%

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	2	0.1%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	12	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	3	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	3	0.1%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	2	0.1%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	6	0.2%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTR	0	

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	3	0.1%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	2	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	11	0.4%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	28	1.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	2	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	5	0.2%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	1	0.0%

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	1	0.0%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	7	0.3%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	3	0.1%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	30	1.1%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.0%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	1	0.0%
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	4	0.1%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	3	0.1%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	8	0.3%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	5	0.2%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	10	0.4%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	1	0.0%
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBEC'S NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBEC'S NEEDS	9	0.3%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	3	0.1%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	10	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	7	0.3%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.0%

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	11	0.4%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	7	0.3%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	33	1.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	4	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	6	0.2%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	2	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	7	0.3%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	6	0.2%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	5	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	4	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	3	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	3	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	3	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	3	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	4	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	2	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	1	0.0%
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	2	0.1%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	3	0.1%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	

v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	1	0.0%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		11	0.4%
704		33	1.2%
706		1	0.0%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	1	0.0%
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	3	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	2	0.1%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	2	0.1%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	2	0.1%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	7	0.3%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	18	0.7%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	

# v1304: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
900	EVERYTHING	3	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	2	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	3	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.0%
948	NOTHING	83	3.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	637	23.2%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	16	0.6%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	29	1.1%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	1463	53.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2727 /-] [Invalid=34 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q64A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	141	5.2%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	23	0.8%
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	20	0.7%
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	22	0.8%
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	10	0.4%
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	1	0.0%
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	38	1.4%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	1	0.0%
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	7	0.3%
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	10	0.4%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	7	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	3	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	7	0.3%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	9	0.3%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	13	0.5%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	63	2.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.0%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	3	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	22	0.8%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	5	0.2%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	4	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	5	0.2%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.1%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	1	0.0%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	1	0.0%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	23	0.8%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	9	0.3%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	7	0.3%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	11	0.4%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	15	0.6%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	15	0.6%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	2	0.1%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	12	0.4%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	1	0.0%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	3	0.1%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	1	0.0%
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	3	0.1%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	45	1.7%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	103	3.8%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	4	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	7	0.3%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	5	0.2%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	6	0.2%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	1	0.0%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	3	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	2	0.1%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	1	0.0%
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	23	0.8%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	8	0.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	4	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	3	0.1%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	7	0.3%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	9	0.3%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	23	0.8%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	10	0.4%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	15	0.6%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	18	0.7%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	12	0.4%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	7	0.3%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	3	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	6	0.2%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.0%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	59	2.2%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	17	0.6%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	14	0.5%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
602	SOCIALISM	11	0.4%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	4	0.1%
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	5	0.2%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	1	0.0%
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	

v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	1	0.0%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		19	0.7%
703		1	0.0%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	5	0.2%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	4	0.1%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	2	0.1%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	2	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	3	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	7	0.3%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	15	0.6%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	19	0.7%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%

# v1305: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	5	0.2%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	4	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	57	2.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	7	0.3%
948	NOTHING	211	7.7%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	760	27.9%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	203	7.4%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	8	0.3%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	300	11.0%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	82	3.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	17	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2741 /-] [Invalid=20 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q64A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	Q64A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY?		
Notes	Q64A.1, Q64A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	8	0.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	1	0.0%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	5	0.2%
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	9	0.3%
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	1	0.0%
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	2	0.1%
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	3	0.1%
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	4	0.1%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	1	0.0%
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	1	0.0%
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	6	0.2%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	8	0.3%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	2	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	31	1.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	2	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	2	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	12	0.4%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	3	0.1%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	2	0.1%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	3	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	6	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	5	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	3	0.1%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.0%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	8	0.3%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	5	0.2%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	5	0.2%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	4	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	9	0.3%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	11	0.4%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	14	0.5%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	1	0.0%
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	8	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	1	0.0%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	3	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	1	0.0%
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	26	0.9%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	33	1.2%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	6	0.2%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	8	0.3%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	1	0.0%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	3	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	10	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	3	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.0%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	3	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	4	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	7	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	8	0.3%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	7	0.3%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	14	0.5%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	21	0.8%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	3	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	3	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	3	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	4	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	20	0.7%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	4	0.1%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	9	0.3%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	7	0.3%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	

v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		12	0.4%
703		3	0.1%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	5	0.2%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.0%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	3	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.0%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	7	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	0	

# v1306: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	3	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	6	0.2%
948	NOTHING	89	3.2%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	608	22.2%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	33	1.2%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	1	0.0%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	40	1.5%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	1478	53.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2727 /-] [Invalid=34 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q64B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	10	0.4%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	7	0.3%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	1	0.0%
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	2	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	7	0.3%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	5	0.2%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	6	0.2%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	2	0.1%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	5	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	51	1.9%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	3	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	15	0.6%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	12	0.4%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	45	1.7%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO)	7	0.3%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	4	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.0%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	1	0.0%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	5	0.2%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	5	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	5	0.2%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	6	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	3	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	2	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	1	0.0%
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.0%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	3	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	2	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	2	0.1%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	3	0.1%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	1	0.0%
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	21	0.8%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	8	0.3%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	48	1.8%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	50	1.8%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	3	0.1%
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.0%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	5	0.2%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	1	0.0%
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	2	0.1%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	16	0.6%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	11	0.4%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	13	0.5%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	8	0.3%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	8	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	6	0.2%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	2	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	10	0.4%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	2	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	6	0.2%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	4	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	6	0.2%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.0%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	2	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	2	0.1%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	2	0.1%

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	7	0.3%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	1	0.0%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	4	0.1%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	0.0%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	112	4.1%
603	COMMUNISM	22	0.8%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	9	0.3%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	26	1.0%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	1	0.0%
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	5	0.2%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	13	0.5%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	5	0.2%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	13	0.5%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	

v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700		41	1.5%
702		1	0.0%
704		16	0.6%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	3	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	3	0.1%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	18	0.7%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.0%
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	1	0.0%
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	3	0.1%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	3	0.1%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	20	0.7%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	2	0.1%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	2	0.1%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	4	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	15	0.6%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	15	0.6%
900	EVERYTHING	16	0.6%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%

# v1307: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	47	1.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	4	0.1%
948	NOTHING	224	8.2%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	985	36.1%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	160	5.9%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	5	0.2%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	291	10.7%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	124	4.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	17	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2741 /-] [Invalid=20 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q64B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.?		
Literal question	Q64B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY?		
Notes	Q64B.1, Q64B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	1	0.0%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	1	0.0%
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	1	0.0%
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	1	0.0%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	4	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	11	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	14	0.5%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO)	8	0.3%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	2	0.1%
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	3	0.1%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	2	0.1%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	2	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	2	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	4	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	3	0.1%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	4	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	5	0.2%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	8	0.3%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	17	0.6%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.0%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.0%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	3	0.1%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	7	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	3	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	4	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	3	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	2	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	3	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	4	0.1%

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	2	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	1	0.0%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	2	0.1%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	20	0.7%
603	COMMUNISM	13	0.5%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	5	0.2%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	4	0.1%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	6	0.2%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.0%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	17	0.6%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	

v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700		8	0.3%
702		1	0.0%
704		1	0.0%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	3	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	6	0.2%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	7	0.3%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	3	0.1%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	6	0.2%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	4	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	

# v1308: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	91	3.3%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	638	23.3%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	17	0.6%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	38	1.4%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	1657	60.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
950	REFUSAL	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=730 /-] [Invalid=2031 /-]		
Universe	Ask only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q65A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	17	2.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	3	0.4%
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	2	0.3%
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	3	0.4%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	15	2.1%
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	2	0.3%
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	4	0.5%

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.1%
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	21	2.9%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	3	0.4%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	3	0.4%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	1	0.1%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.4%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.5%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.3%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	1	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.1%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	2	0.3%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	3	0.4%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	3	0.4%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.1%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	6	0.8%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.1%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	1	0.1%
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	1	0.1%
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.8%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	2	0.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.1%

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	5	0.7%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.4%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	6	0.8%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	2	0.3%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	5	0.7%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	4	0.5%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	1	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	7	1.0%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.1%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	2	0.3%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.1%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	1	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	1	0.1%
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.3%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	2	0.3%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700		8	1.1%
703		1	0.1%
704		1	0.1%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	2	0.3%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	2	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	11	1.5%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	

v1309: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.4%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	38	5.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.1%
948	NOTHING	95	13.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	217	29.7%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	56	7.7%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	2	0.3%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	89	12.2%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	27	3.7%
0	INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2027	
950	REFUSAL	4	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=733 /-] [Invalid=2028 /-]
Universe	Ask only to respondents residing in Quebec.
Pre-question	Q65A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
Literal question	Q65A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
Notes	Q65A.1, Q65A.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	2	0.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	1	0.1%
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	2	0.3%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	3	0.4%
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	7	1.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	2	0.3%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.3%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	2	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.1%
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	1	0.1%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	2	0.3%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.3%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.3%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	3	0.4%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	3	0.4%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	2	0.3%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	1	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	5	0.7%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	1	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.3%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.3%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	1	0.1%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	

v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700		4	0.5%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.1%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	1	0.1%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	

# v1310: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.1%
948	NOTHING	46	6.3%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	201	27.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	7	1.0%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	7	1.0%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	390	53.2%
0	INAP, R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2027	
950	REFUSAL	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=730 /-] [Invalid=2031 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q65B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	15	2.1%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	5	0.7%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	2	0.3%
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	4	0.5%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.3%

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.4%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.3%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	7	1.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	7	1.0%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	10	1.4%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	6	0.8%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	1	0.1%
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.1%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	15	2.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	14	1.9%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	4	0.5%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	12	1.6%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	5	0.7%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	10	1.4%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	5	0.7%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	4	0.5%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE	1	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.1%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	2	0.3%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.1%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.3%
603	COMMUNISM	2	0.3%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	4	0.5%
605	RIGHT WING	3	0.4%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	5	0.7%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700		21	2.9%
704		4	0.5%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	9	1.2%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.1%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	19	2.6%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	1	0.1%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	1	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	14	1.9%
900	EVERYTHING	13	1.8%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	

v1311: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	20	2.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	66	9.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	222	30.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	53	7.3%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	2	0.3%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	76	10.4%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	37	5.1%
0	INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2027	
950	REFUSAL	4	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=733 /-] [Invalid=2028 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents residing in Quebec.
Pre-question	Q65B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
Literal question	Q65B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
Notes	Q65B.1, Q65B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	6	0.8%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLI	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL P	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING,	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	1	0.1%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTION	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	2	0.3%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	4	0.5%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	4	0.5%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	5	0.7%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	3	0.4%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.3%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	1	0.1%
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	5	0.7%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANC	1	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	4	0.5%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESE	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	1	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	4	0.5%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A PO	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS, ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.1%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.1%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	1	0.1%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	

v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
700		3	0.4%
704		2	0.3%
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	4	0.5%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	3	0.4%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	1	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.3%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	

# v1312: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	41	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	210	<div><div></div></div> 28.6%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER; NO SECOND RESPONSE	397	<div><div></div></div> 54.2%
0	INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2027	
950	REFUSAL	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1313: PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2442 /-] [Invalid=319 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, THAT IS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL ... NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		
Interviewer's instructions	(IN QUEBEC, SAY: LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?)		
Notes	Q66A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	INDEPENDENT	142	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
1	LIBERAL	870	<div><div></div></div> 35.6%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	724	<div><div></div></div> 29.6%
3	N.D.P.	331	<div><div></div></div> 13.6%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	131	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
5	OTHER	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	UNION NATIONALE	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	213	<div><div></div></div> 8.7%
8	D.K.	175	
9	REFUSED	126	
99	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1314: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2296 /-] [Invalid=465 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q66A) DO YOU		
Notes	Q66B in the documentation.		

v1314: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	807	35.1%
2	FAIRLY	1135	49.4%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	354	15.4%
8	D.K.	4	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 8, 9 OR 99 IN Q66A	461	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1315: CLOSER TO ANY PARTY

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=392 /-] [Invalid=2369 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "don't know", or "independent" for Q66A.
Literal question	WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
Notes	Q67A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	104	26.5%
2	NO	226	57.7%
7	REFUSED	62	15.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	51	
9	INAP., IF CODED 1 TO 7 IN Q66A	2300	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1316: PROVINCIAL PARTY CLOSE TO

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=83 /-] [Invalid=2678 /-]
Universe	Q67B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q67A.
Pre-question	Q67A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
Literal question	Q67B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
Notes	Q67A, Q67B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	22	26.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	23	27.7%
3	N.D.P.	21	25.3%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	7	8.4%
5	OTHER	0	
6	UNION NATIONALE	1	1.2%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	9	10.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	2	
9	REFUSED	19	
99	INAP., CODED 2 TO 9 IN Q67A	2639	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1317: ANY PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2617 /-] [Invalid=144 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q68A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	775	<div></div> 29.6%
2	NO	1842	<div></div> 70.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	75	
9	REFUSED	51	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1318: PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=751 /-] [Invalid=2010 /-]		
Universe	Q68B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q68A.		
Pre-question	Q68A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	Q68B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q68A, Q68B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	285	<div></div> 37.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	168	<div></div> 22.4%
3	N.D.P. (INCLUDE C.C.F.)	117	<div></div> 15.6%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	83	<div></div> 11.1%
5	OTHER	9	<div></div> 1.2%
6	UNION NATIONALE	62	<div></div> 8.3%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	27	<div></div> 3.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	7	
9	REFUSED	17	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8, 9 IN Q68A	1968	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1319: WHEN CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=687 /-] [Invalid=2074 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q68A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ; Q68B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q68C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY, THAT IS, THE (NAME OF PARTY MENTIONED IN Q68B) TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?		
Notes	Q68A, Q68B, Q68C in the documentation.		

v1319: WHEN CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LAST ELECTION	107	<div></div> 15.6%
2	1978, LAST YEAR, 1 YEAR AGO	21	<div></div> 3.1%
3	1977, 2 YEARS AGO	21	<div></div> 3.1%
4	1976, 3 YEARS AGO	31	<div></div> 4.5%
5	1975, 4 YEARS AGO	40	<div></div> 5.8%
6	1974, 5 YEARS AGO	32	<div></div> 4.7%
7	1973, 6 YEARS AGO	21	<div></div> 3.1%
8	1972, 7 YEARS AGO	30	<div></div> 4.4%
9	1971, 8 YEARS AGO	21	<div></div> 3.1%
10	1970, 9 YEARS AGO	12	<div></div> 1.7%
11	1969, 10 YEARS AGO	38	<div></div> 5.5%
12	1968, 11 OR MORE YEARS AGO	110	<div></div> 16.0%
13	GENERAL, A LONG TIME AGO	19	<div></div> 2.8%
14	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED, TEMPORARY CHANGE, DON'T REALLY BELO	67	<div></div> 9.8%
15	SINCE/AFTER LAST ELECTION (UNABLE TO DETERMINE YEAR)	7	<div></div> 1.0%
16	TIME NOT SPECIFIED, UNABLE TO DETERMINE FROM RESPONSE	85	<div></div> 12.4%
17	THIS YEAR, 1979	25	<div></div> 3.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
88	D.K., N.A., NOT SPECIFIED	64	
99	INAP., CODED 2 TO 9 IN Q68A, OR 8 IN Q68B	1993	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1320: WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY- RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=751 /-] [Invalid=2010 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q68D.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	16	2.1%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	9	1.2%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	31	4.1%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	22	2.9%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	15	2.0%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	14	1.9%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	7	0.9%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONALE,	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	1	0.1%
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	17	2.3%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	12	1.6%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	5	0.7%
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	21	2.8%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	3	0.4%
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	6	0.8%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	8	1.1%
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	6	0.8%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	3	0.4%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	6	0.8%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	10	1.3%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	6	0.8%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	9	1.2%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	9	1.2%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN UN	1	0.1%
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	13	1.7%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	7	0.9%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	8	1.1%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	10	1.3%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	3	0.4%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	17	2.3%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	13	1.7%

v1320: WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN U	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THA	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	5	0.7%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	46	6.1%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	8	1.1%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	19	2.5%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	5	0.7%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	16	2.1%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	16	2.1%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHE	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OT	5	0.7%
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	10	1.3%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	5	0.7%
50	RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	4	0.5%
51	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	30	4.0%
52	"THE MAN" (D.K. IF LEADER OR CANDIDATE)	15	2.0%
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL", DID	51	6.8%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	3	0.4%
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	1	0.1%
58	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
59	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	10	1.3%
60	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	7	0.9%
61	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
62	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	2	0.3%
64	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	3	0.4%
65	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
66	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	1	0.1%
67	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	2	0.3%
68	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	11	1.5%
69	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	3	0.4%
70	APPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
71	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	2	0.3%

v1320: WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY- RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
72	APPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	20	2.7%
73	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	1	0.1%
74	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE	0	
75	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	11	1.5%
76	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	0	
77	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	2	0.3%
78	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	8	1.1%
79	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	9	1.2%
80	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	2	0.3%
81	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	4	0.5%
82	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	1	0.1%
83	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	2	0.3%
84	APPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	1	0.1%
85	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	3	0.4%
86	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED	42	5.6%
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	54	7.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
99	INAP., CODED 0, 2, 8 OR 9 IN 68A	1992	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1321: WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY- RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=697 /-] [Invalid=2064 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE (SECOND MENTION)
Notes	Q68D.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	2	0.3%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	0	
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	2	0.3%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	0	
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	2	0.3%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	1	0.1%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONALE,	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	1	0.1%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	0	

v1321: WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY- RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	0	
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	0	
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	1	0.1%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	1	0.1%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	3	0.4%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	2	0.3%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	0	
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN UN	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	0	
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	0.3%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	0	
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	1	0.1%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	1	0.1%
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN U	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THA	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	0	
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	6	0.9%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	0	
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	2	0.3%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	2	0.3%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHE	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OT	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
50	RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
51	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	1	0.1%

v1321: WHY CHANGED PROVINCIAL PARTY- RESPONSE 2










Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	"THE MAN" (D.K. IF LEADER OR CANDIDATE)	0	
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL", DID	2	0.3%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	0	
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	0	
58	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
59	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
60	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
61	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
62	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
64	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
65	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
66	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
67	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
68	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	0	
69	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	0	
70	APPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
71	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
72	APPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	0	
73	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	0	
74	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE	0	
75	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	0	
76	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	0	
77	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	0	
78	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	0	
79	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	3	0.4%
80	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
81	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
82	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
83	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
84	APPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	2	0.3%
85	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	0	
86	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED	0	
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	0	
89	NO SECOND MENTION	652	93.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
99	INAP., CODED 0, 2, 8 OR 9 IN 68A	2046	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1322: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY PREFERENCE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2146 /-] [Invalid=615 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Notes	Q69A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1470	<div><div></div></div> 68.5%
2	NO	676	<div><div></div></div> 31.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	570	
9	REFUSED	27	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1323: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1418 /-] [Invalid=1343 /-]		
Universe	Q69B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q69A.		
Pre-question	Q69A. DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Literal question	Q69B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT		
Notes	Q69A, Q69B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	674	<div><div></div></div> 47.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	434	<div><div></div></div> 30.6%
3	N.D.P. (INCLUDE C.C.F.)	119	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	87	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
5	OTHER	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	UNION NATIONALE	86	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	14	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q69A	1291	
8	D.K.	33	
9	REFUSED	19	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1324: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1391 /-] [Invalid=1370 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q69A. DID YOUR FATHER HAVE ANY PARTICULAR PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP? ; Q69B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT		
Literal question	Q69C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q69B) WAS HE THEN?		
Notes	Q69A, Q69B, Q69C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONG	710	<div><div></div></div> 51.0%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	599	<div><div></div></div> 43.1%

# v1324: FATHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	NOT STRONG	82	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	27	
9	INAP., CODED 8, 9 OR 0 IN Q69B	1325	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1325: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY PREFERENCE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2142 /-] [Invalid=619 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Notes	Q70A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1201	<div><div></div></div> 56.1%
2	NO	941	<div><div></div></div> 43.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	574	
9	REFUSED	27	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1326: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1165 /-] [Invalid=1596 /-]		
Universe	Q70B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q70A.		
Pre-question	Q70A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?		
Literal question	Q70B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q70A, Q70B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	573	<div><div></div></div> 49.2%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	359	<div><div></div></div> 30.8%
3	N.D.P. (INCLUDE C.C.F.)	87	<div><div></div></div> 7.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	76	<div><div></div></div> 6.5%
5	OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	UNION NATIONALE	62	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q70A	1560	
8	D.K.	21	
9	REFUSED	15	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1327: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1146 /-] [Invalid=1615 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1327: MOTHER PROVINCIAL PARTY INTENSITY			
Pre-question	Q70A. DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY PREFERENCE FOR ONE OF THE PROVINCIAL POLITICAL PARTIES HERE IN CANADA WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP? ; Q70B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Literal question	Q70C. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q70B) WAS SHE THEN?		
Notes	Q70A, Q70B, Q70C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONG	481	<div><div></div></div> 42.0%
2	FAIRLY STRONG	540	<div><div></div></div> 47.1%
3	NOT STRONG	125	<div><div></div></div> 10.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	19	
9	INAP., CODED 8, 9 OR 0 IN Q70B, NA	1578	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1328: PARENTS' INTEREST:PROVINCIAL POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2354 /-] [Invalid=407 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, HOW INTERESTED WERE YOUR PARENTS IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS, VERY INTERESTED, SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED?		
Notes	Q71 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	642	<div><div></div></div> 27.3%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	1218	<div><div></div></div> 51.7%
3	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	356	<div><div></div></div> 15.1%
4	FATHER INTERESTED, MOTHER NOT	138	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	372	
9	REFUSED	17	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1329: VOTE IN PROVINCIAL ELECTION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2724 /-] [Invalid=37 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE VOTED IN ALL OF THEM, MOST OF THEM , SOME OF THEM, OR NONE OF THEM?		
Notes	Q72A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ALL	1555	<div><div></div></div> 57.1%
2	MOST	719	<div><div></div></div> 26.4%
3	SOME	229	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
4	NONE	99	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
5	NOT ELIGIBLE	122	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	15	
9	REFUSED	4	

# v1329: VOTE IN PROVINCIAL ELECTION?			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1330: ALWAYS VOTE SAME PROVINCIAL PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2446 /-] [Invalid=315 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q72B. IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Notes	Q72B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME	1244	 50.9%
2	DIFFERENT	1181	 48.3%
7	REFUSED	21	 0.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	57	
9	INAP., CODED 4, 5, 8 OR 9 IN Q72A	240	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1331: WHICH PROVINCIAL PARTY VOTED FOR			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1205 /-] [Invalid=1556 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have always voted for the same party in provincial elections.		
Pre-question	Q72B. IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		
Literal question	Q72C. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q72B, Q72C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	524	 43.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	369	 30.6%
3	N.D.P.	177	 14.7%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	63	 5.2%
5	OTHER	0	
6	UNION NATIONALE	9	 0.7%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	63	 5.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	8	
9	REFUSED	31	
99	INAP., CODED 2 TO 8 IN 72B	1499	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1332: CHOICE OR NO CONTEST-PROVINCE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1165 /-] [Invalid=1596 /-]		
Universe	Q72D asked only to respondents who have always voted for different parties in provincial elections.		
Pre-question	Q72B. IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, HAVE YOU ALWAYS VOTED FOR THE SAME PARTY, OR HAVE YOU VOTED FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES?		

# v1332: CHOICE OR NO CONTEST-PROVINCE			
Literal question	Q72D. DID YOU VOTE FOR DIFFERENT PARTIES OUT OF CHOICE OR BECAUSE SOME PARTIES DID NOT CONTEST THE ELECTION IN YOUR PROVINCE OR CONSTITUENCY?		
Notes	Q72B, Q72D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CHOICE	1141	<div><div></div></div> 97.9%
2	DID NOT CONTEST	24	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
8	D.K.	16	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 2 IN Q72B	1580	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1333: VOTED LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2477 /-] [Invalid=284 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondent has voted in at least some provincial elections.		
Literal question	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?		
Notes	Q73A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	2298	<div><div></div></div> 92.8%
2	DID NOT VOTE	172	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE THEN	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
7	REFUSED	3	
8	D.K.	42	
9	INAP., CODED 4 OR 5 IN Q72A	221	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1334: HOW VOTED IN LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2119 /-] [Invalid=642 /-]		
Universe	Q73B asked only to respondents who voted in the last provincial election.		
Pre-question	Q73A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN (SPECIFY APPROPRIATE MONTH AND YEAR), DID YOU VOTE IN THAT ELECTION OR DID SOMETHING KEEP YOU AWAY FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q73B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?		
Notes	Q73A, Q73B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	739	<div><div></div></div> 34.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	654	<div><div></div></div> 30.9%
3	N.D.P.	332	<div><div></div></div> 15.7%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	120	<div><div></div></div> 5.7%
5	OTHER	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
6	UNION NATIONALE	36	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	226	<div><div></div></div> 10.7%
8	PC AND LIBERALS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	0	
9	REFUSED	145	

# v1334: HOW VOTED IN LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	D.K.	52	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q73A	445	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1335: PROVINCIAL:MOST IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2342 /-] [Invalid=419 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q74A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	704	<div></div> 30.1%
2	CANDIDATES	627	<div></div> 26.8%
3	THE PARTIES	1011	<div></div> 43.2%
8	D.K.	128	
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 3 TO 9 IN Q73A	291	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1336: PROVINCIAL:2ND IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2243 /-] [Invalid=518 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q74B. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	954	<div></div> 42.5%
2	CANDIDATES	718	<div></div> 32.0%
3	THE PARTIES	571	<div></div> 25.5%
8	D.K.	227	
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 3 TO 9 IN Q73A	291	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1337: PROVINCIAL:3RD IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2208 /-] [Invalid=553 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q74C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE LEAST IMPORTANT?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74C in the documentation.		

v1337: PROVINCIAL:3RD IMPORTANT-LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	604	27.4%
2	CANDIDATES	918	41.6%
3	THE PARTIES	686	31.1%
8	D.K.	262	
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 3 TO 9 IN Q73A	291	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1338: ISSUE OR PERSONAL STAND ON ISSUES

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1297 /-] [Invalid=1464 /-]
Universe	Q74D asked only to respondents who mentioned "leader" or "candidate" as most important in Q74A.
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
Literal question	Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON ISSUES?
Notes	Q74A, Q74D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STAND ON ISSUES	591	45.6%
2	PERSONAL QUALITIES	706	54.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
8	D.K.	59	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 OR 2 IN Q74A	1388	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1339: PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=443 /-] [Invalid=2318 /-]
Universe	Q74E.1 asked only to respondents who answered "stand on issues" for Q74D.
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON ISSUES?
Literal question	Q74E.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?
Notes	Q74A, Q74D, Q74E.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR	17	3.8%
2	HERITAGE FUND	8	1.8%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	16	3.6%
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING	1	0.2%
5	PROPERTY TAXES	1	0.2%
6	WAGES/INCOMES	5	1.1%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	40	9.0%
8	I.C.B.C.	2	0.5%
9	FISHERIES	2	0.5%

v1339: PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONED	9	2.0%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	20	4.5%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS	11	2.5%
13	CAR INSURANCE	0	
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	1	0.2%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	3	0.7%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BIG	0	
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	2	0.5%
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	12	2.7%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	0	
20	OIL/ENERGY	35	7.9%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	20	4.5%
22	BILINGUALISM/LANGUAGE ISSUE	11	2.5%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	25	5.6%
24	FOR SEPARATISM	6	1.4%
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	16	3.6%
26	UNITY	12	2.7%
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	3	0.7%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES/TRANSPORTATION	6	1.4%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	2	0.5%
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	2	0.5%
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	1	0.2%
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, OVERALL WELL-BE	18	4.1%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	4	0.9%
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	19	4.3%
35	CONSTITUTION	1	0.2%
36	RIGHTS OF MINORITIES	2	0.5%
37	OFF-SHORE OIL	2	0.5%
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL, GENERAL WELFARE OF	3	0.7%
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE, GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	10	2.3%
40	GENERAL ISSUES	2	0.5%
41	GENERAL LIKE (PLATFORM, POLICIES)/ NO SPECIFIC ISSUE	36	8.1%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	3	0.7%
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	1	0.2%
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	2	0.5%
45	THE CANDIDATE	4	0.9%
46	THE LEADER	9	2.0%
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	13	2.9%
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	12	2.7%

# v1339: PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	0	
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE AND OTTAWA	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
53	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	148	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q74D	2152	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1340: PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=591 /-] [Invalid=2170 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q74D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q74E.2 WHICH ISSUE ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q74A, Q74D, Q74E.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
2	HERITAGE FUND	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING	0	
5	PROPERTY TAXES	0	
6	WAGES/INCOMES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	20	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
8	I.C.B.C.	0	
9	FISHERIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONED	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
13	CAR INSURANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BIG	0	
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	0	
20	OIL/ENERGY	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
22	BILINGUALISM/LANGUAGE ISSUE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%

# v1340: PROVINCIAL-WHICH ISSUE:RESPONSE2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	FOR SEPARATISM	2	0.3%
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	1	0.2%
26	UNITY	2	0.3%
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	1	0.2%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES/TRANSPORTATION	4	0.7%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	2	0.3%
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	0	
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	0	
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, OVERALL WELL-BE	1	0.2%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	1	0.2%
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	5	0.8%
35	CONSTITUTION	0	
36	RIGHTS OF MINORITIES	0	
37	OFF-SHORE OIL	0	
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL, GENERAL WELFARE OF	4	0.7%
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE, GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	0	
40	GENERAL ISSUES	0	
41	GENERAL LIKE (PLATFORM, POLICIES)/ NO SPECIFIC ISSUE	3	0.5%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	1	0.2%
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	2	0.3%
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	3	0.5%
45	THE CANDIDATE	0	
46	THE LEADER	1	0.2%
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	7	1.2%
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	1	0.2%
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	0	
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE AND OTTAWA	3	0.5%
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
53	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
98	NO SECOND MENTION	449	76.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q74D	2152	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1341: ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=981 /-] [Invalid=1780 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1341: ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT			
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q74F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITION ON ISSUES	331	<div></div> 33.7%
2	GENERAL APPROACH	650	<div></div> 66.3%
8	D.K.	50	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 3 IN Q74A	1730	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1342: PROVINCIAL:WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=283 /-] [Invalid=2478 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q74F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q74G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY?		
Notes	Q74A, Q74F, Q74G.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR	10	<div></div> 3.5%
2	HERITAGE FUND	2	<div></div> 0.7%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	13	<div></div> 4.6%
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING	3	<div></div> 1.1%
5	PROPERTY TAXES	0	
6	WAGES/INCOMES	1	<div></div> 0.4%
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	18	<div></div> 6.4%
8	I.C.B.C.	0	
9	FISHERIES	1	<div></div> 0.4%
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONED	4	<div></div> 1.4%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	9	<div></div> 3.2%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS	11	<div></div> 3.9%
13	CAR INSURANCE	3	<div></div> 1.1%
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	1	<div></div> 0.4%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	3	<div></div> 1.1%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BIG	0	
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	0	
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	3	<div></div> 1.1%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	1	<div></div> 0.4%
20	OIL/ENERGY	15	<div></div> 5.3%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	11	<div></div> 3.9%

v1342: PROVINCIAL:WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	BILINGUALISM/LANGUAGE ISSUE	10	3.5%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	47	16.6%
24	FOR SEPARATISM	7	2.5%
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	24	8.5%
26	UNITY	10	3.5%
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	3	1.1%
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES/TRANSPORTATION	4	1.4%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	2	0.7%
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	0	
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, OVERALL WELL-BE	1	0.4%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	3	1.1%
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	2	0.7%
35	CONSTITUTION	6	2.1%
36	RIGHTS OF MINORITIES	2	0.7%
37	OFF-SHORE OIL	0	
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL, GENERAL WELFARE OF	6	2.1%
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE, GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	9	3.2%
40	GENERAL ISSUES	1	0.4%
41	GENERAL LIKE (PLATFORM, POLICIES)/ NO SPECIFIC ISSUE	9	3.2%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	2	0.7%
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	3	1.1%
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	2	0.7%
45	THE CANDIDATE	0	
46	THE LEADER	0	
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	12	4.2%
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	1	0.4%
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	0	
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE AND OTTAWA	7	2.5%
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.4%
53	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	48	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q74F	2412	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1343: PROVINCIAL:WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=283 -] [Invalid=2478 -]

v1343: PROVINCIAL:WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 2

Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q74A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE LAST PROVINCIAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q74F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?
Literal question	Q74G.2 VWHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)
Notes	Q74A, Q74F, Q74G.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR	3	1.1%
2	HERITAGE FUND	2	0.7%
3	ECONOMY (UNSPECIFIED,GENERAL), ECONOMIC/ FINANCIAL SITUATION/	5	1.8%
4	COST OF HOUSING/HOUSING	2	0.7%
5	PROPERTY TAXES	1	0.4%
6	WAGES/INCOMES	0	
7	UNEMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT/JOBS	7	2.5%
8	I.C.B.C.	0	
9	FISHERIES	1	0.4%
10	OLD AGE PENSION/CARE FOR OLD/PENSIONED	2	0.7%
11	EDUCATION/EDUCATION SYSTEM	4	1.4%
12	HOSPITIZATION/MEDICARE/MEDICAL PROGRAMS	10	3.5%
13	CAR INSURANCE	1	0.4%
14	WELFARE/SOCIAL WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	1	0.4%
15	TAXES (INCOME, OF SPECIFIC THINGS)	2	0.7%
16	CONTROL OF BIG BUSINESS/CORPORATE RIP-OFFS/ PROFITEERING/BIG	0	
17	LABOUR/LABOUR DISPUTES/UNIONS	0	
18	FARM/AGRICULTURAL	4	1.4%
19	FOREIGN INVESTMENT/CONTROL	1	0.4%
20	OIL/ENERGY	2	0.7%
21	POLLUTION/ECOLOGY/RESOURCES	2	0.7%
22	BILINGUALISM/LANGUAGE ISSUE	5	1.8%
23	SEPARATISM (UNSPECIFIED AS TO FOR VS. AGAINST)	2	0.7%
24	FOR SEPARATISM	1	0.4%
25	AGAINST SEPARATISM	0	
26	UNITY	2	0.7%
27	MORE INDEPENDENCE FOR PROVINCE (ECONOMIC & POLITICAL)	0	
28	ROADS/HIGHWAYS/BRIDGES/FERRIES/TRANSPORTATION	4	1.4%
29	PERFORMED WELL IN PAST/GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE	1	0.4%
30	KEEP PROMISES/DO AS THEY SAY THEY WILL	0	
31	DON'T/CAN'T KEEP PROMISES	0	
32	FOR PEOPLE IN GENERAL, THOSE THAT NEED HELP, OVERALL WELL-BE	1	0.4%
33	FOR WORKING MAN/WORKING CLASS	0	
34	LOOKS AFTER LOCAL INTERESTS/HIS CONSTITUENTS/ KEEPS THEM WELL	0	

# v1343: PROVINCIAL:WHICH ISSUE-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
35	CONSTITUTION	0	
36	RIGHTS OF MINORITIES	0	
37	OFF-SHORE OIL	0	
38	OUR WAY OF LIVING, EVERYTHING IN GENERAL, GENERAL WELFARE OF	2	0.7%
39	TIME/NEED FOR A CHANGE, GET RID OF OLD GOV'T	3	1.1%
40	GENERAL ISSUES	0	
41	GENERAL LIKE (PLATFORM, POLICIES)/ NO SPECIFIC ISSUE	3	1.1%
42	FREE/PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	1	0.4%
43	GOV'T TAKEOVER OF INDUSTRIES/LAND	1	0.4%
44	DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/ DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIES	3	1.1%
45	THE CANDIDATE	0	
46	THE LEADER	1	0.4%
47	GOVERNMENT/PROVINCIAL SPENDING/RUNNING OF GOV'T	4	1.4%
48	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.7%
49	LOCAL AFFAIRS	2	0.7%
50	LIQUOR LAWS/LEGAL DRINKING AGE	1	0.4%
51	RELATIONS BETWEEN PROVINCES/PROVINCE AND OTTAWA	1	0.4%
52	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.4%
53	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
98	NO SECOND MENTION	192	67.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q74F	2460	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1344: VOTED IN PENULTIM PROVINCIAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2380 /-] [Invalid=381 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THE PROVINCIAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN (SPECIFY YEAR). DO YOU REMEMBER WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q75A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	2013	84.6%
2	DID NOT VOTE	173	7.3%
3	NOT ELIGIBLE THEN	194	8.2%
8	DON'T REMEMBER	381	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, INAP., CODED 0 OR 3 TO 9 IN Q73A	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1345: HOW VOTED IN PENULTIM ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		

# v1345: HOW VOTED IN PENULTIM ELECTION			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1885 /-] [Invalid=876 /-]		
Universe	Q75B asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q75A.		
Pre-question	Q75A. THE PROVINCIAL ELECTION BEFORE THAT WAS IN (SPECIFY YEAR). DO YOU REMEMBER WHETHER YOU VOTED IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q75B. WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE FOR THEN?		
Notes	Q75A, Q75B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	755	<div><div></div></div> 40.1%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	518	<div><div></div></div> 27.5%
3	N.D.P.	269	<div><div></div></div> 14.3%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	124	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
5	OTHER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	UNION NATIONALE	29	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	83	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
9	REFUSED	104	<div><div></div></div> 5.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	0	
88	D.K.	128	
99	INAP., IF NOT CODED 1 IN Q75A	748	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1346: PROVINCIAL PC LEADER THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1846 /-] [Invalid=915 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q76A in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	89	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
2	2 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	56	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	

v1346: PROVINCIAL PC LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
15	15 SCORE	2	0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	55	3.0%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	6	0.3%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	89	4.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	96	5.2%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	0.1%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	402	21.8%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	4	0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	

v1346: PROVINCIAL PC LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
60	60 SCORE	261	14.1%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	12	0.7%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	212	11.5%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	60	3.3%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	249	13.5%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	16	0.9%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	1	0.1%
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	121	6.6%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	1	0.1%
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	10	0.5%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	90	4.9%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	181	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	734	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1347: PROVINCIAL PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Information [Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]

# v1347: PROVINCIAL PC PARTY THERMOMETER			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1852 /-] [Invalid=909 /-]		
Universe	Q76B asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q76B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q76A, Q76B in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	79	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	46	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	48	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	84	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	

v1347: PROVINCIAL PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	37 SCORE	1	0.1%
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	111	6.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	470	25.4%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	1	0.1%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	6	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	258	13.9%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	20	1.1%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	245	13.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	61	3.3%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	218	11.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	

v1347: PROVINCIAL PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	7	0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	106	5.7%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	65	3.5%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	175	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	734	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1348: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL LEADER THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2033 /-] [Invalid=728 /-]
Universe	Q77A asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia.
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).
Literal question	Q77A. NOW THE LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
Notes	Q76A, Q77A in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	92	4.5%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	5	0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	41	2.0%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	

v1348: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.0%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	71	3.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	4	0.2%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	89	4.4%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.0%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	162	8.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	0.0%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	526	25.9%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.0%
52	52 SCORE	1	0.0%
53	53 SCORE	2	0.1%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	6	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	

v1348: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	273	<div><div></div></div> 13.4%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	31	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	285	<div><div></div></div> 14.0%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	44	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	195	<div><div></div></div> 9.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	107	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	81	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	259	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	469	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1349: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2091 /-] [Invalid=670 /-]		
Universe	Q77B asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q77B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q76A, Q77B in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	75	<div></div> 3.6%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.0%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	47	<div></div> 2.2%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	66	<div></div> 3.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	7	<div></div> 0.3%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	90	<div></div> 4.3%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	

v1349: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	176	8.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	5	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	573	27.4%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	2	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	8	0.4%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	306	14.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	1	0.0%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	20	1.0%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	1	0.0%
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	254	12.1%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	35	1.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	209	10.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	

v1349: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	11	0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	110	5.3%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	1	0.0%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	87	4.2%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	201	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	469	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1350: PROVINCIAL NDP LEADER THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1362 /-] [Invalid=1399 /-]
Universe	Q78A asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island.
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).
Literal question	Q78A. HOW ABOUT THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
Notes	Q76A, Q78A in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	107	7.9%
2	2 SCORE	1	0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	1	0.1%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	38	2.8%
11	11 SCORE	0	

v1350: PROVINCIAL NDP LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	1	0.1%
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	60	4.4%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	14	1.0%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	1	0.1%
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	92	6.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	135	9.9%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	6	0.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	380	27.9%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	9	0.7%
56	56 SCORE	0	

v1350: PROVINCIAL NDP LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	138	10.1%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	22	1.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	124	9.1%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	22	1.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	95	7.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	8	0.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	52	3.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	46	3.4%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	296	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	1103	

# v1350: PROVINCIAL NDP LEADER THERMOMETER			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1351: PROVINCIAL NDP THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1442 /-] [Invalid=1319 /-]		
Universe	Q78B asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q78B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q76A, Q78B in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	135	<div></div> 9.4%
2	2 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	62	<div></div> 4.3%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	76	<div></div> 5.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	13	<div></div> 0.9%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	112	<div></div> 7.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	

v1351: PROVINCIAL NDP THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	6	0.4%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	131	9.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	1	0.1%
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	0.3%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	0.1%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	390	27.0%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	8	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	1	0.1%
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	1	0.1%
60	60 SCORE	142	9.8%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	19	1.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	118	8.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	23	1.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	

# v1351: PROVINCIAL NDP THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	96	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	50	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	36	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	216	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	1103	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1352: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=435 /-] [Invalid=2326 /-]		
Universe	Q79A asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q79A. NOW, THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. (NAME LEADER)? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q76A, Q79A in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	35	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	

v1352: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	15	3.4%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.5%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	19	4.4%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	3	0.7%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	30	6.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	29	6.7%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	0.9%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	96	22.1%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	

v1352: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	4	0.9%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	48	11.0%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	2	0.5%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	55	12.6%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	14	3.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	37	8.5%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	3	0.7%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	23	5.3%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	

# v1352: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	14	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	52	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	2274	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1353: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1014 /-] [Invalid=1747 /-]		
Universe	Q79B.1 asked only to respondents who reside in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q79B.1 HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) TAKEN AS A WHOLE		
Notes	Q76A, Q79B.1 in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	127	<div><div></div></div> 12.5%
2	2 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	5 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	77	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	74	<div><div></div></div> 7.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	

v1353: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	106	10.5%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	85	8.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.3%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	272	26.8%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	2	0.2%
53	53 SCORE	1	0.1%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	73	7.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	3	0.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	73	7.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	

# v1353: PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	7	0.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	55	5.4%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	3	0.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	16	1.6%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	1	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	20	2.0%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	207	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	1540	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1354: LEVESQUE THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=706 /-] [Invalid=2055 /-]		
Universe	Q80A asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q80A. HOW ABOUT THE LEADER OF THE PARTI QUEBECOIS, MR. LEVESQUE? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q76A, Q80A in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	61	8.6%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	

v1354: LEVESQUE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	5 SCORE	1	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	27	3.8%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	26	3.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	3	0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	33	4.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	1	0.1%
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	0	
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	43	6.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	1	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	1	0.1%
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	

v1354: LEVESQUE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	NEUTRAL	106	15.0%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	1	0.1%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	64	9.1%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	2	0.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	88	12.5%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	1	0.1%
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	19	2.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	94	13.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	4	0.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	71	10.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	

# v1354: LEVESQUE THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
95	95 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	54	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	46	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	2009	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1355: PARTI QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=702 /-] [Invalid=2059 /-]		
Universe	Q80B asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q80B. HOW ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q76A, Q80B in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	83	<div><div></div></div> 11.8%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	31	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	32	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
26	26 SCORE	0	

v1355: PARTI QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	33	4.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	0.4%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	55	7.8%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	0	
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	119	17.0%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	3	0.4%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	66	9.4%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	6	0.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	75	10.7%
71	71 SCORE	0	

# v1355: PARTI QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	89	<div><div></div></div> 12.7%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	48	<div><div></div></div> 6.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	31	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	50	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	2009	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1356: UNION NATIONALE LEADER THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=664 /-] [Invalid=2097 /-]		
Universe	Q81A asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).		
Literal question	Q81A. HOW ABOUT THE LEADER OF THE UNION NATIONALE, MR. BIRON? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q76A, Q81A in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	47	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	

v1356: UNION NATIONALE LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	0.5%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	27	4.1%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	4	0.6%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	1	0.2%
20	20 SCORE	46	6.9%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.2%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	50	7.5%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	4	0.6%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	60	9.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	1	0.2%
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.3%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	

v1356: UNION NATIONALE LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	216	32.5%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	4	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	108	16.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	7	1.1%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	45	6.8%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	7	1.1%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	23	3.5%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	0	
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	5	0.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	

v1356: UNION NATIONALE LEADER THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	3	0.5%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	88	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	2009	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1357: UNION NATIONALE PARTY THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=661 /-] [Invalid=2100 /-]
Universe	Q81B asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	Q76A. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE). WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS (HAND CARD 2). LET'S START WITH THE PROVINCIAL (NAME PARTY).
Literal question	Q81B. HOW ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE TAKEN AS A WHOLE?
Notes	Q76A, Q81B in the documentation. NOT ALL PARTIES ASKED IN EVERY PROVINCE AND ORDER OF QUESTIONS VARIED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	48	7.3%
2	2 SCORE	1	0.2%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	0.5%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	26	3.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	5	0.8%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	55	8.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	

v1357: UNION NATIOANLE PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	25 SCORE	4	0.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	45	6.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	0.5%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	59	8.9%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.5%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	241	36.5%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	1	0.2%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	5	0.8%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	101	15.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	5	0.8%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	

v1357: UNION NATIOANLE PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
70	70 SCORE	29	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	15	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	NO OPINION, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	91	
999	INAP., QUESTION NOT ASKED IN PROVINCE	2009	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE?
Notes	Q82A.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1453	<div><div></div></div> 52.6%

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	25	0.9%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	19	0.7%
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	6	0.2%
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	4	0.1%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	3	0.1%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	8	0.3%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	9	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	3	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	12	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	6	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	4	0.1%

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	4	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	2	0.1%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	3	0.1%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	1	0.0%
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	2	0.1%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	1	0.0%
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	11	0.4%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	8	0.3%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	6	0.2%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	2	0.1%
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	4	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	4	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	17	0.6%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	8	0.3%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	2	0.1%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	3	0.1%
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	3	0.1%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	2	0.1%
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	18	0.7%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	2	0.1%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	7	0.3%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	5	0.2%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	2	0.1%
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	3	0.1%
294	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	4	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	1	0.0%
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	5	0.2%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	3	0.1%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	2	0.1%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	9	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	34	1.2%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	5	0.2%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	7	0.3%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	4	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	26	0.9%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	3	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	5	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	6	0.2%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	3	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	6	0.2%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	9	0.3%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	4	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	3	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	5	0.2%
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	16	0.6%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	1	0.0%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	3	0.1%
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	19	0.7%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	3	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	6	0.2%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	3	0.1%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	1	0.0%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	

v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	5	0.2%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	4	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	2	0.1%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	3	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	5	0.2%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	1	0.0%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.0%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	3	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	22	0.8%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	14	0.5%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	5	0.2%
900	EVERYTHING	4	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	11	0.4%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	11	0.4%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	29	1.1%

# v1358: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	2	0.1%
948		88	3.2%
949		375	13.6%
950		6	0.2%
966		76	2.8%
969		8	0.3%
988		120	4.3%
999		38	1.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q82A.2 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q82A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q82A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1452	52.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	2	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	2	0.1%
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	5	0.2%
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	5	0.2%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	4	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	4	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	4	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	3	0.1%
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	3	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	3	0.1%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.0%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	3	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	6	0.2%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	4	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
176	FISHING POLICY	3	0.1%
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	3	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	14	0.5%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	4	0.1%
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	7	0.3%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	2	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	1	0.0%
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	3	0.1%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	8	0.3%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	4	0.1%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	6	0.2%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	2	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	1	0.0%
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	2	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	2	0.1%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	2	0.1%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	4	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	12	0.4%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	3	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	2	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	1	0.0%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	6	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	4	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	2	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	2	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	3	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	5	0.2%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	1	0.0%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	1	0.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	

v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	3	0.1%
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	3	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	3	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	

# v1359: LIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	3	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	7	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	2	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	4	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		30	1.1%
949		289	10.5%
950		1	0.0%
966		22	0.8%
969		1	0.0%
988		27	1.0%
999		704	25.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q82B.1 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q82B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q82B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1452	52.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	29	1.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	5	0.2%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	4	0.1%
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	3	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	6	0.2%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	4	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	4	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	1	0.0%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	6	0.2%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.0%
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	3	0.1%

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.0%
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	5	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.1%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	11	0.4%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	20	0.7%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	3	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	2	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	3	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	9	0.3%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	1	0.0%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	1	0.0%

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.0%
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
231	THE BRICKLIN	3	0.1%
232	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	2	0.1%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	2	0.1%
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	3	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	2	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	2	0.1%
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	4	0.1%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	8	0.3%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	2	0.1%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	1	0.0%

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	1	0.0%
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	1	0.0%
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	1	0.0%
284	EDUCATION POLICY	17	0.6%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	2	0.1%
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	2	0.1%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	2	0.1%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	1	0.0%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	5	0.2%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	3	0.1%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	9	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	2	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	4	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	3	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	17	0.6%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	3	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	4	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	5	0.2%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	2	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.0%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	5	0.2%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	4	0.1%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	11	0.4%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	6	0.2%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	1	0.0%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	1	0.0%
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	3	0.1%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	7	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	22	0.8%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	3	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	2	0.1%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	6	0.2%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	5	0.2%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%

v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	6	0.2%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	22	0.8%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	4	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.0%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	11	0.4%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	14	0.5%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	7	0.3%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	2	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	5	0.2%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	9	0.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	1	0.0%
948		104	3.8%
949		536	19.4%
950		5	0.2%
966		39	1.4%
969		4	0.1%

# v1360: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
988		98	<div></div> 3.5%
999		48	<div></div> 1.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q82B.2 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q82B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q82B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1453	<div></div> 52.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	1	0.0%
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	2	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	1	0.0%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	2	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	5	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	1	0.0%
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	18	0.7%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	2	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	3	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	8	0.3%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	2	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	1	0.0%
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
231	THE BRICKLIN	1	0.0%
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	1	0.0%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	2	0.1%
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	2	0.1%
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	1	0.0%
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	9	0.3%
285	SCHOOL TAX	2	0.1%
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	2	0.1%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	2	0.1%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	7	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	2	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	2	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT,	7	0.3%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	2	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	2	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	4	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.1%

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	8	0.3%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOV'T. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	

v1361: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	1	0.0%
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	2	0.1%
948		26	0.9%
949		299	10.8%
950		1	0.0%
966		12	0.4%
988		26	0.9%
999		760	27.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q83A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q82A.1, Q83A.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1230	44.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	70	2.5%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	14	0.5%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	4	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	1	0.0%
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	2	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	7	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	4	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	2	0.1%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	5	0.2%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	3	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	17	0.6%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	1	0.0%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.0%

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	2	0.1%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	5	0.2%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.0%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	2	0.1%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	5	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	5	0.2%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	16	0.6%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	27	1.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	1	0.0%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	6	0.2%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	0.0%
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	4	0.1%

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.0%
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	5	0.2%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	1	0.0%
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	4	0.1%

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	1	0.0%
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.0%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	3	0.1%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	12	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	38	1.4%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	2	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	2	0.1%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	3	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	3	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	17	0.6%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	6	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	9	0.3%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	2	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	6	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	4	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	29	1.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	2	0.1%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.0%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
602	SOCIALISM	0	

v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	3	0.1%
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	31	1.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	3	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	2	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	4	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	2	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	4	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%

# v1362: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	10	0.4%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	1	0.0%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER,UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	2	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	26	0.9%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	11	0.4%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	8	0.3%
900	EVERYTHING	5	0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	2	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	9	0.3%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	13	0.5%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	56	2.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	3	0.1%
948		117	4.2%
949		489	17.7%
950		7	0.3%
966		79	2.9%
969		5	0.2%
988		159	5.8%
999		48	1.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

# v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q83A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q83A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1230	44.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	14	0.5%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	3	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	5	0.2%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	2	0.1%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	6	0.2%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	8	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	5	0.2%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	6	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	4	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	2	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	1	0.0%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	1	0.0%
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	2	0.1%
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	2	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	1	0.0%
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	4	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	1	0.0%
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	2	0.1%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	6	0.2%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	11	0.4%

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	5	0.2%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	2	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	3	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	8	0.3%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	1	0.0%
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.0%
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	8	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	

v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	2	0.1%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	5	0.2%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.0%

# v1363: LIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	1	0.0%
948		25	0.9%
949		325	11.8%
950		1	0.0%
966		15	0.5%
988		28	1.0%
999		958	34.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q83B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE LIBERAL PARTY? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q83B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1230	44.5%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	54	2.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	8	0.3%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	2	0.1%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	14	0.5%

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	7	0.3%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	3	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	5	0.2%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	11	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	2	0.1%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	4	0.1%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	2	0.1%
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	4	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	3	0.1%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	4	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	7	0.3%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	0.0%
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	1	0.0%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	5	0.2%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.0%
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	3	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.0%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	4	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	4	0.1%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	1	0.0%
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	4	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	1	0.0%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	1	0.0%
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	1	0.0%
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	9	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	3	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	10	0.4%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	2	0.1%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	19	0.7%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	4	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	2	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	10	0.4%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	3	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	10	0.4%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	4	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	4	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	9	0.3%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	4	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	4	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	3	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	1	0.0%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	3	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	3	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	1	0.0%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	6	0.2%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	1	0.0%
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	3	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	1	0.0%
603	COMMUNISM	1	0.0%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	3	0.1%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	1	0.0%

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	15	0.5%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.0%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	16	0.6%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	7	0.3%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	7	0.3%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	3	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	8	0.3%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	3	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	2	0.1%
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	2	0.1%
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	1	0.0%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	

v1364: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	2	0.1%
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.0%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	7	0.3%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	9	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	11	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	36	1.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		123	4.5%
949		632	22.9%
950		5	0.2%
966		63	2.3%
969		4	0.1%
988		136	4.9%
999		70	2.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q83B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY?
Notes	Q82A.1, Q83B.2 in the documentation.

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1231	44.6%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	7	0.3%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	4	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	3	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	5	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	1	0.0%
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	3	0.1%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	1	0.0%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.0%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	3	0.1%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	2	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.0%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	1	0.0%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	2	0.1%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	8	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	3	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	4	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	3	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.0%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	5	0.2%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.0%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	2	0.1%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	4	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	2	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	3	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.0%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	3	0.1%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	1	0.0%
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.0%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	3	0.1%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.0%

v1365: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		34	1.2%
949		320	11.6%
950		1	0.0%
966		9	0.3%
988		23	0.8%
999		997	36.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Q84A.1 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island.
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q84A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q82A.1, Q84A.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1707	61.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	30	1.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	3	0.1%
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	7	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	3	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	26	0.9%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	1	0.0%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	1	0.0%
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	23	0.8%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	5	0.2%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	3	0.1%

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	2	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	9	0.3%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	6	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	1	0.0%
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	13	0.5%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	4	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	1	0.0%
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	1	0.0%
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	1	0.0%
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	3	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	1	0.0%
289	TOURISM	1	0.0%
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	1	0.0%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	4	0.1%
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	1	0.0%

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.0%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	12	0.4%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	25	0.9%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	3	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	2	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	1	0.0%
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	1	0.0%
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	1	0.0%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	17	0.6%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	3	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	13	0.5%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	2	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	6	0.2%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	6	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	3	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	1	0.0%

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	19	0.7%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	2	0.1%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	1	0.0%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	

v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	10	0.4%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	3	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	1	0.0%
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	1	0.0%
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	

# v1366: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.0%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	2	0.1%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	4	0.1%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	4	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	3	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	7	0.3%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	15	0.5%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	2	0.1%
948		81	2.9%
949		372	13.5%
950		3	0.1%
966		52	1.9%
969		4	0.1%
988		89	3.2%
999		66	2.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q84A.2 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q84A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL N.D.P.?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q84A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1707	61.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	9	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.0%
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	3	0.1%

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	3	0.1%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	16	0.6%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	2	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	8	0.3%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	6	0.2%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	1	0.0%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	1	0.0%
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	2	0.1%
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	5	0.2%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	4	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	2	0.1%

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	1	0.0%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	1	0.0%
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.0%
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	8	0.3%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	9	0.3%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.0%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	5	0.2%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	5	0.2%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	2	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	5	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	4	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	6	0.2%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	2	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	3	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	9	0.3%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	1	0.0%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.0%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMEMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	

v1367: LIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	3	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		17	0.6%
949		194	7.0%
966		8	0.3%
988		21	0.8%
999		630	22.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q84B.1 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q84B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL N.D.P.? ANYTHING ELSE? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q84B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1707	61.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	12	0.4%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	4	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	4	0.1%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	4	0.1%
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	7	0.3%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	3	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	15	0.5%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.0%

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	3	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	2	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	14	0.5%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	3	0.1%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.0%
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	2	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	1	0.0%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	5	0.2%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	9	0.3%

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	4	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	3	0.1%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	1	0.0%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	5	0.2%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.0%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	2	0.1%
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	9	0.3%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	12	0.4%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.0%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	9	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	5	0.2%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	3	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	3	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	11	0.4%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	2	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	1	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	2	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	3	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	10	0.4%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	2	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	2	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	7	0.3%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	1	0.0%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.0%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	42	1.5%
603	COMMUNISM	5	0.2%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	3	0.1%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	10	0.4%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	6	0.2%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	17	0.6%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	

v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	3	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	4	0.1%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	1	0.0%
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.0%
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.0%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.0%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	1	0.0%
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	

# v1368: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	10	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	9	0.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		78	2.8%
949		408	14.8%
950		2	0.1%
966		34	1.2%
969		3	0.1%
988		93	3.4%
999		83	3.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q84B.2 asked only to respondents who do not reside in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q84B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL N.D.P.?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q84B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1707	61.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	1	0.0%
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.1%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	7	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.0%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	7	0.3%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	3	0.1%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	2	0.1%

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	1	0.0%
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	1	0.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	4	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	1	0.0%
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	1	0.0%
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	3	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	4	0.1%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	3	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIRC ORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.0%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.0%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.0%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	6	0.2%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	4	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	4	0.1%

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	1	0.0%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	3	0.1%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	3	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.0%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	

v1369: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	2	0.1%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	2	0.1%
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		20	0.7%
949		190	6.9%
966		9	0.3%
988		22	0.8%
999		691	25.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q85A.1 asked only to respondents residing in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q85A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE)? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q85A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1930	69.9%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	9	0.3%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	1	0.0%
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	20	0.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	2	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	2	0.1%
135	BUDGET	3	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	4	0.1%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	1	0.0%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.0%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	5	0.2%
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	1	0.0%
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	2	0.1%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	1	0.0%
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	3	0.1%
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	1	0.0%
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	4	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	4	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	11	0.4%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.0%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	3	0.1%

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	8	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	5	0.2%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	8	0.3%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	5	0.2%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	5	0.2%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	7	0.3%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	1	0.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	1	0.0%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	3	0.1%
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	7	0.3%
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	11	0.4%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	

v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	1	0.0%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	2	0.1%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	2	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	

# v1370: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	6	0.2%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	4	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	5	0.2%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	6	0.2%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	28	1.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		82	3.0%
949		295	10.7%
950		1	0.0%
966		55	2.0%
969		1	0.0%
988		105	3.8%
999		41	1.5%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q85A.2 asked only to respondents residing in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q85A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q85A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1930	69.9%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	1	0.0%
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	2	0.1%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	4	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	4	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	1	0.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.0%
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	1	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.0%
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	4	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.0%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	1	0.0%
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	2	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	1	0.0%
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	1	0.0%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	4	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	2	0.1%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	3	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.1%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	2	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	1	0.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	2	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.0%

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	3	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	7	0.3%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%

v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	

# v1371: LIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.0%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	2	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	2	0.1%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	3	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		35	1.3%
949		186	6.7%
966		9	0.3%
988		16	0.6%
999		486	17.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q85B.1 asked only to respondents residing in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q85B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Notes

Q82A.1, Q85B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1932	70.0%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	8	0.3%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	4	0.1%
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	5	0.2%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	4	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.0%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	8	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	5	0.2%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	1	0.0%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	3	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	4	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	2	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.0%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	1	0.0%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	1	0.0%
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	6	0.2%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.0%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	3	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	3	0.1%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.0%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	5	0.2%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	2	0.1%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	1	0.0%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	9	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	5	0.2%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	11	0.4%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
513	MOVES SLOWLY	2	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	6	0.2%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	11	0.4%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR, CORRUPT,	7	0.3%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	3	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	5	0.2%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	2	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	8	0.3%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	3	0.1%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.0%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	2	0.1%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	3	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	2	0.1%
605	RIGHT WING	2	0.1%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	1	0.0%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	27	1.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	7	0.3%

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	13	0.5%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	1	0.0%
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	2	0.1%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	8	0.3%
900	EVERYTHING	11	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	

v1372: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	18	0.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		60	2.2%
949		282	10.2%
950		1	0.0%
966		47	1.7%
969		1	0.0%
988		92	3.3%
999		59	2.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Q85B.2 asked only to respondents residing in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec.
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q85B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY?
Notes	Q82A.1, Q85B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1933	70.0%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	1	0.0%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	1	0.0%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	0	

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	2	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	2	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	3	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	1	0.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	1	0.0%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	1	0.0%

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	1	0.0%
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	2	0.1%
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	2	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	1	0.0%
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	4	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	2	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	1	0.0%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.0%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR, CORRUPT,	4	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.0%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	1	0.0%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.0%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	2	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.0%
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	1	0.0%
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.0%

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	6	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	1	0.0%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	2	0.1%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	3	0.1%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	

v1373: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.0%
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	4	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		34	1.2%
949		196	7.1%
966		11	0.4%
988		10	0.4%
999		487	17.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Q86A.1 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q86A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q82A.1, Q86A.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2227	80.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	12	0.4%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	9	0.3%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	4	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	4	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.0%
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	10	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	2	0.1%
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.0%
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	4	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	4	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.0%
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.0%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	9	0.3%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	7	0.3%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	12	0.4%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	0.0%
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	1	0.0%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	1	0.0%
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	15	0.5%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	27	1.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	5	0.2%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	1	0.0%
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	4	0.1%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	2	0.1%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	2	0.1%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	1	0.0%
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	1	0.0%
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	18	0.7%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	3	0.1%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	3	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	18	0.7%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	1	0.0%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	6	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	5	0.2%

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	10	0.4%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	3	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	4	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	4	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	2	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	7	0.3%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	4	0.1%
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	1	0.0%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	1	0.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	13	0.5%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	2	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%

v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	2	0.1%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	2	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	4	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	24	0.9%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	1	0.0%
948		52	1.9%
949		97	3.5%
950		4	0.1%
966		15	0.5%
969		1	0.0%

# v1374: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
988		32	1.2%
999		12	0.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q86A.2 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q86A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q86A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2227	80.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	4	0.1%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.1%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	2	0.1%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	1	0.0%
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	6	0.2%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	6	0.2%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	3	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.0%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	1	0.0%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.0%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	3	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	0.0%
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	9	0.3%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	1	0.0%
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	1	0.0%
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	9	0.3%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	3	0.1%
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	2	0.1%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	1	0.0%
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	1	0.0%
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	5	0.2%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.0%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	2	0.1%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.0%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	7	0.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	1	0.0%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	1	0.0%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	6	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	1	0.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	5	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	3	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	2	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	4	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	5	0.2%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	6	0.2%
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	1	0.0%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	1	0.0%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	3	0.1%

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTTATION	1	0.0%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	1	0.0%
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOV'T. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.0%
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	

v1375: LIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	3	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		19	0.7%
949		119	4.3%
988		2	0.1%
999		240	8.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Q86B.1 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q86B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q82A.1, Q86B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2229	80.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	4	0.1%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	2	0.1%

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	3	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	2	0.1%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	2	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	4	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.0%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.0%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	1	0.0%
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	1	0.0%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	2	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	5	0.2%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	145	5.3%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	5	0.2%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	1	0.0%
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	0.0%
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	16	0.6%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	8	0.3%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	2	0.1%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	1	0.0%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.0%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.0%

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	2	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	5	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	8	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	2	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	8	0.3%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.0%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	3	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	4	0.1%

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	2	0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	2	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	3	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	2	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	1	0.0%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	3	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	1	0.0%
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	2	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	3	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	4	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	0	

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	2	0.1%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	1	0.0%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	3	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.0%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	1	0.0%
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	8	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	2	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	

v1376: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	1	0.0%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	2	0.1%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	6	0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.0%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.0%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	9	0.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		25	0.9%
949		117	4.2%
950		3	0.1%
966		13	0.5%
969		1	0.0%
988		23	0.8%
999		17	0.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Q86B.2 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q86B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS ?
Notes	Q82A.1, Q86B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2228	80.7%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	2	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	1	0.0%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	1	0.0%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	1	0.0%
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	1	0.0%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
135	BUDGET	1	0.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.0%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	1	0.0%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	2	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	1	0.0%

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	15	0.5%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	2	0.1%
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	2	0.1%
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	1	0.0%
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.0%
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	6	0.2%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	3	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	1	0.0%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.0%
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	1	0.0%
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	1	0.0%
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.0%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.0%
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	1	0.0%
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.0%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	7	0.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	2	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	3	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	2	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.0%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.0%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.0%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.0%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.0%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	2	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	2	0.1%

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	2	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.1%
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	2	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.1%
603	COMMUNISM	1	0.0%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.0%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	3	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	1	0.0%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	3	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	3	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	1	0.0%
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	

v1377: DISLIKE PROVINCIAL P.Q.-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.0%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	2	0.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		18	0.7%
949		145	5.3%
966		1	0.0%
988		1	0.0%
999		256	9.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	Q87A.1 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	Q87A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q82A.1, Q87A.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2230	80.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	19	0.7%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	3	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	2	0.1%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.1%
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	1	0.0%
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.0%

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.1%
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	6	0.2%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	5	0.2%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	1	0.0%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	1	0.0%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	1	0.0%
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	1	0.0%

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
294	SALES TAX	0	0.0%
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.1%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	6	0.2%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	4	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	1	0.0%
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	3	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	1	0.0%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.0%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.0%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.0%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.0%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	8	0.3%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	4	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	

v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	0.2%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	6	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	

# v1378: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	2	0.1%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	2	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	1	0.0%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	5	0.2%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	31	1.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	1	0.0%
948		52	1.9%
949		181	6.6%
950		2	0.1%
966		49	1.8%
969		1	0.0%
988		70	2.5%
999		26	0.9%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q87A.2 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q87A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q87A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2230	80.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	0.1%

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	3	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	1	0.0%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.0%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	0.0%
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	0.0%
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	1	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	0.0%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	1	0.0%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	2	0.1%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	1	0.0%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	2	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	3	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	1	0.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	0	
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	

v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.0%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	2	0.1%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		26	0.9%

# v1379: LIKE PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
949		120	4.3%
966		5	0.2%
988		8	0.3%
999		341	12.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q87B.1 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q87B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q87B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2230	80.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	23	0.8%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	2	0.1%
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	1	0.0%
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.0%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	2	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	2	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	1	0.0%
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	0.0%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	0.0%
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	0.0%
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	7	0.3%

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	1	0.0%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	1	0.0%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	2	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	4	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	4	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	3	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	3	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.0%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	0.0%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.0%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	7	0.3%
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.0%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.0%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.0%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	

v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	9	0.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREA	2	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	4	0.1%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.0%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	

# v1380: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	3	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	3	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	6	0.2%
900	EVERYTHING	7	0.3%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.0%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	19	0.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		49	1.8%
949		192	7.0%
950		1	0.0%
966		42	1.5%
969		1	0.0%
988		69	2.5%
999		32	1.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Q87B.2 asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q82A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).		
Literal question	Q87B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE UNION NATIONALE PARTY?		
Notes	Q82A.1, Q87B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2232	80.8%
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES	3	0.1%
2	LEADER - PERSONALITY	0	
3	LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
4	LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
5	PAST LEADER - PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
6	PAST LEADER - INSTRUMENTAL	0	
7	PAST LEADER - POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.0%
21	BILL BENNETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
22	DAVE BARRETT (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23	BILL DAVIS (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
24	PETER LOUGHEED (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
25	RENE LEVESQUE (SPECIFIC MENTION)	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET/GOVT.	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S, NOT LEADERS)	0	
80	LEADERSHIP - CABINET MINISTERS	0	
81	LEADERSHIP IS AWARE	0	
82	LEADERSHIP IS UNAWARE	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.0%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES GENERALLY	1	0.0%
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.0%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
96	FEDERAL RESPONSE FOR PROVINCIAL PARTY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED	4	0.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.0%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	CUTBACKS IN SPENDING, LAYOFFS, ETC.	0	

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH	0	
163	WAGES TOO HIGH	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE, DENTAL, ETC.)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES -	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY, RENT POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY, RAILWAYS, ETC.	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	ELECTRIC POWER POLICY, HYDRO, RATES	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS,MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	EMIGRATION FROM PROVINCE, PEOPLE LEAVING, ETC.	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM, REFERENDUM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
205	POLICIES BAD FOR PROVINCE	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	0	
210	URBAN POLICIES, ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD	0	
211	REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
216	ABORTION, ABORTION POLICY	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, BILL 101, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.)	0	
230	DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY	0	
231	THE BRICKLIN	0	
232	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
233	JAMES BAY PROJECT	0	
234	MANITOBA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	0	
235	WINNIPEG FLOODWAY	0	
236	B.C. RESOURCES, "BRIC"	0	
237	ABOLISH DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
239	REFERENCE TO CO-OPS	0	
240	FORESTRY POLICY	0	
241	CROWN CORPORATIONS (HYDRO ETC.)	0	
242	SELLING GOVT. OWNED INDUSTRIES	0	
243	AUTO INSURANCE, NO FAULT, ETC.	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
246	HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	0	
248	PROMOTES PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
249	HINDERS PROVINCE, PROVINCIAL GROWTH	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
255	HERITAGE FUND (ALBERTA)	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
263	NOT ENOUGH PATRONAGE	0	
264	JOB DISTRIBUTION NOT BIASED BY PARTISAN CONCERNS	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
268	GUN CONTROL	0	
269	LIQUOR LAWS	0	
270	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL), CONSERVATION	0	
271	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IM	0	
272	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (TOO MUCH IMPA	0	
273	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
276	ROADBUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
277	TAX REBATES, ONT. TAX CREDIT, ETC.	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY	0	
285	SCHOOL TAX	0	
286	SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION	0	
287	TEACHERS (SCHOOL) STRIKES	0	
288	AID TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS (HANDLING OF)	0	
289	TOURISM	0	
290	LOW INTEREST LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES	0	
291	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
292	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
293	FOR THE PROVINCE (NO OTHER REFERENCE)	0	
294	SALES TAX	0	
296	LAND FREEZE	0	
297	LAND EXPROPRIATION, NATIONALIZATION, ETC.	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
299	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
333	ANTI-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	CONTROLLED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	CONTROLLED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY CONTROLLED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILI	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, ETC.	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.0%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW IDEAS, NEW BLOOD	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANY	2	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY (FAST)	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY	1	0.0%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.0%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A P	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.0%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	1	0.0%

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS	0	0.0%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
545	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH),	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
552	SPECIFIC PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	2	0.1%

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI-FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.0%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES, OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREAL	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.0%
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER, HAS RESOURCES)	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER, LACKS RESOUR	2	0.1%
724	TOO LARGE MAJORITY, NO OPPOSITION	0	
725	TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
726	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL PARTY	0	
727	TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
728	LACK OF TIES TO FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
732	HAVEN'T BEEN IN POWER LONG ENOUGH TO FORM JUDGEMENT	1	0.0%

v1381: DISLIK PROVINCIAL UNION NATIONALE-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
740	STRONG STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
741	WEAK STANCE OF PARTY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOV'T	0	
742	FORCES FEDERAL GOV'T TO ACT	0	
743	PROV. PARTY OR GOV'T INEFFECTIVE, POWER LIES WITH THE FEDERA	0	
744	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER; FEDERAL GOVT. S	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTI	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
753	FEDERALLY, NOT PROVINCIALY ORIENTED	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
761	PARTY ON THE RISE, REBUILDING	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.0%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN PROVINCIAL PARTY	1	0.0%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY	0	
948		20	0.7%
949		132	4.8%
966		4	0.1%
988		8	0.3%
999		328	11.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1382: R THINKS OF SOCIAL CLASS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2625 /-] [Invalid=136 /-]

# v1382: R THINKS OF SOCIAL CLASS			
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ONE HEARS A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES. DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS?		
Notes	Q88A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1154	<div><div></div></div> 44.0%
2	NO	1471	<div><div></div></div> 56.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	116	
9	REFUSED	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1383: SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1145 /-] [Invalid=1616 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who think of themselves as belonging to a social class.		
Literal question	WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Notes	Q88B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER CLASS	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
2	UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS	152	<div><div></div></div> 13.3%
3	MIDDLE CLASS	669	<div><div></div></div> 58.4%
4	WORKING CLASS	286	<div><div></div></div> 25.0%
5	LOWER CLASS	32	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	9	
9	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 0 IN Q88A	1589	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1384: SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS-FORCED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1435 /-] [Invalid=1326 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "no" or "don't know" in Q88A.		
Literal question	WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Notes	Q88C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER CLASS	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
2	UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS	90	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
3	MIDDLE CLASS	653	<div><div></div></div> 45.5%
4	WORKING CLASS	549	<div><div></div></div> 38.3%
5	LOWER CLASS	62	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
7	REFUSED	73	<div><div></div></div> 5.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	154	

# v1384: SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS-FORCED			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	INAP., CODED 1 IN Q88A	1154	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1385: FEEL CLOSE TO OWN CLASS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2380 /-] [Invalid=381 /-]		
Universe	Q89A asked only to respondents who chose a class in Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? ; Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE FEEL THEY HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH OTHER PEOPLE OF THEIR OWN CLASS, BUT OTHERS DON'T FEEL THIS WAY SO MUCH. HOW ABOUT YOU? WOULD YOU SAY YOU FEEL PRETTY CLOSE TO OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN ABOVE) PEOPLE, OR THAT YOU DON'T FEEL MUCH CLOSER TO THEM THAN YOU DO TO PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES?		
Notes	Q88B, Q88C, Q89A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PRETTY CLOSE TO OWN CLASS	1511	<div></div> 63.5%
2	NOT CLOSER TO OWN CLASS	869	<div></div> 36.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	127	
9	INAP., CODED 7 OR 8 IN Q88C OR 8 IN Q88B	236	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1386: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2485 /-] [Invalid=276 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who chose a class in Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? ; Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN IN Q88B OR C) PEOPLE? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q89B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME AS I AM, SAME AS YOU ARE, SAME INCOME AS ME, SAME MONE	169	<div></div> 6.8%
2	ALL THE SAME, NO DIFFERENCE, DON'T THINK OF PEOPLE AS BEING	99	<div></div> 4.0%
3	ALL KINDS, EVERY TYPE, DEPENDS ON MANY THINGS	94	<div></div> 3.8%
4	ORDINARY, EVERYDAY PEOPLE, AVERAGE TYPES, COMMON PEOPLE, DO	282	<div></div> 11.3%
5	HONEST, TRUSTWORTHY, UPRIGHT	51	<div></div> 2.1%
6	FRIENDLY, SOCIABLE, NEIGHBOURLY, WARM, EASY TO GET ALONG WI	109	<div></div> 4.4%
7	GOOD, NICE, FINE	135	<div></div> 5.4%
8	KIND, THOUGHTFUL, HELPFUL, SYMPATHETIC	26	<div></div> 1.0%

v1386: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	GOOD CITIZENS, GOOD CANADIANS, BACKBONE OF THE COUNTRY	19	0.8%
10	PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR A LIVING, ORDINARY WORKING CLASS PEOPLE	388	15.6%
14	WORK HARD AND GET LITTLE, STRUGGLE TO MAKE ENDS MEET, PEOP	57	2.3%
15	WORK HARD TO BETTER THEMSELVES, TRYING TO GET AHEAD, IMPROVE	27	1.1%
16	(WORKING) PEOPLE WHO HAVE THE BASIC NEEDS - A CAR, HOUSE, M	23	0.9%
18	PAY A LOT OF TAXES, TAXES	4	0.2%
19	AVERAGE INCOME, MIDDLE INCOME	66	2.7%
21	LOWER INCOME, POOR PEOPLE	37	1.5%
22	HIGHER INCOME, RICHER, HAVE MORE MONEY	30	1.2%
24	COMFORTABLE INCOME, REASONABLE SALARY, FINANCIALLY STABLE,	129	5.2%
25		21	0.8%
28	TWO WAGE EARNERS IN FAMILY, HOLD TWO JOBS	4	0.2%
29	NAME SPECIFIC TIME PERIOD JOB - 8 TO 5 STEADY, 9 TO 5 MON. T	6	0.2%
30	BETTER THAN US, SMARTER THAN ME, MORE MONEY THAN US; I HAVE	8	0.3%
31	SAME INTERESTS, LIFE STYLE AS ME, SAME MATERIAL THINGS (NOT	23	0.9%
32	HOME OWNERS, AVERAGE HOME OWNER (WITH A MORTGAGE)	17	0.7%
33	CAR OWNERS	1	0.0%
34	SAME TYPE OF OCCUPATION (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
35	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	45	1.8%
36	NAMED SPECIFIC PROFESSION (DOCTORS, LAWYERS, TEACHERS, NURSE	20	0.8%
37	NAMED SPECIFIC PROFESSION (POLITICIANS, CIVIL SERVANTS, SEN	2	0.1%
38	SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	7	0.3%
39	WHITE COLLAR, OFFICE WORKING (UNSPECIFIED)	22	0.9%
40	GENERAL BUSINESS PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	15	0.6%
41	SMALL BUSINESSMAN, WORK FOR SELF	11	0.4%
42	SKILLED LABOUR (UNSPECIFIED)	17	0.7%
43	NAMED SPECIFIC SKILLED JOB (FIREMAN, POLICEMAN, CARPENTER)	5	0.2%
44	UNSKILLED LABOUR (UNSPECIFIED)	27	1.1%
45	NAMED SPECIFIC UNSKILLED JOB (FISHERMAN, LUMBER)	1	0.0%
46	FARMERS, FARM WORKERS	14	0.6%
47	MOSTLY PENSIONERS, SENIOR CITIZENS, WIDOWS	8	0.3%
48	NOT AS WELL EDUCATED, LESS EDUCATION	7	0.3%
49	WITH FAIR/GOOD EDUCATION	28	1.1%
50	WELL EDUCATED, BETTER EDUCATED	35	1.4%
51	UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE-EDUCATED	7	0.3%
52	INTELLIGENT PEOPLE	17	0.7%

# v1386: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	TOO GREEDY, SNOOPY, UPPITY, OTHER NEGATIVE MENTION, NOT FRIE	38	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
56	ENTHUSIASTIC, AGGRESSIVE, INDEPENDENT	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
57	MORE POLITICALLY AWARE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
59	UNION MEMBERS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
60	PEOPLE WHO HAVE, SAVE SOME; THRIFTY, LIVE WITHIN THEIR MEANS	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
61	WELFARE PEOPLE, UNEMPLOYED	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
62	SALARIED PEOPLE	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
63	WELL DRESSED, GO OUT TO RESTAURANTS/SPORTS ETC.	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
64	PEOPLE WITH A CERTAIN STANDARD OF LIVING	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
65	MEMBERS OF ESTABLISHMENT, BORN INTO IT, HIGH SOCIETY	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
66	BLUE COLLAR	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
67	ONE WAGE EARNER	0	
69	LIVE IN SUBURBS AND HAVE A COTTAGE, 2 CARS ETC.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
70	CITY PEOPLE, URBAN DWELLERS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
71	MIDDLE CLASS	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
72	SUCCESSFUL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
73	SICK PEOPLE	0	
74	MISC, SINGLE MENTIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
97	DON'T KNOW, NO OPINION	252	<div><div></div></div> 10.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	22	
99	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q88B OR 7 OR 8 IN Q88C	236	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1387: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2507 /-] [Invalid=254 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who chose a class in Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? ; Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN IN Q88B OR C) PEOPLE? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q89B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME AS I AM, SAME AS YOU ARE, SAME INCOME AS ME, SAME MONE	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
2	ALL THE SAME, NO DIFFERENCE, DON'T THINK OF PEOPLE AS BEING	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
3	ALL KINDS, EVERY TYPE, DEPENDS ON MANY THINGS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	ORDINARY, EVERYDAY PEOPLE, AVERAGE TYPES, COMMON PEOPLE, DO	60	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
5	HONEST, TRUSTWORTHY, UPRIGHT	39	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%

v1387: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	FRIENDLY, SOCIABLE, NEIGHBOURLY, WARM, EASY TO GET ALONG WI	55	2.2%
7	GOOD, NICE, FINE	31	1.2%
8	KIND, THOUGHTFUL, HELPFUL, SYMPATHETIC	34	1.4%
9	GOOD CITIZENS, GOOD CANADIANS, BACKBONE OF THE COUNTRY	17	0.7%
10	PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR A LIVING, ORDINARY WORKING CLASS PEOPLE	160	6.4%
14	WORK HARD AND GET LITTLE, STRUGGLE TO MAKE ENDS MEET, PEOPL	31	1.2%
15	WORK HARD TO BETTER THEMSELVES, TRYING TO GET AHEAD, IMPROVE	26	1.0%
16	(WORKING) PEOPLE WHO HAVE THE BASIC NEEDS - A CAR, HOUSE, M	22	0.9%
18	PAY A LOT OF TAXES, TAXES	11	0.4%
19	AVERAGE INCOME, MIDDLE INCOME	29	1.2%
21	LOWER INCOME, POOR PEOPLE	15	0.6%
22	HIGHER INCOME, RICHER, HAVE MORE MONEY	12	0.5%
24	COMFORTABLE INCOME, REASONABLE SALARY, FINANCIALLY STABLE,	75	3.0%
25		25	1.0%
28	TWO WAGE EARNERS IN FAMILY, HOLD TWO JOBS	4	0.2%
29	NAME SPECIFIC TIME PERIOD JOB - 8 TO 5 STEADY, 9 TO 5 MON. T	4	0.2%
30	BETTER THAN US, SMARTER THAN ME, MORE MONEY THAN US; I HAVE	0	
31	SAME INTERESTS, LIFE STYLE AS ME, SAME MATERIAL THINGS (NOT	16	0.6%
32	HOME OWNERS, AVERAGE HOME OWNER (WITH A MORTGAGE)	24	1.0%
33	CAR OWNERS	11	0.4%
34	SAME TYPE OF OCCUPATION (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.1%
35	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	14	0.6%
36	NAMED SPECIFIC PROFESSION (DOCTORS, LAWYERS, TEACHERS, NURSE	5	0.2%
37	NAMED SPECIFIC PROFESSION (POLITICIANS, CIVIL SERVANTS, SEN	5	0.2%
38	SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	3	0.1%
39	WHITE COLLAR, OFFICE WORKING (UNSPECIFIED)	11	0.4%
40	GENERAL BUSINESS PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	7	0.3%
41	SMALL BUSINESSMAN, WORK FOR SELF	9	0.4%
42	SKILLED LABOUR (UNSPECIFIED)	13	0.5%
43	NAMED SPECIFIC SKILLED JOB (FIREMAN, POLICEMAN, CARPENTER)	0	
44	UNSKILLED LABOUR (UNSPECIFIED)	18	0.7%
45	NAMED SPECIFIC UNSKILLED JOB (FISHERMAN, LUMBER)	2	0.1%
46	FARMERS, FARM WORKERS	7	0.3%
47	MOSTLY PENSIONERS, SENIOR CITIZENS, WIDOWS	2	0.1%
48	NOT AS WELL EDUCATED, LESS EDUCATION	10	0.4%

# v1387: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	WITH FAIR/GOOD EDUCATION	37	1.5%
50	WELL EDUCATED, BETTER EDUCATED	24	1.0%
51	UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE-EDUCATED	8	0.3%
52	INTELLIGENT PEOPLE	10	0.4%
53	TOO GREEDY, SNOOPY, UPPITY, OTHER NEGATIVE MENTION, NOT FRIE	7	0.3%
56	ENTHUSIASTIC, AGGRESSIVE, INDEPENDENT	10	0.4%
57	MORE POLITICALLY AWARE	6	0.2%
59	UNION MEMBERS	0	
60	PEOPLE WHO HAVE, SAVE SOME; THRIFTY, LIVE WITHIN THEIR MEANS	14	0.6%
61	WELFARE PEOPLE, UNEMPLOYED	9	0.4%
62	SALARIED PEOPLE	1	0.0%
63	WELL DRESSED, GO OUT TO RESTAURANTS/SPORTS ETC.	0	
64	PEOPLE WITH A CERTAIN STANDARD OF LIVING	7	0.3%
65	MEMBERS OF ESTABLISHMENT, BORN INTO IT, HIGH SOCIETY	3	0.1%
66	BLUE COLLAR	2	0.1%
67	ONE WAGE EARNER	1	0.0%
69	LIVE IN SUBURBS AND HAVE A COTTAGE, 2 CARS ETC.	0	
70	CITY PEOPLE, URBAN DWELLERS	1	0.0%
71	MIDDLE CLASS	0	
72	SUCCESSFUL	2	0.1%
73	SICK PEOPLE	1	0.0%
74	MISC, SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
97	NO SECOND MENTION	1517	60.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q88B OR 7 OR 8 IN Q88C	236	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1388: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2507 /-] [Invalid=254 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who chose a class in Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? ; Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE OTHER (CLASS CHOSEN IN Q88B OR C) PEOPLE? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q89B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME AS I AM, SAME AS YOU ARE, SAME INCOME AS ME, SAME MONE	5	0.2%
2	ALL THE SAME, NO DIFFERENCE, DON'T THINK OF PEOPLE AS BEING	0	
3	ALL KINDS, EVERY TYPE, DEPENDS ON MANY THINGS	0	

v1388: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	ORDINARY, EVERYDAY PEOPLE, AVERAGE TYPES, COMMON PEOPLE, DO	8	0.3%
5	HONEST, TRUSTWORTHY, UPRIGHT	15	0.6%
6	FRIENDLY, SOCIABLE, NEIGHBOURLY, WARM, EASY TO GET ALONG WI	15	0.6%
7	GOOD, NICE, FINE	3	0.1%
8	KIND, THOUGHTFUL, HELPFUL, SYMPATHETIC	8	0.3%
9	GOOD CITIZENS, GOOD CANADIANS, BACKBONE OF THE COUNTRY	8	0.3%
10	PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR A LIVING, ORDINARY WORKING CLASS PEOPLE	23	0.9%
14	WORK HARD AND GET LITTLE, STRUGGLE TO MAKE ENDS MEET, PEOP	7	0.3%
15	WORK HARD TO BETTER THEMSELVES, TRYING TO GET AHEAD, IMPROVE	8	0.3%
16	(WORKING) PEOPLE WHO HAVE THE BASIC NEEDS - A CAR, HOUSE, M	5	0.2%
18	PAY A LOT OF TAXES, TAXES	3	0.1%
19	AVERAGE INCOME, MIDDLE INCOME	9	0.4%
21	LOWER INCOME, POOR PEOPLE	5	0.2%
22	HIGHER INCOME, RICHER, HAVE MORE MONEY	5	0.2%
24	COMFORTABLE INCOME, REASONABLE SALARY, FINANCIALLY STABLE,	23	0.9%
25		6	0.2%
28	TWO WAGE EARNERS IN FAMILY, HOLD TWO JOBS	2	0.1%
29	NAME SPECIFIC TIME PERIOD JOB - 8 TO 5 STEADY, 9 TO 5 MON. T	0	
30	BETTER THAN US, SMARTER THAN ME, MORE MONEY THAN US; I HAVE	0	
31	SAME INTERESTS, LIFE STYLE AS ME, SAME MATERIAL THINGS (NOT	4	0.2%
32	HOME OWNERS, AVERAGE HOME OWNER (WITH A MORTGAGE)	8	0.3%
33	CAR OWNERS	4	0.2%
34	SAME TYPE OF OCCUPATION (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
35	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.2%
36	NAMED SPECIFIC PROFESSION (DOCTORS, LAWYERS, TEACHERS, NURSE	5	0.2%
37	NAMED SPECIFIC PROFESSION (POLITICIANS, CIVIL SERVANTS, SEN	1	0.0%
38	SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.1%
39	WHITE COLLAR, OFFICE WORKING (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
40	GENERAL BUSINESS PEOPLE (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.1%
41	SMALL BUSINESSMAN, WORK FOR SELF	3	0.1%
42	SKILLED LABOUR (UNSPECIFIED)	6	0.2%
43	NAMED SPECIFIC SKILLED JOB (FIREMAN, POLICEMAN, CARPENTER)	0	
44	UNSKILLED LABOUR (UNSPECIFIED)	8	0.3%
45	NAMED SPECIFIC UNSKILLED JOB (FISHERMAN, LUMBER)	0	
46	FARMERS, FARM WORKERS	4	0.2%

# v1388: 'PEOPLE IN OWN CLASS'-3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
47	MOSTLY PENSIONERS, SENIOR CITIZENS, WIDOWS	0	
48	NOT AS WELL EDUCATED, LESS EDUCATION	2	0.1%
49	WITH FAIR/GOOD EDUCATION	12	0.5%
50	WELL EDUCATED, BETTER EDUCATED	5	0.2%
51	UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE-EDUCATED	3	0.1%
52	INTELLIGENT PEOPLE	5	0.2%
53	TOO GREEDY, SNOOPY, UPPITY, OTHER NEGATIVE MENTION, NOT FRIE	1	0.0%
56	ENTHUSIASTIC, AGGRESSIVE, INDEPENDENT	1	0.0%
57	MORE POLITICALLY AWARE	3	0.1%
59	UNION MEMBERS	2	0.1%
60	PEOPLE WHO HAVE, SAVE SOME; THRIFTY, LIVE WITHIN THEIR MEANS	3	0.1%
61	WELFARE PEOPLE, UNEMPLOYED	0	
62	SALARIED PEOPLE	0	
63	WELL DRESSED, GO OUT TO RESTAURANTS/SPORTS ETC.	0	
64	PEOPLE WITH A CERTAIN STANDARD OF LIVING	4	0.2%
65	MEMBERS OF ESTABLISHMENT, BORN INTO IT, HIGH SOCIETY	0	
66	BLUE COLLAR	0	
67	ONE WAGE EARNER	0	
69	LIVE IN SUBURBS AND HAVE A COTTAGE, 2 CARS ETC.	0	
70	CITY PEOPLE, URBAN DWELLERS	0	
71	MIDDLE CLASS	0	
72	SUCCESSFUL	1	0.0%
73	SICK PEOPLE	0	
74	MISC, SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
97	NO THIRD MENTION	2255	89.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q88B OR 7 OR 8 IN Q88C	236	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1389: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2461 /-] [Invalid=300 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who chose a class for Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? ; Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q89C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME AS I AM, WE ARE ALL THE SAME	58	2.4%
2	ALL THE SAME, NO DIFFERENCE, DON'T REALLY THINK OF PEOPLE A	364	14.8%

v1389: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS' -1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	ALL KINDS OF PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES, DEPENDS ON MANY THING	164	<div></div> 6.7%
4	THE RICH ARE THE RICH AND THE POOR ARE THE POOR, THE HAVES	164	<div></div> 6.7%
5	CLASS IS A MATTER OF OCCUPATION/BUSINESS/WORK, SOME DON'T W	53	<div></div> 2.2%
6	RICHER, HAVE MORE MONEY	146	<div></div> 5.9%
7	BORN TO MONEY, DON'T HAVE TO WORK FOR A LIVING	41	<div></div> 1.7%
8	CAN AFFORD LUXURIES, CAN AFFORD SPECIFICS - BOATS, TRIPS, A	25	<div></div> 1.0%
9	SOME WORK VERY HARD TO GET THERE, HAVE TO WORK TOO, CAN WOR	19	<div></div> 0.8%
10	MILLIONAIRES, HAVE LOTS OF MONEY, TOO RICH	38	<div></div> 1.5%
11	HAVE EASY LIFE, LESS TO WORRY ABOUT, THEY HAVE MADE IT DON'	57	<div></div> 2.3%
12	LUCKY	8	<div></div> 0.3%
13	SNOBS, LOOK DOWN ON WORKING PEOPLE, ARROGANT, NOT FRIENDLY	129	<div></div> 5.2%
14	THINK ONLY OF SELVES, APPEARANCES	16	<div></div> 0.7%
15	THINK THEY ARE BETTER / DIFFERENT	27	<div></div> 1.1%
16	CONCEITED, SPOILED, RUDE	18	<div></div> 0.7%
17	HAVE AUTHORITY, POLITICAL "POWER", MONEY TALKS	15	<div></div> 0.6%
18	HIGHER INCOME JOBS, PAID A LOT, PAY HIGHER TAXES	60	<div></div> 2.4%
19	PROFESSIONALS, DOCTORS, LAWYERS	124	<div></div> 5.0%
20	OWN OWN BUSINESS, OWN LARGE PRIVATE COMPANIES, EXECUTIVE TY	55	<div></div> 2.2%
21	PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES	0	
22	BETTER EDUCATED, INFORMED	25	<div></div> 1.0%
23	HAVE NICE HOMES (IN SUBURBS), CARS	6	<div></div> 0.2%
24	NICE, REFINED, SOCIABLE, GOOD PEOPLE	19	<div></div> 0.8%
25	NOT HONEST, CHEAT OTHERS	11	<div></div> 0.4%
26	NOT HAPPY, THEY HAVE THEIR PROBLEMS	6	<div></div> 0.2%
27	OFTEN LIVE BEYOND MEANS	4	<div></div> 0.2%
28	HAVE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS,DO THINGS	2	<div></div> 0.1%
29	CONSERVATIVE POLITICS	3	<div></div> 0.1%
30	I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE I DON'T ASSOCIATE WITH THEM	10	<div></div> 0.4%
31	HAVE MORE MONEY, RICHER (THAN I AM), WELL-OFF	3	<div></div> 0.1%
32	MUCH THE SAME AS UPPER CLASS	2	<div></div> 0.1%
33	PROFESSIONALS - DENTISTS, ACCOUNTANTS	5	<div></div> 0.2%
34	BUSINESS PEOPLE, MERCHANTS, OFFICERS	2	<div></div> 0.1%
35	BETTER EDUCATED	0	
36	SNOBS	2	<div></div> 0.1%
37	HAVE KIDS RUNNING AROUND BOOZING IT UP	0	
40	I DON'T ASSOCIATE WITH THEM	0	
41	IS A WORKING CLASS, HAVE TO WORK FOR A LIVING	2	<div></div> 0.1%
42	STRUGGLING FINANCIALLY, HAVE THINGS BUT DON'T OWN THEM	6	<div></div> 0.2%

v1389: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, SMALL FARMS	0	
44	HOME OWNERS, CARS, HAVE HOLIDAYS	0	
45	EXECUTIVES	1	0.0%
46	9 TO 5 PEOPLE, OFFICE WORKERS, WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	8	0.3%
47	NICE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
48	HIGHER INCOME THAN MINE, HAVE MORE MONEY	8	0.3%
49	BETTER EDUCATED	2	0.1%
50	BLAND	0	
51	SKILLED WORKERS, HAVE A TRADE	0	
56	SAME AS I AM	1	0.0%
57	MAKE LESS MONEY	2	0.1%
58	SAME AS MIDDLE	6	0.2%
59	WANT TO WORK, WORK STEADILY, WORK HARD	10	0.4%
60	THEY WANT TO GET AHEAD, THEY MAKE GOOD MONEY	1	0.0%
61	THEY ARE LABOURERS, UNSKILLED, DO MANUAL	6	0.2%
62	WORK IN INDUSTRY, FACTORIES	6	0.2%
63	BLUE COLLAR, CARRY LUNCH PAILS	6	0.2%
64	GOOD, NICE, FRIENDLY, HONEST	4	0.2%
65	WORK TO MAINTAIN STANDARD OF LIVING	5	0.2%
66	ALWAYS WANT MORE BENEFITS, PAID WELL FOR WHAT THEY DO	2	0.1%
67	LESS EDUCATED	1	0.0%
71	ON WELFARE	28	1.1%
72	TAKE HAND-OUTS FROM GOVERNMENT, THE "WELFARE BUMS"	17	0.7%
73	UNEMPLOYED	8	0.3%
74	DON'T WANT TO WORK, LAZY	13	0.5%
75	LOW INCOME, NO MONEY, FINANCIAL TROUBLES	16	0.7%
76	POOR JOBS, LOW PAYING MANUAL JOBS	4	0.2%
77	NO INITIATIVE, DON'T WANT TO IMPROVE SELVES EVEN IF GIVEN OP	18	0.7%
78	THEY ARE THE POOR UNFORTUNATE	26	1.1%
79	NOT AS WELL EDUCATED	19	0.8%
80	LACK SKILLS	0	
81	IMMIGRANTS	1	0.0%
82	WORK HARD (TO GET HIGHER)	3	0.1%
83	CONTENT, HELPFUL, FRIENDLY, DOWN TO EARTH, HONEST	7	0.3%
84	THEY HAVEN'T A CHANCE TO IMPROVE, NO TIME, NEVER GET MORE,	12	0.5%
85	THEY NEED HELP, FEEL SORRY FOR THEM	6	0.2%
86	MAYBE HANDICAPPED, DISABLED	1	0.0%
87	COME FROM BROKEN HOMES	0	
88	CLASS IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION	26	1.1%
89	MISC. SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
90	CRIMINALS, DRUG ADDICTS, DRUNKS	3	0.1%

# v1389: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	ARE N.D.P.	0	
92	HAVE STRONG POLITICAL IDEALS	1	0.0%
93	LIVE IN HOUSING PROJECTS, SLUMS, NOT HOME OWNERS	2	0.1%
95	THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS STANDARD OF LIVING	20	0.8%
96	CLASS IS A MATTER OF AREA LIVED IN, THEIR ENVIRONMENT	2	0.1%
97	DON'T KNOW, NO OPINION	467	19.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	46	
99	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q88B OR 7 OR 8 IN Q88C	236	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1390: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2507 /-] [Invalid=254 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who chose a class for Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? : Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (2ND MENTION)		
Notes	Q89C.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME AS I AM, WE ARE ALL THE SAME	1	0.0%
2	ALL THE SAME, NO DIFFERENCE, DON'T REALLY THINK OF PEOPLE A	7	0.3%
3	ALL KINDS OF PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES, DEPENDS ON MANY THING	8	0.3%
4	THE RICH ARE THE RICH AND THE POOR ARE THE POOR, THE HAVES	26	1.0%
5	CLASS IS A MATTER OF OCCUPATION/BUSINESS/WORK, SOME DON'T W	9	0.4%
6	RICHER, HAVE MORE MONEY	30	1.2%
7	BORN TO MONEY, DON'T HAVE TO WORK FOR A LIVING	15	0.6%
8	CAN AFFORD LUXURIES, CAN AFFORD SPECIFICS - BOATS, TRIPS, A	20	0.8%
9	SOME WORK VERY HARD TO GET THERE, HAVE TO WORK TOO, CAN WOR	10	0.4%
10	MILLIONAIRES, HAVE LOTS OF MONEY, TOO RICH	5	0.2%
11	HAVE EASY LIFE, LESS TO WORRY ABOUT, THEY HAVE MADE IT DON'	19	0.8%
12	LUCKY	4	0.2%
13	SNOBS, LOOK DOWN ON WORKING PEOPLE, ARROGANT, NOT FRIENDLY	28	1.1%
14	THINK ONLY OF SELVES, APPEARANCES	11	0.4%
15	THINK THEY ARE BETTER / DIFFERENT	14	0.6%
16	CONCEITED, SPOILED, RUDE	4	0.2%
17	HAVE AUTHORITY, POLITICAL "POWER", MONEY TALKS	12	0.5%
18	HIGHER INCOME JOBS, PAID A LOT, PAY HIGHER TAXES	16	0.6%

v1390: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	PROFESSIONALS, DOCTORS, LAWYERS	26	1.0%
20	OWN OWN BUSINESS, OWN LARGE PRIVATE COMPANIES, EXECUTIVE TY	20	0.8%
21	PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES	0	
22	BETTER EDUCATED, INFORMED	39	1.6%
23	HAVE NICE HOMES (IN SUBURBS), CARS	6	0.2%
24	NICE, REFINED, SOCIABLE, GOOD PEOPLE	7	0.3%
25	NOT HONEST, CHEAT OTHERS	3	0.1%
26	NOT HAPPY, THEY HAVE THEIR PROBLEMS	5	0.2%
27	OFTEN LIVE BEYOND MEANS	0	
28	HAVE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS,DO THINGS	4	0.2%
29	CONSERVATIVE POLITICS	1	0.0%
30	I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE I DON'T ASSOCIATE WITH THEM	4	0.2%
31	HAVE MORE MONEY, RICHER (THAN I AM), WELL-OFF	24	1.0%
32	MUCH THE SAME AS UPPER CLASS	13	0.5%
33	PROFESSIONALS - DENTISTS, ACCOUNTANTS	14	0.6%
34	BUSINESS PEOPLE, MERCHANTS, OFFICERS	15	0.6%
35	BETTER EDUCATED	2	0.1%
36	SNOBS	0	
37	HAVE KIDS RUNNING AROUND BOOZING IT UP	0	
40	I DON'T ASSOCIATE WITH THEM	1	0.0%
41	IS A WORKING CLASS, HAVE TO WORK FOR A LIVING	12	0.5%
42	STRUGGLING FINANCIALLY, HAVE THINGS BUT DON'T OWN THEM	14	0.6%
43	SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, SMALL FARMS	4	0.2%
44	HOME OWNERS, CARS, HAVE HOLIDAYS	3	0.1%
45	EXECUTIVES	3	0.1%
46	9 TO 5 PEOPLE, OFFICE WORKERS, WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	7	0.3%
47	NICE PEOPLE	8	0.3%
48	HIGHER INCOME THAN MINE, HAVE MORE MONEY	12	0.5%
49	BETTER EDUCATED	3	0.1%
50	BLAND	2	0.1%
51	SKILLED WORKERS, HAVE A TRADE	1	0.0%
56	SAME AS I AM	0	
57	MAKE LESS MONEY	7	0.3%
58	SAME AS MIDDLE	5	0.2%
59	WANT TO WORK, WORK STEADILY, WORK HARD	13	0.5%
60	THEY WANT TO GET AHEAD, THEY MAKE GOOD MONEY	2	0.1%
61	THEY ARE LABOURERS, UNSKILLED, DO MANUAL	8	0.3%
62	WORK IN INDUSTRY, FACTORIES	7	0.3%
63	BLUE COLLAR, CARRY LUNCH PAILS	7	0.3%
64	GOOD, NICE, FRIENDLY, HONEST	9	0.4%
65	WORK TO MAINTAIN STANDARD OF LIVING	12	0.5%
66	ALWAYS WANT MORE BENEFITS, PAID WELL FOR WHAT THEY DO	1	0.0%

# v1390: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
67	LESS EDUCATED	0	
71	ON WELFARE	47	1.9%
72	TAKE HAND-OUTS FROM GOVERNMENT, THE "WELFARE BUMS"	18	0.7%
73	UNEMPLOYED	19	0.8%
74	DON'T WANT TO WORK, LAZY	21	0.8%
75	LOW INCOME, NO MONEY, FINANCIAL TROUBLES	38	1.5%
76	POOR JOBS, LOW PAYING MANUAL JOBS	17	0.7%
77	NO INITIATIVE, DON'T WANT TO IMPROVE SELVES EVEN IF GIVEN OP	36	1.4%
78	THEY ARE THE POOR UNFORTUNATE	43	1.7%
79	NOT AS WELL EDUCATED	36	1.4%
80	LACK SKILLS	5	0.2%
81	IMMIGRANTS	2	0.1%
82	WORK HARD (TO GET HIGHER)	9	0.4%
83	CONTENT, HELPFUL, FRIENDLY, DOWN TO EARTH, HONEST	27	1.1%
84	THEY HAVEN'T A CHANCE TO IMPROVE, NO TIME, NEVER GET MORE,	22	0.9%
85	THEY NEED HELP, FEEL SORRY FOR THEM	12	0.5%
86	MAYBE HANDICAPPED, DISABLED	2	0.1%
87	COME FROM BROKEN HOMES	0	
88	CLASS IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION	18	0.7%
89	MISC. SINGLE MENTIONS	1	0.0%
90	CRIMINALS, DRUG ADDICTS, DRUNKS	2	0.1%
91	ARE N.D.P.	0	
92	HAVE STRONG POLITICAL IDEALS	2	0.1%
93	LIVE IN HOUSING PROJECTS, SLUMS, NOT HOME OWNERS	0	
95	THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS STANDARD OF LIVING	11	0.4%
96	CLASS IS A MATTER OF AREA LIVED IN, THEIR ENVIRONMENT	4	0.2%
97	NO SECOND MENTION	1552	61.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q88B OR 7 OR 8 IN Q88C	236	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1391: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2507 /-] [Invalid=254 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who chose a class for Q88B or Q88C.		
Pre-question	Q88B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN: UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS? ; Q88C.) WELL, IF YOU HAD TO MAKE A CHOICE, WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE IN THE UPPER CLASS, UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE CLASS, WORKING CLASS, OR LOWER CLASS?		
Literal question	WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES? WHAT KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THEY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q89C.3 in the documentation.		

v1391: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SAME AS I AM, WE ARE ALL THE SAME	0	
2	ALL THE SAME, NO DIFFERENCE, DON'T REALLY THINK OF PEOPLE A	1	0.0%
3	ALL KINDS OF PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASSES, DEPENDS ON MANY THING	2	0.1%
4	THE RICH ARE THE RICH AND THE POOR ARE THE POOR, THE HAVES	6	0.2%
5	CLASS IS A MATTER OF OCCUPATION/BUSINESS/WORK, SOME DON'T W	0	
6	RICHER, HAVE MORE MONEY	13	0.5%
7	BORN TO MONEY, DON'T HAVE TO WORK FOR A LIVING	4	0.2%
8	CAN AFFORD LUXURIES, CAN AFFORD SPECIFICS - BOATS, TRIPS, A	4	0.2%
9	SOME WORK VERY HARD TO GET THERE, HAVE TO WORK TOO, CAN WOR	3	0.1%
10	MILLIONAIRES, HAVE LOTS OF MONEY, TOO RICH	2	0.1%
11	HAVE EASY LIFE, LESS TO WORRY ABOUT, THEY HAVE MADE IT DON'	9	0.4%
12	LUCKY	0	
13	SNOBS, LOOK DOWN ON WORKING PEOPLE, ARROGANT, NOT FRIENDLY	4	0.2%
14	THINK ONLY OF SELVES, APPEARANCES	3	0.1%
15	THINK THEY ARE BETTER / DIFFERENT	1	0.0%
16	CONCEITED, SPOILED, RUDE	2	0.1%
17	HAVE AUTHORITY, POLITICAL "POWER", MONEY TALKS	5	0.2%
18	HIGHER INCOME JOBS, PAID A LOT, PAY HIGHER TAXES	6	0.2%
19	PROFESSIONALS, DOCTORS, LAWYERS	4	0.2%
20	OWN OWN BUSINESS, OWN LARGE PRIVATE COMPANIES, EXECUTIVE TY	7	0.3%
21	PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES	0	
22	BETTER EDUCATED, INFORMED	7	0.3%
23	HAVE NICE HOMES (IN SUBURBS), CARS	3	0.1%
24	NICE, REFINED, SOCIABLE, GOOD PEOPLE	6	0.2%
25	NOT HONEST, CHEAT OTHERS	0	
26	NOT HAPPY, THEY HAVE THEIR PROBLEMS	2	0.1%
27	OFTEN LIVE BEYOND MEANS	2	0.1%
28	HAVE TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS,DO THINGS	1	0.0%
29	CONSERVATIVE POLITICS	0	
30	I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE I DON'T ASSOCIATE WITH THEM	0	
31	HAVE MORE MONEY, RICHER (THAN I AM), WELL-OFF	4	0.2%
32	MUCH THE SAME AS UPPER CLASS	2	0.1%
33	PROFESSIONALS - DENTISTS, ACCOUNTANTS	5	0.2%
34	BUSINESS PEOPLE, MERCHANTS, OFFICERS	0	
35	BETTER EDUCATED	0	
36	SNOBS	0	
37	HAVE KIDS RUNNING AROUND BOOZING IT UP	0	
40	I DON'T ASSOCIATE WITH THEM	1	0.0%

v1391: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	IS A WORKING CLASS, HAVE TO WORK FOR A LIVING	7	0.3%
42	STRUGGLING FINANCIALLY, HAVE THINGS BUT DON'T OWN THEM	4	0.2%
43	SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, SMALL FARMS	3	0.1%
44	HOME OWNERS, CARS, HAVE HOLIDAYS	1	0.0%
45	EXECUTIVES	2	0.1%
46	9 TO 5 PEOPLE, OFFICE WORKERS, WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	3	0.1%
47	NICE PEOPLE	3	0.1%
48	HIGHER INCOME THAN MINE, HAVE MORE MONEY	4	0.2%
49	BETTER EDUCATED	0	
50	BLAND	1	0.0%
51	SKILLED WORKERS, HAVE A TRADE	1	0.0%
56	SAME AS I AM	0	
57	MAKE LESS MONEY	4	0.2%
58	SAME AS MIDDLE	5	0.2%
59	WANT TO WORK, WORK STEADILY, WORK HARD	8	0.3%
60	THEY WANT TO GET AHEAD, THEY MAKE GOOD MONEY	0	
61	THEY ARE LABOURERS, UNSKILLED, DO MANUAL	13	0.5%
62	WORK IN INDUSTRY, FACTORIES	9	0.4%
63	BLUE COLLAR, CARRY LUNCH PAILS	5	0.2%
64	GOOD, NICE, FRIENDLY, HONEST	4	0.2%
65	WORK TO MAINTAIN STANDARD OF LIVING	12	0.5%
66	ALWAYS WANT MORE BENEFITS, PAID WELL FOR WHAT THEY DO	0	
67	LESS EDUCATED	1	0.0%
71	ON WELFARE	43	1.7%
72	TAKE HAND-OUTS FROM GOVERNMENT, THE "WELFARE BUMS"	13	0.5%
73	UNEMPLOYED	20	0.8%
74	DON'T WANT TO WORK, LAZY	20	0.8%
75	LOW INCOME, NO MONEY, FINANCIAL TROUBLES	33	1.3%
76	POOR JOBS, LOW PAYING MANUAL JOBS	9	0.4%
77	NO INITIATIVE, DON'T WANT TO IMPROVE SELVES EVEN IF GIVEN OP	18	0.7%
78	THEY ARE THE POOR UNFORTUNATE	22	0.9%
79	NOT AS WELL EDUCATED	27	1.1%
80	LACK SKILLS	8	0.3%
81	IMMIGRANTS	1	0.0%
82	WORK HARD (TO GET HIGHER)	17	0.7%
83	CONTENT, HELPFUL, FRIENDLY, DOWN TO EARTH, HONEST	10	0.4%
84	THEY HAVEN'T A CHANCE TO IMPROVE, NO TIME, NEVER GET MORE,	24	1.0%
85	THEY NEED HELP, FEEL SORRY FOR THEM	8	0.3%
86	MAYBE HANDICAPPED, DISABLED	3	0.1%
87	COME FROM BROKEN HOMES	1	0.0%

# v1391: 'PEOPLE IN OTHER CLASS'-3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	CLASS IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION	4	0.2%
89	MISC. SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
90	CRIMINALS, DRUG ADDICTS, DRUNKS	2	0.1%
91	ARE N.D.P.	1	0.0%
92	HAVE STRONG POLITICAL IDEALS	0	
93	LIVE IN HOUSING PROJECTS, SLUMS, NOT HOME OWNERS	0	
95	THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS STANDARD OF LIVING	10	0.4%
96	CLASS IS A MATTER OF AREA LIVED IN, THEIR ENVIRONMENT	2	0.1%
97	NO THIRD MENTION	2012	80.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
98	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q88B OR 7 OR 8 IN Q88C	236	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1392: CONFLICT BETWEEN CLASSES			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2547 /-] [Invalid=214 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ON THE WHOLE, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS BOUND TO BE SOME CONFLICT BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES, OR DO YOU THINK THEY CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER WITHOUT ANY CONFLICT?		
Notes	Q90A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BOUND TO BE CONFLICT	1295	50.8%
2	CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER	1252	49.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	193	
9	REFUSED	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1393: POLITICS AND CLASS CONFLICTS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1199 /-] [Invalid=1562 /-]		
Universe	Q90B asked only to respondents who answered "bound to be conflict" for Q90A.		
Pre-question	Q90A. ON THE WHOLE, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS BOUND TO BE SOME CONFLICT BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES, OR DO YOU THINK THEY CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER WITHOUT ANY CONFLICT?		
Literal question	Q90B. DOES POLITICS HELP TO RESOLVE THESE CONFLICTS, DOES IT MAKE THEM WORSE, OR DOES IT NOT HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THEM?		
Notes	Q90A, Q90B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HELPS RESOLVE	313	26.1%
2	NOT MUCH TO DO WITH THEM	479	39.9%
3	MAKES WORSE	407	33.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	96	

# v1393: POLITICS AND CLASS CONFLICTS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q90A	1448	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1394: POLITICS HELP HARMONY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1181 /-] [Invalid=1580 /-]		
Universe	Q90C asked only to respondents answered "can get along" for Q90A.		
Pre-question	Q90A. ON THE WHOLE, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS BOUND TO BE SOME CONFLICT BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES, OR DO YOU THINK THEY CAN GET ALONG TOGETHER WITHOUT ANY CONFLICT?		
Literal question	Q90C. DOES POLITICS HELP THEM GET ALONG TOGETHER, MAKES THINGS WORSE, OR DOES POLITICS NOT HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH IT?		
Notes	Q90A, Q90C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HELPS GET ALONG	281	23.8%
2	NOT MUCH TO DO WITH IT	703	59.5%
3	MAKES THINGS WORSE	197	16.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	71	
9	INAP., CODED 1, 8 OR 9 IN Q90A	1491	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1395: ANY CLASS GET TOO MUCH?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2238 /-] [Invalid=523 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES?		
Notes	Q91A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1407	62.9%
2	NO	831	37.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	502	
9	REFUSED	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1396: CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-1ST			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1385 /-] [Invalid=1376 /-]		
Universe	Q91B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q90A.		
Pre-question	Q91A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES?		
Literal question	Q91B.1 WHICH <CLASS GETS TOO MANY BENEFITS>? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q91A, Q91B.1 in the documentation. SEE QUESTION NO. 90A FOR COMPLETE QUESTION TEXT.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER UPPER CLASS	12	0.9%

v1396: CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-1ST

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	UPPER CLASS	625	45.1%
3	THE HIGHER CLASS, THE HIGHER BRACKET, THE HIGHER UP	84	6.1%
4	THE RICH, WEALTHY, PEOPLE WITH MONEY	150	10.8%
5	THE VERY TOP GROUP, ONES AT THE TOP, TOP OF THE BUNCH	9	0.6%
6	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	22	1.6%
7	MIDDLE CLASS	17	1.2%
8	WORKING MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE WORKING CLASS	0	
9	LOWER MIDDLE, MIDDLE LOWER	2	0.1%
10	LOWER CLASS	177	12.8%
11	VERY LOW, ON THE BOTTOM	4	0.3%
12	POOR CLASS	13	0.9%
13	UNEMPLOYED CLASS, NON-WORKERS	27	1.9%
14	PEOPLE ON WELFARE, MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	90	6.5%
15	PEOPLE PARTIALLY ON WELFARE	3	0.2%
16	TEENS ON WELFARE	3	0.2%
17	YOUNG PEOPLE, TEENS	1	0.1%
18	WORKING CLASS, WORKERS	13	0.9%
19	THE NATIVES	6	0.4%
20	PEOPLE WHO CAN FIND TAX LOOPHOLES	3	0.2%
21	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE	36	2.6%
22	BIG BUSINESSMEN	10	0.7%
23	LARGE INDUSTRIALISTS	5	0.4%
24	MANUFACTURERS	0	
25	THE COMPANIES	6	0.4%
26	WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	1	0.1%
27	CIVIL SERVANTS	5	0.4%
28	FARMERS	2	0.1%
29	FIREMEN, POLICEMEN	1	0.1%
30	ENTERTAINERS	1	0.1%
31	THE STRONGER ONES	2	0.1%
32	THE HIGH SALARIED (IN ANY CLASS), MAKE THE MOST MONEY	11	0.8%
33	ALCOHOLICS	1	0.1%
34	POOR WORKING CLASS	0	
35	LABOURERS	0	
36	SINGLE PEOPLE	0	
37	NAME SPECIFIC PROFESSIONALS - DOCTORS, LAWYERS	12	0.9%
38	MINIMUM WAGE GROUP, LOWER INCOME GROUP	1	0.1%
39	WORKING CLASS IN MIDDLE INCOME GROUP	0	
40	ALL CLASSES, ALL EQUAL	2	0.1%
42	SMALL BUSINESS OWNER	2	0.1%
43	OLDER PEOPLE IN MIDDLE CLASS ON PENSIONS, PEOPLE ON FIXED IN	1	0.1%
44	UNION TYPES	6	0.4%

# v1396: CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-1ST			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	IMMIGRANTS, SOME OF IMMIGRANTS, BOAT PEOPLE, NAMED SPECIFIC	11	0.8%
46	THE FRENCH	0	
47	THE EDUCATED	4	0.3%
48	STUDENTS	1	0.1%
49	THE HANDICAPPED	0	
50	HIPPIES	1	0.1%
51	SOCIAL CREDIT	1	0.1%
52	THOSE WITH A FAIR NUMBER OF KIDS	0	
53	HOME OWNERS	1	0.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T PUT INTO CLASSES	22	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A	1336	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1397: CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-2ND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=1354 /-]		
Universe	Q91B.2 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q90A.		
Pre-question	Q91A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES?		
Literal question	Q91B.2 WHICH <CLASS GETS TOO MANY BENEFITS>? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q91A, Q91B.2 in the documentation. SEE QUESTION NO. 90A FOR COMPLETE QUESTION TEXT.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER UPPER CLASS	0	
2	UPPER CLASS	39	2.8%
3	THE HIGHER CLASS, THE HIGHER BRACKET, THE HIGHER UP	2	0.1%
4	THE RICH, WEALTHY, PEOPLE WITH MONEY	11	0.8%
5	THE VERY TOP GROUP, ONES AT THE TOP, TOP OF THE BUNCH	0	
6	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	28	2.0%
7	MIDDLE CLASS	8	0.6%
8	WORKING MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE WORKING CLASS	0	
9	LOWER MIDDLE, MIDDLE LOWER	0	
10	LOWER CLASS	38	2.7%
11	VERY LOW, ON THE BOTTOM	4	0.3%
12	POOR CLASS	5	0.4%
13	UNEMPLOYED CLASS, NON-WORKERS	6	0.4%
14	PEOPLE ON WELFARE, MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	24	1.7%
15	PEOPLE PARTIALLY ON WELFARE	1	0.1%
16	TEENS ON WELFARE	0	
17	YOUNG PEOPLE, TEENS	0	
18	WORKING CLASS, WORKERS	2	0.1%
19	THE NATIVES	0	
20	PEOPLE WHO CAN FIND TAX LOOPHOLES	3	0.2%
21	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE	6	0.4%

# v1397: CLASS GETS TOO MUCH-2ND			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	BIG BUSINESSMEN	4	0.3%
23	LARGE INDUSTRIALISTS	3	0.2%
24	MANUFACTURERS	1	0.1%
25	THE COMPANIES	4	0.3%
26	WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	0	
27	CIVIL SERVANTS	3	0.2%
28	FARMERS	2	0.1%
29	FIREMEN, POLICEMEN	0	
30	ENTERTAINERS	0	
31	THE STRONGER ONES	0	
32	THE HIGH SALARIED (IN ANY CLASS), MAKE THE MOST MONEY	0	
33	ALCOHOLICS	0	
34	POOR WORKING CLASS	0	
35	LABOURERS	0	
36	SINGLE PEOPLE	0	
37	NAME SPECIFIC PROFESSIONALS - DOCTORS, LAWYERS	3	0.2%
38	MINIMUM WAGE GROUP, LOWER INCOME GROUP	0	
39	WORKING CLASS IN MIDDLE INCOME GROUP	0	
40	ALL CLASSES, ALL EQUAL	0	
42	SMALL BUSINESS OWNER	0	
43	OLDER PEOPLE IN MIDDLE CLASS ON PENSIONS, PEOPLE ON FIXED IN	0	
44	UNION TYPES	0	
45	IMMIGRANTS, SOME OF IMMIGRANTS, BOAT PEOPLE, NAMED SPECIFIC	0	
46	THE FRENCH	1	0.1%
47	THE EDUCATED	0	
48	STUDENTS	0	
49	THE HANDICAPPED	0	
50	HIPPIES	0	
51	SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
52	THOSE WITH A FAIR NUMBER OF KIDS	0	
53	HOME OWNERS	0	
88	NO SECOND MENTION	1209	85.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A	1336	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1398: UNDESERVED BENEFITS-1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1323 /-] [Invalid=1438 /-]		
Universe	Q91C.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q91A.		
Pre-question	Q91A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES?		
Literal question	Q91C.1 WHAT BENEFITS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q91A, Q91C.1 in the documentation.		

v1398: UNDESERVED BENEFITS-1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC	230	17.4%
2	TAX BENEFITS	357	27.0%
3	BETTER JOBS/JOB BENEFITS, EXPENSE ACCOUNTS	36	2.7%
4	BETTER STANDARD OF LIVING, LIVE BETTER, MORE MATERIAL THING	41	3.1%
5	BETTER HOMES, CAN OWN HOME	3	0.2%
6	PUBLIC RECOGNITION, STATUS	20	1.5%
7	HUMAN RIGHTS	1	0.1%
8	LEGAL BENEFITS, 'CAN GET OFF THE HOOK'	21	1.6%
9	MORE INFLUENCE (POWER) IN GOVERNMENT/ BUSINESS/ GENERALLY,	102	7.7%
10	BETTER EDUCATION, KNOW WHAT TO DO	15	1.1%
11	MORE LEISURE, RECREATION	6	0.5%
12	MEDICAL/DENTAL/HEALTH CARE	4	0.3%
13	LESS WORRY, EASIER LIFE, GET BETTER SERVICE	13	1.0%
14	BENEFITS THEY HAVE NOT EARNED	7	0.5%
15	BENEFITS THEY DON'T NEED LIKE FAMILY ALLOWANCE, PENSIONS, GR	49	3.7%
17	EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	34	2.6%
30	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC BENEFITS	18	1.4%
31	TAX BENEFITS	1	0.1%
32	WELFARE BENEFITS (ALSO SEE CODE 41)	119	9.0%
33	HOUSING BENEFITS	12	0.9%
34	CAN AFFORD LUXURIES DUE TO OTHER BENEFITS RECEIVED, SPEND M	3	0.2%
35	SPECIFIC BENEFITS - MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	3	0.2%
36	SOCIAL BENEFITS	26	2.0%
37	EXCESSIVE WAGES FOR LABOUR	0	
38	TOO MUCH HELP FROM GOVERNMENT	19	1.4%
39	HEALTH BENEFITS	2	0.2%
40	U.I.C.	53	4.0%
41	WELFARE TOO EASY TO GET, ABUSE WELFARE SYSTEM	75	5.7%
53	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC	8	0.6%
54	TAX BENEFITS	3	0.2%
55	BETTER JOBS, JOB BENEFITS	11	0.8%
56	BETTER STANDARD OF LIVING	1	0.1%
57	HOMEOWNERSHIP SCHEMES, CAN OWN OWN HOMES	1	0.1%
58	BETTER EDUCATION	0	
59	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	5	0.4%
61	LEGAL BENEFITS	5	0.4%
62	MORE LEISURE, RECREATION	0	
63	THEY GOT TOO MUCH, EVERYTHING	7	0.5%
81	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC, TREATY MONEY	5	0.4%
82	TAX BENEFITS	1	0.1%
83	WELFARE BENEFITS, MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	2	0.2%
84	REHABILITATION CENTRES FOR ALCOHOLICS	0	

# v1398: UNDESERVED BENEFITS-1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
85	INDIANS GET JOB TRAINING, FREE BOOKS, ETC.	4	0.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW	84	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A	1336	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1399: UNDESERVED BENEFITS-2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=1354 /-]		
Universe	Q91C.2 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q91A.		
Pre-question	Q91A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES?		
Literal question	Q91C.2 WHAT BENEFITS ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q91A, Q91C.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC	32	2.3%
2	TAX BENEFITS	46	3.3%
3	BETTER JOBS/JOB BENEFITS, EXPENSE ACCOUNTS	26	1.8%
4	BETTER STANDARD OF LIVING, LIVE BETTER, MORE MATERIAL THING	26	1.8%
5	BETTER HOMES, CAN OWN HOME	3	0.2%
6	PUBLIC RECOGNITION, STATUS	11	0.8%
7	HUMAN RIGHTS	0	
8	LEGAL BENEFITS, 'CAN GET OFF THE HOOK'	11	0.8%
9	MORE INFLUENCE (POWER) IN GOVERNMENT/ BUSINESS/ GENERALLY,	62	4.4%
10	BETTER EDUCATION, KNOW WHAT TO DO	9	0.6%
11	MORE LEISURE, RECREATION	3	0.2%
12	MEDICAL/DENTAL/HEALTH CARE	2	0.1%
13	LESS WORRY, EASIER LIFE, GET BETTER SERVICE	6	0.4%
14	BENEFITS THEY HAVE NOT EARNED	7	0.5%
15	BENEFITS THEY DON'T NEED LIKE FAMILY ALLOWANCE, PENSIONS, GR	14	1.0%
17	EVERYTHING IN GENERAL	8	0.6%
30	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC BENEFITS	3	0.2%
31	TAX BENEFITS	2	0.1%
32	WELFARE BENEFITS (ALSO SEE CODE 41)	39	2.8%
33	HOUSING BENEFITS	7	0.5%
34	CAN AFFORD LUXURIES DUE TO OTHER BENEFITS RECEIVED, SPEND M	6	0.4%
35	SPECIFIC BENEFITS - MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	7	0.5%
36	SOCIAL BENEFITS	13	0.9%
37	EXCESSIVE WAGES FOR LABOUR	0	
38	TOO MUCH HELP FROM GOVERNMENT	14	1.0%
39	HEALTH BENEFITS	5	0.4%
40	U.I.C.	34	2.4%
41	WELFARE TOO EASY TO GET, ABUSE WELFARE SYSTEM	16	1.1%

v1399: UNDESERVED BENEFITS-2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC	5	0.4%
54	TAX BENEFITS	3	0.2%
55	BETTER JOBS, JOB BENEFITS	3	0.2%
56	BETTER STANDARD OF LIVING	3	0.2%
57	HOMEOWNERSHIP SCHEMES, CAN OWN OWN HOMES	1	0.1%
58	BETTER EDUCATION	0	
59	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	2	0.1%
61	LEGAL BENEFITS	0	
62	MORE LEISURE, RECREATION	0	
63	THEY GOT TOO MUCH, EVERYTHING	2	0.1%
81	FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC, TREATY MONEY	1	0.1%
82	TAX BENEFITS	0	
83	WELFARE BENEFITS, MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	1	0.1%
84	REHABILITATION CENTRES FOR ALCOHOLICS	1	0.1%
85	INDIANS GET JOB TRAINING, FREE BOOKS, ETC.	1	0.1%
88	NO SECOND MENTION	972	69.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A	1336	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1400: ANY CLASS PAY TOO MUCH?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2198 /-] [Invalid=563 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?
Notes	Q92A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1270	57.8%
2	NO	928	42.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	543	
9	REFUSED	2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1401: CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-1ST

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1254 /-] [Invalid=1507 /-]
Universe	Q92B.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q92A.
Pre-question	Q92A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?
Literal question	Q92B.1 WHICH <CLASS PAYS MORE COSTS>? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q92A, Q92B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER UPPER CLASS	1	0.1%
2	UPPER CLASS	90	7.2%

v1401: CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-1ST

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	THE HIGHER CLASS, THE HIGHER BRACKET,THE HIGHER UP	12	1.0%
4	THE RICH, WEALTHY, PEOPLE WITH MONEY	14	1.1%
5	THE VERY TOP GROUP, ONES AT THE TOP, TOP OF THE BUNCH	0	
6	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	27	2.2%
7	MIDDLE CLASS	527	42.0%
8	WORKING MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE WORKING CLASS	10	0.8%
9	LOWER MIDDLE, MIDDLE LOWER	4	0.3%
10	LOWER CLASS	131	10.4%
11	VERY LOW, ON THE BOTTOM	4	0.3%
12	POOR CLASS	25	2.0%
13	UNEMPLOYED CLASS, NON-WORKERS	1	0.1%
14	PEOPLE ON WELFARE, MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	3	0.2%
15	PEOPLE PARTIALLY ON WELFARE	0	
16	TEENS ON WELFARE	0	
17	YOUNG PEOPLE, TEENS	0	
18	WORKING CLASS, WORKERS	327	26.1%
19	THE NATIVES	0	
20	PEOPLE WHO CAN FIND TAX LOOPHOLES	0	
21	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE	6	0.5%
22	BIG BUSINESSMEN	2	0.2%
23	LARGE INDUSTRIALISTS	0	
24	MANUFACTURERS	0	
25	THE COMPANIES	1	0.1%
26	WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	0	
27	CIVIL SERVANTS	2	0.2%
28	FARMERS	4	0.3%
29	FIREMEN, POLICEMEN	0	
30	ENTERTAINERS	0	
31	THE STRONGER ONES	0	
32	THE HIGH SALARIED (IN ANY CLASS), MAKE THE MOST MONEY	11	0.9%
33	ALCOHOLICS	0	
34	POOR WORKING CLASS	0	
35	LABOURERS	2	0.2%
36	SINGLE PEOPLE	6	0.5%
37	NAME SPECIFIC PROFESSIONALS - DOCTORS, LAWYERS	4	0.3%
38	MINIMUM WAGE GROUP, LOWER INCOME GROUP	15	1.2%
39	WORKING CLASS IN MIDDLE INCOME GROUP	8	0.6%
40	ALL CLASSES, ALL EQUAL	3	0.2%
41	POOR MIDDLE CLASS EARNING MORE THAN \$15,000	0	
42	SMALL BUSINESS OWNER	3	0.2%
43	OLDER PEOPLE IN MIDDLE CLASS ON PENSIONS, PEOPLE ON FIXED I	9	0.7%
44	UNION TYPES	0	

# v1401: CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-1ST			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	IMMIGRANTS, SOME OF IMMIGRANTS, BOAT PEOPLE, NAMED SPECIFIC	0	
46	THE FRENCH	0	
47	THE EDUCATED	0	
48	STUDENTS	0	
49	THE HANDICAPPED	0	
50	HIPPIES	0	
51	SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
52	THOSE WITH A FAIR NUMBER OF KIDS	1	0.1%
53	HOME OWNERS	1	0.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T PUT INTO CLASSES	16	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q92A	1473	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1402: CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-2ND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=168 /-] [Invalid=2593 /-]		
Universe	Q92B.2 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q92A.		
Pre-question	Q92A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?		
Literal question	Q92B.2 WHICH <CLASS PAYS MORE COSTS>? (SECOND ENTION)		
Notes	Q92A, Q92B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UPPER UPPER CLASS	0	
2	UPPER CLASS	13	<div><div></div></div> 7.7%
3	THE HIGHER CLASS, THE HIGHER BRACKET,THE HIGHER UP	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
4	THE RICH, WEALTHY, PEOPLE WITH MONEY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
5	THE VERY TOP GROUP, ONES AT THE TOP, TOP OF THE BUNCH	0	
6	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	29	<div><div></div></div> 17.3%
7	MIDDLE CLASS	45	<div><div></div></div> 26.8%
8	WORKING MIDDLE CLASS, MIDDLE WORKING CLASS	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
9	LOWER MIDDLE, MIDDLE LOWER	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
10	LOWER CLASS	19	<div><div></div></div> 11.3%
11	VERY LOW, ON THE BOTTOM	0	
12	POOR CLASS	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
13	UNEMPLOYED CLASS, NON-WORKERS	0	
14	PEOPLE ON WELFARE, MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE	0	
15	PEOPLE PARTIALLY ON WELFARE	0	
16	TEENS ON WELFARE	0	
17	YOUNG PEOPLE, TEENS	0	
18	WORKING CLASS, WORKERS	39	<div><div></div></div> 23.2%
19	THE NATIVES	0	
20	PEOPLE WHO CAN FIND TAX LOOPHOLES	0	
21	PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE	0	

# v1402: CLASS PAYS TOO MUCH-2ND			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	BIG BUSINESSMEN	0	
23	LARGE INDUSTRIALISTS	0	
24	MANUFACTURERS	0	
25	THE COMPANIES	0	
26	WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	1	0.6%
27	CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
28	FARMERS	0	
29	FIREMEN, POLICEMEN	0	
30	ENTERTAINERS	0	
31	THE STRONGER ONES	0	
32	THE HIGH SALARIED (IN ANY CLASS), MAKE THE MOST MONEY	1	0.6%
33	ALCOHOLICS	0	
34	POOR WORKING CLASS	0	
35	LABOURERS	1	0.6%
36	SINGLE PEOPLE	0	
37	NAME SPECIFIC PROFESSIONALS - DOCTORS, LAWYERS	1	0.6%
38	MINIMUM WAGE GROUP, LOWER INCOME GROUP	0	
39	WORKING CLASS IN MIDDLE INCOME GROUP	1	0.6%
40	ALL CLASSES, ALL EQUAL	0	
41	POOR MIDDLE CLASS EARNING MORE THAN \$15,000	0	
42	SMALL BUSINESS OWNER	3	1.8%
43	OLDER PEOPLE IN MIDDLE CLASS ON PENSIONS, PEOPLE ON FIXED IN	1	0.6%
44	UNION TYPES	1	0.6%
45	IMMIGRANTS, SOME OF IMMIGRANTS, BOAT PEOPLE, NAMED SPECIFIC	0	
46	THE FRENCH	0	
47	THE EDUCATED	0	
48	STUDENTS	0	
49	THE HANDICAPPED	1	0.6%
50	HIPPIES	0	
51	SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
52	THOSE WITH A FAIR NUMBER OF KIDS	1	0.6%
53	HOME OWNERS	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
88	NO SECOND MENTION	1102	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q92A	1473	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1403: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-1ST?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98/89]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2737 /-] [Invalid=24 /-]		
Universe	Q93.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q91A or Q92A.		
Pre-question	Q91A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS GET MORE BENEFITS THAN IT DESERVES? ;Q92A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?		

v1403: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-1ST?

Literal question	Q93.1 WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ONE SOCIAL CLASS GETS MORE OR ANOTHER CLASS PAYS MORE THAN THE OTHERS? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q92A, Q92A, Q93.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	THE TAX STRUCTURE, THE WAY THE TAX SYSTEM IS SET UP	139	5.1%
2	HIGHER CLASSES/BUSINESSMEN HAVE MORE WRITE-OFFS/EXPENSES	74	2.7%
3	HIGHER CLASSES/BUSINESSMEN CAN AFFORD LAWYERS/KNOW HOW TO	44	1.6%
4	TAX LOOP-HOLES	21	0.8%
5	TAXES ARE SCALED TO INCOME, THE MORE YOU MAKE THE MORE YOU P	118	4.3%
6	MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS PAY MORE TAX, MIDDLE CLASS WAGE EARNER	207	7.6%
7	THE ECONOMY IN GENERAL, INFLATION, SOME CAN'T KEEP UP WITH	11	0.4%
8	THERE ARE MORE PEOPLE IN MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS/UPPER MIDDLE	56	2.0%
9	UPPER CLASSES DON'T FEEL THE PINCH OF OF TAXES LIKE THE LOW	60	2.2%
10	SOME ARE MORE UNFORTUNATE, HAVE TO HELP THE NEEDY, SOME CLA	21	0.8%
11	LOWER CLASS GETS MORE BENEFITS/ DON'T PAY FOR WHAT THEY GET	22	0.8%
12	WELFARE, THE AMOUNT OF WELFARE	14	0.5%
13	BECAUSE WELFARE IS ABUSED	22	0.8%
14	THE AMOUNT OF UNEMPLOYMENT PAID OUT	4	0.1%
15	U.I.C. ABUSED, SOME PEOPLE JUST DON'T WORK	21	0.8%
16	SOME PEOPLE WHO NEED WELFARE CAN'T GET IT	1	0.0%
17	UPPER (RICH) CLASSES DON'T PAY ENOUGH, ALWAYS IT'S THE LOWE	54	2.0%
18	UPPER CLASS GETS MORE IN BENEFITS, SPECIFIC BENEFITS LIKE M	16	0.6%
19	HIGHER CLASSES ARE BETTER EDUCATED, KNOW MORE, LOWER CLASS	37	1.4%
20	MONEY TALKS, RICH HAVE INFLUENCE/POWER	116	4.2%
21	RICH GET RICHER, POOR GET POORER, 'THEY THAT HAVE, GET'	32	1.2%
22	IT IS JUST THE WAY THINGS ARE, ALWAYS BEEN THAT WAY, IT WIL	56	2.0%
23	RICH PAY FOR THE POOR	21	0.8%
24	CAPITALIST SYSTEM	9	0.3%
25	SOCIALISM	4	0.1%
26	YOU'RE BORN INTO IT	6	0.2%
27	LOWER CLASSES WORK FOR LESS PAY	4	0.1%
28	POOR (WORKING CLASS) PAY MORE THAN THEY CAN AFFORD, CAN'T A	36	1.3%
29	INJUSTICE, HUMAN INJUSTICE	26	0.9%
30	SOMETHING DISHONEST SOMEWHERE, TOO EASY TO BREAK LAWS	4	0.1%

# v1403: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-1ST?				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
31	POOR ADMINISTRATION/GOVERNMENT	40	<div></div>	1.5%
32	UPPER CLASS ARE THE PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT, MORE ACTIVE POLITI	38	<div></div>	1.4%
33	POLITICAL DEAL FOR VOTES, POLITICAL LOBBY	11	<div></div>	0.4%
34	CONTRACTS, KNOW THE RIGHT PEOPLE	26	<div></div>	0.9%
35	CERTAIN CLASSES ARE CONTROLLED (MIDDLE/WORKING), UPPER NOT C	5	<div></div>	0.2%
36	DEPENDS ON GOVERNMENT IN POWER, GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS	16	<div></div>	0.6%
37	ALL CLASSES PAY SAME U.I.C., PENSIONS, BUT NEEDS ARE DIFFERE	1	<div></div>	0.0%
38	LOWER CLASSES/INCOME GROUPS HAVE NO DEFENCE	12	<div></div>	0.4%
39	FARMERS PAY MORE - MORE LAND TAXES, MORE FOR OUT OF TOWN ED	2	<div></div>	0.1%
40	INDIANS COMPLAIN MORE/GET EVERYTHING	2	<div></div>	0.1%
41	WORKING CLASS COMPLAINS MORE, ALWAYS STRIKING FOR MORE, UNI	10	<div></div>	0.4%
42	FARMERS ARE CATERED TO	1	<div></div>	0.0%
88	DON'T KNOW	292	<div></div>	10.7%
99		1025	<div></div>	37.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
89	REFUSED	6		
98	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A AND Q92A	0		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1404: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-2ND?				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/89/98]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]			
Universe	Q93.2 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q91A or Q92A.			
Pre-question	Q92A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?			
Literal question	Q93.2 WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ONE SOCIAL CLASS GETS MORE OR ANOTHER CLASS PAYS MORE THAN THE OTHERS? (SECOND MENTION)			
Notes	Q92A, Q92A, Q93.2 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	THE TAX STRUCTURE, THE WAY THE TAX SYSTEM IS SET UP	21	<div></div>	0.8%
2	HIGHER CLASSES/BUSINESSMEN HAVE MORE WRITE-OFFS/EXPENSES	30	<div></div>	1.1%
3	HIGHER CLASSES/BUSINESSMEN CAN AFFORD LAWYERS/KNOW HOW TO	23	<div></div>	0.8%
4	TAX LOOP-HOLES	2	<div></div>	0.1%
5	TAXES ARE SCALED TO INCOME, THE MORE YOU MAKE THE MORE YOU P	5	<div></div>	0.2%
6	MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS PAY MORE TAX, MIDDLE CLASS WAGE EARNER	70	<div></div>	2.6%
7	THE ECONOMY IN GENERAL, INFLATION, SOME CAN'T KEEP UP WITH	2	<div></div>	0.1%
8	THERE ARE MORE PEOPLE IN MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS/UPPER MIDDLE	12	<div></div>	0.4%

v1404: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-2ND?

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	UPPER CLASSES DON'T FEEL THE PINCH OF OF TAXES LIKE THE LOW	12	0.4%
10	SOME ARE MORE UNFORTUNATE, HAVE TO HELP THE NEEDY, SOME CLA	9	0.3%
11	LOWER CLASS GETS MORE BENEFITS/ DON'T PAY FOR WHAT THEY GET	25	0.9%
12	WELFARE, THE AMOUNT OF WELFARE	5	0.2%
13	BECAUSE WELFARE IS ABUSED	11	0.4%
14	THE AMOUNT OF UNEMPLOYMENT PAID OUT	2	0.1%
15	U.I.C. ABUSED, SOME PEOPLE JUST DON'T WORK	9	0.3%
16	SOME PEOPLE WHO NEED WELFARE CAN'T GET IT	4	0.1%
17	UPPER (RICH) CLASSES DON'T PAY ENOUGH, ALWAYS IT'S THE LOWE	26	0.9%
18	UPPER CLASS GETS MORE IN BENEFITS, SPECIFIC BENEFITS LIKE M	8	0.3%
19	HIGHER CLASSES ARE BETTER EDUCATED, KNOW MORE, LOWER CLASS	8	0.3%
20	MONEY TALKS, RICH HAVE INFLUENCE/POWER	33	1.2%
21	RICH GET RICHER, POOR GET POORER, 'THEY THAT HAVE, GET'	7	0.3%
22	IT IS JUST THE WAY THINGS ARE, ALWAYS BEEN THAT WAY, IT WIL	6	0.2%
23	RICH PAY FOR THE POOR	9	0.3%
24	CAPITALIST SYSTEM	1	0.0%
25	SOCIALISM	0	
26	YOU'RE BORN INTO IT	1	0.0%
27	LOWER CLASSES WORK FOR LESS PAY	2	0.1%
28	POOR (WORKING CLASS) PAY MORE THAN THEY CAN AFFORD, CAN'T A	16	0.6%
29	INJUSTICE, HUMAN INJUSTICE	7	0.3%
30	SOMETHING DISHONEST SOMEWHERE, TOO EASY TO BREAK LAWS	1	0.0%
31	POOR ADMINISTRATION/GOVERNMENT	6	0.2%
32	UPPER CLASS ARE THE PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT, MORE ACTIVE POLITI	17	0.6%
33	POLITICAL DEAL FOR VOTES, POLITICAL LOBBY	6	0.2%
34	CONTRACTS, KNOW THE RIGHT PEOPLE	9	0.3%
35	CERTAIN CLASSES ARE CONTROLLED (MIDDLE/ WORKING), UPPER NOT C	1	0.0%
36	DEPENDS ON GOVERNMENT IN POWER, GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS	5	0.2%
37	ALL CLASSES PAY SAME U.I.C., PENSIONS, BUT NEEDS ARE DIFFERE	5	0.2%
38	LOWER CLASSES/INCOME GROUPS HAVE NO DEFENCE	15	0.5%
39	FARMERS PAY MORE - MORE LAND TAXES, MORE FOR OUT OF TOWN ED	0	
40	INDIANS COMPLAIN MORE/GET EVERYTHING	0	
41	WORKING CLASS COMPLAINS MORE, ALWAYS STRIKING FOR MORE, UNI	0	
42	FARMERS ARE CATERED TO	0	







# v1404: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-2ND?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	NO SECOND MENTION	1287	46.9%
99		1025	37.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
89	REFUSED	0	
98	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A AND Q92A	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1405: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-3RD?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/89/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	Q93.3 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q91A or Q92A.		
Pre-question	Q92A. DOES ANY SOCIAL CLASS PAY MORE COSTS THAN IT DESERVES TO?		
Literal question	Q93.3 WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ONE SOCIAL CLASS GETS MORE OR ANOTHER CLASS PAYS MORE THAN THE OTHERS? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q92A, Q92A, Q93.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	THE TAX STRUCTURE, THE WAY THE TAX SYSTEM IS SET UP	3	0.1%
2	HIGHER CLASSES/BUSINESSMEN HAVE MORE WRITE-OFFS/EXPENSES	5	0.2%
3	HIGHER CLASSES/BUSINESSMEN CAN AFFORD LAWYERS/KNOW HOW TO	3	0.1%
4	TAX LOOP-HOLES	3	0.1%
5	TAXES ARE SCALED TO INCOME, THE MORE YOU MAKE THE MORE YOU P	2	0.1%
6	MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS PAY MORE TAX, MIDDLE CLASS WAGE EARNER	13	0.5%
7	THE ECONOMY IN GENERAL, INFLATION, SOME CAN'T KEEP UP WITH	0	
8	THERE ARE MORE PEOPLE IN MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS/UPPER MIDDLE	1	0.0%
9	UPPER CLASSES DON'T FEEL THE PINCH OF OF TAXES LIKE THE LOW	2	0.1%
10	SOME ARE MORE UNFORTUNATE, HAVE TO HELP THE NEEDY, SOME CLA	1	0.0%
11	LOWER CLASS GETS MORE BENEFITS/ DON'T PAY FOR WHAT THEY GET	13	0.5%
12	WELFARE, THE AMOUNT OF WELFARE	0	
13	BECAUSE WELFARE IS ABUSED	1	0.0%
14	THE AMOUNT OF UNEMPLOYMENT PAID OUT	1	0.0%
15	U.I.C. ABUSED, SOME PEOPLE JUST DON'T WORK	4	0.1%
16	SOME PEOPLE WHO NEED WELFARE CAN'T GET IT	0	
17	UPPER (RICH) CLASSES DON'T PAY ENOUGH, ALWAYS IT'S THE LOWE	2	0.1%
18	UPPER CLASS GETS MORE IN BENEFITS, SPECIFIC BENEFITS LIKE M	1	0.0%
19	HIGHER CLASSES ARE BETTER EDUCATED, KNOW MORE, LOWER CLASS	0	
20	MONEY TALKS, RICH HAVE INFLUENCE/POWER	2	0.1%

# v1405: WHY CLASSES UNEQUAL-3RD?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	RICH GET RICHER, POOR GET POORER, 'THEY THAT HAVE, GET'	1	0.0%
22	IT IS JUST THE WAY THINGS ARE, ALWAYS BEEN THAT WAY, IT WIL	0	
23	RICH PAY FOR THE POOR	3	0.1%
24	CAPITALIST SYSTEM	0	
25	SOCIALISM	0	
26	YOU'RE BORN INTO IT	0	
27	LOWER CLASSES WORK FOR LESS PAY	0	
28	POOR (WORKING CLASS) PAY MORE THAN THEY CAN AFFORD, CAN'T A	6	0.2%
29	INJUSTICE, HUMAN INJUSTICE	1	0.0%
30	SOMETHING DISHONEST SOMEWHERE, TOO EASY TO BREAK LAWS	1	0.0%
31	POOR ADMINISTRATION/GOVERNMENT	0	
32	UPPER CLASS ARE THE PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT, MORE ACTIVE POLITI	1	0.0%
33	POLITICAL DEAL FOR VOTES, POLITICAL LOBBY	0	
34	CONTRACTS, KNOW THE RIGHT PEOPLE	1	0.0%
35	CERTAIN CLASSES ARE CONTROLLED (MIDDLE/ WORKING), UPPER NOT C	0	
36	DEPENDS ON GOVERNMENT IN POWER, GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS	1	0.0%
37	ALL CLASSES PAY SAME U.I.C., PENSIONS, BUT NEEDS ARE DIFFERE	0	
38	LOWER CLASSES/INCOME GROUPS HAVE NO DEFENCE	2	0.1%
39	FARMERS PAY MORE - MORE LAND TAXES, MORE FOR OUT OF TOWN ED	0	
40	INDIANS COMPLAIN MORE/GET EVERYTHING	0	
41	WORKING CLASS COMPLAINS MORE, ALWAYS STRIKING FOR MORE, UNI	0	
42	FARMERS ARE CATERED TO	0	
88	NO THIRD MENTION	1644	59.9%
99		1025	37.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
89	REFUSED	0	
98	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q91A AND Q92A	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1406: LEFT-RIGHT SELF PLACEMNT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2069 /-] [Invalid=692 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	SOME PEOPLE THINK OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES AE BEING ON THE 'LEFT' OR 'RIGHT'. HERE IS A SCALE STRETCHING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, WITH '1' AS BEING THE MOST TO THE LEFT AND '7' BEING THE MOST TO THE RIGHT. (HAND CARD 3)		
Literal question	WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR OWN POLITICAL OPINIONS, WHERE WOULD YOU PUT YOURSELF ON THIS SCALE?		
Notes	Q94A in the documentation.		

# v1406: LEFT-RIGHT SELF PLACEMNT				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LEFT	50	<div><div></div></div>	2.4%
2	2 ON L-R SCALE	93	<div><div></div></div>	4.5%
3	3 ON L-R SCALE	234	<div><div></div></div>	11.3%
4	4 ON L-R SCALE	869	<div><div></div></div>	42.0%
5	5 ON L-R SCALE	459	<div><div></div></div>	22.2%
6	6 ON L-R SCALE	189	<div><div></div></div>	9.1%
7	RIGHT	175	<div><div></div></div>	8.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
8	D.K.	672		
9	REFUSED	2		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1407: LIBERALS:LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1994 /-] [Invalid=767 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q94A. SOME PEOPLE THINK OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES AE BEING ON THE 'LEFT' OR 'RIGHT'. HERE IS A SCALE STRETCHING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, WITH '1' AS BEING THE MOST TO THE LEFT AND '7' BEING THE MOST TO THE RIGHT. (HAND CARD 3) WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR OWN POLITICAL OPINIONS, WHERE WOULD YOU PUT YOURSELF ON THIS SCALE?			
Literal question	Q94B. NOW, WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY ON THIS LEFT/RIGHT SCALE			
Notes	Q94A, Q94B in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LEFT	105	<div><div></div></div>	5.3%
2	2 ON L-R SCALE	153	<div><div></div></div>	7.7%
3	3 ON L-R SCALE	311	<div><div></div></div>	15.6%
4	4 ON L-R SCALE	527	<div><div></div></div>	26.4%
5	5 ON L-R SCALE	398	<div><div></div></div>	20.0%
6	6 ON L-R SCALE	312	<div><div></div></div>	15.6%
7	RIGHT	188	<div><div></div></div>	9.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
8	D.K.	745		
9	REFUSED	4		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1408: PC: LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1954 /-] [Invalid=807 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q94A. SOME PEOPLE THINK OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES AE BEING ON THE 'LEFT' OR 'RIGHT'. HERE IS A SCALE STRETCHING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, WITH '1' AS BEING THE MOST TO THE LEFT AND '7' BEING THE MOST TO THE RIGHT. (HAND CARD 3) WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR OWN POLITICAL OPINIONS, WHERE WOULD YOU PUT YOURSELF ON THIS SCALE?			
Literal question	Q94C. HOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THEM ON THE LEFT/RIGHT SCALE?			
Notes	Q94A, Q94C in the documentation.			

# v1408: PC: LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LEFT	76	<div><div></div></div>	3.9%
2	2 ON L-R SCALE	98	<div><div></div></div>	5.0%
3	3 ON L-R SCALE	211	<div><div></div></div>	10.8%
4	4 ON L-R SCALE	405	<div><div></div></div>	20.7%
5	5 ON L-R SCALE	502	<div><div></div></div>	25.7%
6	6 ON L-R SCALE	432	<div><div></div></div>	22.1%
7	RIGHT	230	<div><div></div></div>	11.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
8	D.K.	785		
9	REFUSED	4		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1409: NDP: LEFT-RIGHT PLACEMENT				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1830 /-] [Invalid=931 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q94A. SOME PEOPLE THINK OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES AE BEING ON THE 'LEFT' OR 'RIGHT'. HERE IS A SCALE STRETCHING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, WITH '1' AS BEING THE MOST TO THE LEFT AND '7' BEING THE MOST TO THE RIGHT. (HAND CARD 3) WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR OWN POLITICAL OPINIONS, WHERE WOULD YOU PUT YOURSELF ON THIS SCALE?			
Literal question	Q94D. HOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THEM ON THE LEFT/RIGHT SCALE?			
Notes	Q94A, Q94D in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LEFT	266	<div><div></div></div>	14.5%
2	2 ON L-R SCALE	424	<div><div></div></div>	23.2%
3	3 ON L-R SCALE	441	<div><div></div></div>	24.1%
4	4 ON L-R SCALE	349	<div><div></div></div>	19.1%
5	5 ON L-R SCALE	173	<div><div></div></div>	9.5%
6	6 ON L-R SCALE	95	<div><div></div></div>	5.2%
7	RIGHT	82	<div><div></div></div>	4.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
8	D.K.	910		
9	REFUSED	3		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1410: SOCIAL CREDIT LEFT-RIGHT				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=381 /-] [Invalid=2380 /-]			
Universe	Q94E asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.			
Pre-question	Q94A. SOME PEOPLE THINK OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES AE BEING ON THE 'LEFT' OR 'RIGHT'. HERE IS A SCALE STRETCHING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT, WITH '1' AS BEING THE MOST TO THE LEFT AND '7' BEING THE MOST TO THE RIGHT. (HAND CARD 3) WHEN YOU THINK OF YOUR OWN POLITICAL OPINIONS, WHERE WOULD YOU PUT YOURSELF ON THIS SCALE?			
Literal question	Q94E. AND HOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE THEM ON THE LEFT/RIGHT SCALE?			
Notes	Q94A, Q94E in the documentation.			

# v1410: SOCIAL CREDIT LEFT-RIGHT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LEFT	69	<div><div></div></div> 18.1%
2	2 ON L-R SCALE	50	<div><div></div></div> 13.1%
3	3 ON L-R SCALE	72	<div><div></div></div> 18.9%
4	4 ON L-R SCALE	74	<div><div></div></div> 19.4%
5	5 ON L-R SCALE	37	<div><div></div></div> 9.7%
6	6 ON L-R SCALE	36	<div><div></div></div> 9.4%
7	RIGHT	43	<div><div></div></div> 11.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2027	
8	D.K.	353	
9	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1411: GOVERNMENT ROLE:WELFARE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2675 /-] [Invalid=86 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	PROVIDE WELFARE SERVICES FOR ANYONE WHO NEEDS THEM.		
Notes	Q95A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2354	<div><div></div></div> 88.0%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	321	<div><div></div></div> 12.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	68	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1412: WELFARE FOR ALL-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2266 /-] [Invalid=495 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95B. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES <PROVIDE WELFARE SERVICES?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	365	<div><div></div></div> 16.1%
2	FAIRLY WELL	1136	<div><div></div></div> 50.1%
3	NOT VERY WELL	765	<div><div></div></div> 33.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	88	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95A	389	

# v1412: WELFARE FOR ALL-ATTITUDE			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1413: GOVERNMENT ROLE: DEFENSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95C. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) KEEP OUR ARMED FORCES STRONG ENOUGH TO PROTECT US FROM A POSSIBLE ATTACK FROM ANY SOURCE.		
Notes	Q95A, Q95C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2240	 81.7%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	351	 12.8%
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	152	 5.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1414: ARMY STRONG-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2035 /-] [Invalid=726 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95D. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (KEEP ARMED FORCES STRONG)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	327	 16.1%
2	FAIRLY WELL	1077	 52.9%
3	NOT VERY WELL	631	 31.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	205	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95C	503	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1415: GOVERNMENT ROLE: LIFE PROTECT?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2617 /-] [Invalid=144 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95E. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) GUARANTEE THE PROTECTION OF THE LIVES AND PROPERTY OF ALL PEOPLE.		

# v1415: GOVERNMENT ROLE: LIFE PROTECT?			
Notes		Q95A, Q95E in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2388	<div><div></div></div> 91.2%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	229	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	126	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1416: LIFE/PROPERTY PROTECT-ATTITUDE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2267 /-] [Invalid=494 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.	
Literal question		Q95F. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (PROTECT LIVES AND PROPERTY)?	
Notes		Q95A, Q95F in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	336	<div><div></div></div> 14.8%
2	FAIRLY WELL	1473	<div><div></div></div> 65.0%
3	NOT VERY WELL	458	<div><div></div></div> 20.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	121	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95E	355	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1417: GOVERNMENT ROLE: GUARANTEE WORK?			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2681 /-] [Invalid=80 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.	
Literal question		Q95G. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE WHO WANTS TO WORK HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO.	
Notes		Q95A, Q95G in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2542	<div><div></div></div> 94.8%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	139	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	62	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1418: WORK FOR ALL-ATTITUDE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2458 /-] [Invalid=303 /-]	

# v1418: WORK FOR ALL-ATTITUDE			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95H. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (KEEP PEOPLE EMPLOYED)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	145	<div></div> 5.9%
2	FAIRLY WELL	993	<div></div> 40.4%
3	NOT VERY WELL	1320	<div></div> 53.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	84	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95G	201	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1419: GOVERNMENT ROLE: CIVIL RIGHTS?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2501 /-] [Invalid=260 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95I. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT THE PERSONAL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS OF PEOPLE NEVER ARE ENDANGERED BY THE POLICE, THE COURTS, OR THE CIVIL SERVICE.		
Notes	Q95A, Q95I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2321	<div></div> 92.8%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	180	<div></div> 7.2%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	242	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1420: CIVIL RIGHTS-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2198 /-] [Invalid=563 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95J. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (PROTECT PERSONAL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	243	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
2	FAIRLY WELL	1390	<div><div></div></div> 63.2%
3	NOT VERY WELL	565	<div><div></div></div> 25.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	123	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95I	422	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1421: GOVERNMENT ROLE: INFLATION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2675 /-] [Invalid=86 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95K. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT INFLATION IS KEPT UNDER CONTROL?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2620	<div><div></div></div> 97.9%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	55	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	68	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1422: FIGHT INFLATION-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2542 /-] [Invalid=219 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95L. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (CONTROL INFLATION)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95L in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	52	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%

# v1422: FIGHT INFLATION-ATTITUDE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	FAIRLY WELL	638	<div><div></div></div> 25.1%
3	NOT VERY WELL	1852	<div><div></div></div> 72.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	78	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95K	123	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1423: GOVERNMENT ROLE: TAXATION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2670 /-] [Invalid=91 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95M. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT EVERYONE PAYS THEIR FAIR SHARE OF TAXES WHETHER THEY ARE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS, RICH OR POOR.		
Notes	Q95A, Q95M in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2632	<div><div></div></div> 98.6%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	38	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	73	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1424: FAIR TAXES-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2490 /-] [Invalid=271 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95N. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (INSURE THAT EVERYONE PAYS TAXES)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95N in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	270	<div><div></div></div> 10.8%
2	FAIRLY WELL	1084	<div><div></div></div> 43.5%
3	NOT VERY WELL	1136	<div><div></div></div> 45.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	142	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95M	111	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1425: GOVERNMENT ROLE: FOREIGN INVESTMENT?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2457 /-] [Invalid=304 /-]		

# v1425: GOVERNMENT ROLE: FOREIGN INVESTMENT?			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95O. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) LIMIT FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND CONTROL OF OUR NATURAL RESOUCES BY FOREIGN OWNERSHIP.		
Notes	Q95A, Q95O in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2242	<div><div></div></div> 91.2%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	215	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	286	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1426: FOREIGN INVESTMENT-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2080 /-] [Invalid=681 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95P. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (LIMIT FOREIGN INVESTMENT)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95P in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	100	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
2	FAIRLY WELL	805	<div><div></div></div> 38.7%
3	NOT VERY WELL	1175	<div><div></div></div> 56.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	162	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95O	501	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1427: GOVERNMENT ROLE: REGIONAL EQUALITY?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2580 /-] [Invalid=181 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95Q. STILL THINKNG ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD INSURE THAT PEOPLE IN EVERY REGION OF CANADA HAVE A DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING BY PASSING LAWS THAT BENEFIT ALL REGIONS EQUALLY.		
Notes	Q95A, Q95Q in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2367	<div><div></div></div> 91.7%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	213	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%





# v1427: GOVERNMENT ROLE: REGIONAL EQUALITY?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	163	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1428: REGIONAL EQUALITY-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2215 /-] [Invalid=546 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95R. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (INSURE AN EQUAL STANDARD OF LIVING)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95R in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	111	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
2	FAIRLY WELL	1122	<div><div></div></div> 50.7%
3	NOT VERY WELL	982	<div><div></div></div> 44.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	152	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95Q	376	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1429: GOVERNMENT ROLE: EQUAL POLITICAL POWE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2486 /-] [Invalid=275 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95S. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT NO PERSON OR GROUP HAS MORE OPPORTUNITY TO INFLUENCE POLITICAL DECISIONS THAN OTHERS?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95S in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	2154	<div><div></div></div> 86.6%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	332	<div><div></div></div> 13.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	257	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1430: EQUAL POLITICAL POWER-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1909 /-] [Invalid=852 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL		

# v1430: EQUAL POLITICAL POWER-ATTITUDE			
	GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95T. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (MAINTAIN POLITICAL EQUALITY)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95T in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	103	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
2	FAIRLY WELL	883	<div><div></div></div> 46.3%
3	NOT VERY WELL	923	<div><div></div></div> 48.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	245	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95S	589	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1431: GOVERNMENT ROLE: LANGUAGE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2590 /-] [Invalid=171 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95U. (SHOULD GOVERNMENT) INSURE THAT PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE THEIR CHILDREN TAUGHT IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE, EVEN IN AREAS IN WHICH THEY ARE A MINORITY.		
Notes	Q95A, Q95U in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SHOULD DO	1866	<div><div></div></div> 72.0%
2	SHOULD NOT DO	724	<div><div></div></div> 28.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	REFUSED/NO OPINION	153	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1432: LANGUAGE RIGHTS-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1748 /-] [Invalid=1013 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q95A. THINKING NOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, NOT A PARTICULAR PARTY GOVERNMENT, I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS PEOPLE HAVE SAID THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER DOING. AS I READ EACH OF THESE TO YOU, WOULD YOU TELL ME WHETHER YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DOING THESE THINGS.		
Literal question	Q95V. HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT DOES (INSURE FREEDOM OF LANGUAGE)?		
Notes	Q95A, Q95V in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY WELL	159	<div><div></div></div> 9.1%
2	FAIRLY WELL	808	<div><div></div></div> 46.2%
3	NOT VERY WELL	781	<div><div></div></div> 44.7%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
8	D.K.	118	
9	INAP., CODED 2 OR 8 IN 95U	877	

# v1432: LANGUAGE RIGHTS-ATTITUDE			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1433: SUPPORT FEDERAL 'REGIME'-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2549 /-] [Invalid=212 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Notes	Q10D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	263	<div><div></div>10.3%</div>
2	AGREE	1376	<div><div></div>54.0%</div>
3	DISAGREE	753	<div><div></div>29.5%</div>
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	157	<div><div></div>6.2%</div>
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	194	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1434: LAW EQUAL: RICH/POOR-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2529 /-] [Invalid=232 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96B. IN SOME COUNTRIES THERE MAY BE ONE LAW FOR THE RICH AND ANOTHER FOR THE POOR BUT THAT IS NOT THE WAY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WORKS IN CANADA.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	209	<div><div></div>8.3%</div>
2	AGREE	1268	<div><div></div>50.1%</div>
3	DISAGREE	871	<div><div></div>34.4%</div>
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	181	<div><div></div>7.2%</div>
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	214	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1435: FEDERAL SYSTEM GOOD-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2283 /-] [Invalid=478 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD		

# v1435: FEDERAL SYSTEM GOOD-ATTITUDE			
	BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96C. ALTHOUGH DIVIDING POWERS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS MAY HAVE PRESENTED PROBLEMS AT TIMES, ON THE WHOLE THE BENEFITS OF OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM FAR OUTWEIGH THE COSTS.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	235	<div><div></div></div> 10.3%
2	AGREE	1524	<div><div></div></div> 66.8%
3	DISAGREE	449	<div><div></div></div> 19.7%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	75	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	460	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1436: PARLIAMENT MOST IMPORTANT INSTITUTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2542 /-] [Invalid=219 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96D. PARLIAMENT MAY HAVE BECOME LESS IMPORTANT IN SOME COUNTRIES, BUT IN CANADA IT CONTINUES TO BE OUR MOST IMPORTANT POLITICAL INSTITUTION.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	567	<div><div></div></div> 22.3%
2	AGREE	1779	<div><div></div></div> 70.0%
3	DISAGREE	158	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	38	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	201	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1437: PARTIES WORK FOR ALL-ATTITUDE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2558 /-] [Invalid=203 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96E. OVER THE YEARS, POLITICAL PARTIES GENERALLY HAVE TRIED TO LOOK AFTER THE BEST INTERESTS OF ALL CANADIANS, NOT JUST THE INTERESTS OF THOSE WHO VOTE FOR THEM.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96E in the documentation.		





v1437: PARTIES WORK FOR ALL-ATTITUDE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	174	 6.8%
2	AGREE	1758	 68.7%
3	DISAGREE	554	 21.7%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	72	 2.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	185	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1438: COURTS ACT QUICK AND FAIR





Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2369 /-] [Invalid=392 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.
Literal question	Q96F. OVER THE YEARS, THE FEDERAL COURTS GENERALLY HAVE ACTED SPEEDILY AND TREATED PEOPLE FAIRLY.
Notes	Q96A, Q96F in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	95	 4.0%
2	AGREE	1372	 57.9%
3	DISAGREE	780	 32.9%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	122	 5.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	374	









Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1439: FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE HELPS ALL

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2415 /-] [Invalid=346 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.
Literal question	Q96G. GENERALLY SPEAKING, THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE DOES ITS BEST TO HELP SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF CANADIANS.
Notes	Q96A, Q96G in the documentation.









Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	88	 3.6%
2	AGREE	1646	 68.2%
3	DISAGREE	581	 24.1%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	100	 4.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	

# v1439: FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE HELPS ALL			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	328	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1440: LEADERS DO GOOD WORK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2572 /-] [Invalid=189 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96H. OVER THE YEARS, LEADERS OF ALL PARTIES AND OUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT GENERALLY HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB OF GOVERNING THE COUNTRY.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	91	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
2	AGREE	1672	<div><div></div></div> 65.0%
3	DISAGREE	718	<div><div></div></div> 27.9%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	91	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	171	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1441: KEEP CANADA TOGETHER-IMPORTANT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2585 /-] [Invalid=176 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96I. KEEPING CANADA TOGETHER AS A COUNTRY IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN ANY OTHER PROBLEM WE FACE.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	648	<div><div></div></div> 25.1%
2	AGREE	1235	<div><div></div></div> 47.8%
3	DISAGREE	605	<div><div></div></div> 23.4%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	97	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	158	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1442: INTEREST GROUPS BEHAVE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2320 /-] [Invalid=441 /-]		

# v1442: INTEREST GROUPS BEHAVE			
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96J. IN SOME OTHER COUNTRIES, INTEREST GROUPS LIKE BUSINESS, LABOUR OR FARMERS GROUPS HAVE HAD TOO MUCH SAY IN POLITICS BUT THIS HASN'T BEEN THE CASE IN CANADA.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	60	 2.6%
2	AGREE	973	 41.9%
3	DISAGREE	1110	 47.8%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	177	 7.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	423	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1443: CIVIL SERVICE TREATS ALL EQUAL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2355 /-] [Invalid=406 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q96A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO READ SOME STATEMENTS THAT PEOPLE HAVE MADE. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE WITH THEM, YOU AGREE, YOU DISAGREE, OR YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE. CANADIANS SHOULD BE WILLING TO SUPPORT WHAT THEIR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DECIDES EVEN IF THEY DO NOT PERSONALLY SUPPORT THE POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS IN CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.		
Literal question	Q96K. ALTHOUGH THERE MAY HAVE BEEN MINOR EXCEPTIONS, OVER THE YEARS THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE GENERALLY HAS TREATED ALL CANADIANS EQUALLY.		
Notes	Q96A, Q96K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY AGREE	69	 2.9%
2	AGREE	1497	 63.6%
3	DISAGREE	685	 29.1%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	104	 4.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	388	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1444: MP'S CONSIDER MY VIEWS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2554 /-] [Invalid=207 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HOW LIKELY IS IT, IN YOUR OPINION, THAT A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT WOULD DO THE FOLLOWING: TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE OPINIONS OF PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF WHEN MAKING UP HIS OR HER MIND ON AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, IF HE OR SHE KNEW YOUR FEELINGS ON IT.		
Notes	Q97A in the documentation.		

# v1444: MP'S CONSIDER MY VIEWS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	407	<div><div></div></div> 15.9%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	1185	<div><div></div></div> 46.4%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	962	<div><div></div></div> 37.7%
8	REFUSED/D.K.	189	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1445: MP'S WORK FOR RIDING			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2572 /-] [Invalid=189 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q97A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HOW LIKELY IS IT, IN YOUR OPINION, THAT A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT WOULD DO THE FOLLOWING:		
Literal question	Q97B. (HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT A FEDERAL MP WOULD) TRY HARD TO DO OR GET SOMETHING FOR HIS RIDING IF PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF ASKED HIM OR HER FOR SOMETHING OR NEEDED SOMETHING.		
Notes	Q97A, Q97B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	696	<div><div></div></div> 27.1%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	1376	<div><div></div></div> 53.5%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	500	<div><div></div></div> 19.4%
8	REFUSED/D.K.	171	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1446: MP'S HELP PERSONAL PROBLEMS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2505 /-] [Invalid=256 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q97A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HOW LIKELY IS IT, IN YOUR OPINION, THAT A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT WOULD DO THE FOLLOWING:		
Literal question	Q97C. (HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT A FEDERAL MP WOULD) TRY HARD TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT A SPECIFIC PERSONAL OR FAMILY PROBLEM THAT A PERSON LIKE YOURSELF APPROACH HIM OR HER WITH.		
Notes	Q97A, Q97C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	443	<div><div></div></div> 17.7%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	919	<div><div></div></div> 36.7%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	1143	<div><div></div></div> 45.6%
8	REFUSED/D.K.	238	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1447: MP'S ARE APPROACHABLE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2519 /-] [Invalid=242 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1447: MP'S ARE APPROACHABLE			
Pre-question	Q97A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL, HOW LIKELY IS IT, IN YOUR OPINION, THAT A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT WOULD DO THE FOLLOWING:		
Literal question	Q97D. (HOW LIKELY IS IT THAT A FEDERAL MP WOULD) MAKE HIMSELF OR HERSELF AVAILABLE AT HOME IN HIS OR HER CONSTITUENCY OFFICE AND IN OTTAWA TO PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF IF THEY SHOULD NEED TO CALL ON HIM OR HER.		
Notes	Q97A, Q97D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	829	<div></div> 32.9%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	1131	<div></div> 44.9%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	559	<div></div> 22.2%
8	REFUSED/D.K.	224	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1448: EVER CONTACTED MP?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2692 /-] [Invalid=69 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, HAVE YOU ACTUALLY EVER TALKED WITH, WRITTEN TO, OR IN ANY OTHER WAY CONTACTED A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ABOUT ANY PROBLEMS?		
Notes	Q98A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	669	<div></div> 24.9%
2	NO	2023	<div></div> 75.1%
8	REFUSED/D.K.	51	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1449: DID MP DO ANYTHING FOR YOU?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2671 /-] [Invalid=90 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q98A. STILL THINKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, HAVE YOU ACTUALLY EVER TALKED WITH, WRITTEN TO, OR IN ANY OTHER WAY CONTACTED A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ABOUT ANY PROBLEMS?		
Literal question	Q98BC. HAS A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ACTUALLY EVER DONE ANYTHING FOR YOU OR FOR A MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY?		
Post-question	(IF 'YES') WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH WHAT HE OR SHE DID?		
Notes	Q98A, Q98BC in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES, MP DID SOMETHING AND RESPONDENT SATISFIED	480	<div></div> 18.0%
2	YES, MP DID SOMETHING AND RESPONDENT D.K. WHETHER SATISFIED	14	<div></div> 0.5%
3	YES, MP DID SOMETHING AND RESPONDENT NOT SATISFIED	31	<div></div> 1.2%
5	NO, MP NEVER DID ANYTHING	2146	<div></div> 80.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	D.K., REFUSED	72	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1450: RATE MP: AVAILABLE TO RIDING			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2347 /-] [Invalid=414 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	GENERALLY SPEAKING, WHAT KIND OF JOB DO YOU THINK YOUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, THE ONE YOU HAVE NOW AND THOSE YOU'VE HAD IN THE PAST, HAVE DONE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS. AS I MENTION THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, WOULD YOU TELL ME IF THEY HAVE DONE A VERY GOOD JOB, A GOOD JOB, A BAD JOB, OR A VERY BAD JOB.		
Literal question	BEING AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE RIDING.		
Notes	Q99A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY GOOD JOB	547	 23.3%
2	GOOD JOB	1476	 62.9%
3	BAD JOB	267	 11.4%
4	VERY BAD JOB	57	 2.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	396	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1451: RATE MP: EXPLAINING GOVERNMENT ACTIONS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2336 /-] [Invalid=425 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q99A. GENERALLY SPEAKING, WHAT KIND OF JOB DO YOU THINK YOUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, THE ONE YOU HAVE NOW AND THOSE YOU'VE HAD IN THE PAST, HAVE DONE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS. AS I MENTION THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, WOULD YOU TELL ME IF THEY HAVE DONE A VERY GOOD JOB, A GOOD JOB, A BAD JOB, OR A VERY BAD JOB.		
Literal question	Q99B. (JOB MPS DO IN) EXPLAINING TO THE PEOPLE WHAT KINDS OF THINGS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS THINKING ABOUT DOING.		
Notes	Q99A, Q99B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY GOOD JOB	377	 16.1%
2	GOOD JOB	1389	 59.5%
3	BAD JOB	491	 21.0%
4	VERY BAD JOB	79	 3.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	407	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1452: RATE MP: WORK IN PARLIAMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2078 /-] [Invalid=683 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q99A. GENERALLY SPEAKING, WHAT KIND OF JOB DO YOU THINK YOUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, THE ONE YOU HAVE NOW AND THOSE YOU'VE HAD IN THE PAST, HAVE DONE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS. AS I MENTION THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, WOULD YOU TELL ME IF THEY HAVE DONE A VERY GOOD JOB, A GOOD JOB, A BAD JOB, OR A VERY BAD JOB.		
Literal question	Q99C. (JOB MPS DO IN) TAKING PART IN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, QUESTION PERIOD, AND COMMITTEE WORK AND SO FORTH.		

# v1452: RATE MP: WORK IN PARLIAMENT			
Notes		Q99A, Q99C in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY GOOD JOB	388	<div><div></div></div> 18.7%
2	GOOD JOB	1408	<div><div></div></div> 67.8%
3	BAD JOB	227	<div><div></div></div> 10.9%
4	VERY BAD JOB	55	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	665	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1453: RATE MP: HELP RIDING			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1999 /-] [Invalid=762 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q99A. GENERALLY SPEAKING, WHAT KIND OF JOB DO YOU THINK YOUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, THE ONE YOU HAVE NOW AND THOSE YOU'VE HAD IN THE PAST, HAVE DONE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS. AS I MENTION THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, WOULD YOU TELL ME IF THEY HAVE DONE A VERY GOOD JOB, A GOOD JOB, A BAD JOB, OR A VERY BAD JOB.	
Literal question		Q99D. (JOB MPS DO IN) HELPING PEOPLE IN THE RIDING WHO HAVE PROBLEM WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SOLVE THEM.	
Notes		Q99A, Q99D in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY GOOD JOB	324	<div><div></div></div> 16.2%
2	GOOD JOB	1280	<div><div></div></div> 64.0%
3	BAD JOB	329	<div><div></div></div> 16.5%
4	VERY BAD JOB	66	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	744	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1454: RATE MP: RIDING PROJECTS			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2192 /-] [Invalid=569 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q99A. GENERALLY SPEAKING, WHAT KIND OF JOB DO YOU THINK YOUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, THE ONE YOU HAVE NOW AND THOSE YOU'VE HAD IN THE PAST, HAVE DONE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS. AS I MENTION THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, WOULD YOU TELL ME IF THEY HAVE DONE A VERY GOOD JOB, A GOOD JOB, A BAD JOB, OR A VERY BAD JOB.	
Literal question		Q99E. <JOB MPS DO IN> GETTING PROJECTS AND OTHER THINGS THE RIDING NEEDS.	
Notes		Q99A, Q99E in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY GOOD JOB	349	<div><div></div></div> 15.9%
2	GOOD JOB	1445	<div><div></div></div> 65.9%
3	BAD JOB	334	<div><div></div></div> 15.2%
4	VERY BAD JOB	64	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
9	REFUSED/NO OPINION	551	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			

# v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2706 /-] [Invalid=55 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Notes	Q100.11 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	427	<div></div> 15.8%
2	PROUD CANADIAN	50	<div></div> 1.8%
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	66	<div></div> 2.4%
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	109	<div></div> 4.0%
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	13	<div></div> 0.5%
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	1	<div></div> 0.0%
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	10	<div></div> 0.4%
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	4	<div></div> 0.1%
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	1	<div></div> 0.0%
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	77	<div></div> 2.8%
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	16	<div></div> 0.6%
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	13	<div></div> 0.5%
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	1	<div></div> 0.0%
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	2	<div></div> 0.1%
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	12	<div></div> 0.4%
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	0	
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	5	<div></div> 0.2%
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	0	
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	1	<div></div> 0.0%
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	3	<div></div> 0.1%
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	4	<div></div> 0.1%
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	5	<div></div> 0.2%
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	0	
33	ACADIAN	3	<div></div> 0.1%
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	31	<div></div> 1.1%
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	1	<div></div> 0.0%
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	

v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	3	0.1%
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	4	0.1%
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.0%
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	0	
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	1	0.0%
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	1	0.0%
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	0	
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	42	1.6%
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	6	0.2%
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	0	
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	0	
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	1	0.0%
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	1	0.0%
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	2	0.1%
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	1	0.0%
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	0	
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE	0	
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	0	
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	0	
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	3	0.1%
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	0	
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	7	0.3%
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	1	0.0%
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	9	0.3%
352	I'M BILINGUAL	1	0.0%
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	0	
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	42	1.6%
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	1	0.0%
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	3	0.1%
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	1	0.0%
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	8	0.3%
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	22	0.8%
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	44	1.6%

v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	17	0.6%
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	49	1.8%
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	9	0.3%
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	3	0.1%
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	54	2.0%
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	10	0.4%
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	116	4.3%
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	0	
432	RAISED FAMILY	0	
433	MOTHER	83	3.1%
434	MARRIED	14	0.5%
435	MAN	19	0.7%
436	WOMAN	49	1.8%
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	23	0.8%
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	1	0.0%
440	SINGLE	4	0.1%
441	WORKING MOTHER	15	0.6%
442	BREADWINNER	4	0.1%
443	GOOD PARENT	2	0.1%
445	WIDOW	7	0.3%
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	2	0.1%
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	5	0.2%
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	3	0.1%
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	1	0.0%
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	4	0.1%
503	CHRISTIAN	9	0.3%
504	GOD-FEARING	1	0.0%
505	CHILD OF GOD	6	0.2%
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	
507	JEWISH	1	0.0%
508	CATHOLIC	3	0.1%
509	PROTESTANT	0	
527	PENSIONER	11	0.4%
528	FARMER	25	0.9%
529	BUSINESS PERSON	9	0.3%
530	HONEST WORKER	12	0.4%
531	HARD WORKER	61	2.3%
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	10	0.4%
533	ENJOYS JOB	6	0.2%
534	I WORK	9	0.3%
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	3	0.1%
537	UNEMPLOYED	7	0.3%
538	UNDERPAID	1	0.0%

v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	3	0.1%
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	3	0.1%
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	2	0.1%
542	RETIRED	21	0.8%
543	STUDENT	28	1.0%
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	0	
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	4	0.1%
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	2	0.1%
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	0	
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	4	0.1%
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	6	0.2%
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	2	0.1%
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	7	0.3%
556	ON WELFARE	0	
557	MANUAL WORKER	21	0.8%
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	9	0.3%
559	CLERICAL	3	0.1%
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	1	0.0%
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	0	
602	LIKES SPORTS	5	0.2%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	0	
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	0	
606	LIKES THE ARTS	1	0.0%
607	LIKES GARDENING	1	0.0%
608	LIKES MUSIC	0	
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	3	0.1%
610	LIKES ANIMALS	0	
611	LIKES TO READ	0	
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	4	0.1%
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	0	
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	2	0.1%
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	1	0.0%
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	1	0.0%
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	0	
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	0	
631	WELL-EDUCATED	3	0.1%
651	TAXPAYER	9	0.3%
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	1	0.0%
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	8	0.3%
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	3	0.1%

v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	4	0.1%
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	1	0.0%
658	LIBERAL	4	0.1%
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	6	0.2%
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	1	0.0%
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	3	0.1%
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	4	0.1%
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	1	0.0%
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	4	0.1%
667	CONSERVATIVE	7	0.3%
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	1	0.0%
669	SOCIALIST	3	0.1%
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	0	
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	4	0.1%
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	1	0.0%
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	0	
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	13	0.5%
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	0	
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	0	
677	LAW-ABIDING	6	0.2%
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	0	
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	0	
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	0	
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	0	
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	3	0.1%
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	0	
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	3	0.1%
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	0	
689	INFORMED VOTER	0	
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	1	0.0%
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	0	
701	NOBODY	6	0.2%
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	66	2.4%
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	9	0.3%
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	3	0.1%
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	0	
708	LONER	0	

v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	10	0.4%
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	13	0.5%
711	CURIOUS	2	0.1%
712	CREATIVE	0	
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	109	4.0%
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	1	0.0%
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	18	0.7%
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	23	0.8%
717	INDEPENDENT	13	0.5%
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	5	0.2%
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	17	0.6%
720	HAPPY	18	0.7%
721	GOOD, HONEST	21	0.8%
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	0	
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	0	
725	REAL PERSON	3	0.1%
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	1	0.0%
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	22	0.8%
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	3	0.1%
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	19	0.7%
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	2	0.1%
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	1	0.0%
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	5	0.2%
733	LOVES CHILDREN	0	
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	9	0.3%
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	20	0.7%
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	10	0.4%
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	10	0.4%
740	AGGRESSIVE	0	
741	COMPETETIVE	0	
742	SHY	6	0.2%
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	2	0.1%
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	0	
745	INTELLIGENT	9	0.3%
747	CAN DO BETTER	4	0.1%
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	3	0.1%
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	1	0.0%
750	IDEALISTIC	0	
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	0	
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	11	0.4%
776	SUCCESSFUL	1	0.0%
777	MIDDLE AGED	12	0.4%

# v1455: 'WHO AM I'-1ST RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	26	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	17	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
786	HEALTHY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	0	
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	80	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	0	
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	0	
807	OPEN-MINDED	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0	
996	NO COMMENT	65	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	24	
998	DO NOT KNOW	31	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1456: 'WHO AM I'-1ST DETAILS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.12 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 1ST RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.12 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	134	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	1171	<div><div></div></div> 42.4%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	963	<div><div></div></div> 34.9%

# v1456: 'WHO AM I'-1ST DETAILS				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	329	<div></div>	11.9%
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	109	<div></div>	3.9%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	24	<div></div>	0.9%
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	16	<div></div>	0.6%
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	5	<div></div>	0.2%
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	4	<div></div>	0.1%
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	4	<div></div>	0.1%
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div></div>	0.0%
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div></div>	0.0%
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2398 /-] [Invalid=363 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'			
Literal question	Q100.21 "WHO AM I?" (SECOND MENTION)			
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.21 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	I'M A CANADIAN	100	<div></div>	4.2%
2	PROUD CANADIAN	44	<div></div>	1.8%
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	31	<div></div>	1.3%
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	21	<div></div>	0.9%
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	60	<div></div>	2.5%
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	1	<div></div>	0.0%
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	1	<div></div>	0.0%
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	8	<div></div>	0.3%
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	8	<div></div>	0.3%
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	2	<div></div>	0.1%
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	11	<div></div>	0.5%
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	14	<div></div>	0.6%
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	4	<div></div>	0.2%
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	16	<div></div>	0.7%
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	17	<div></div>	0.7%
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	5	<div></div>	0.2%
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	2	<div></div>	0.1%
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	7	<div></div>	0.3%

v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	0	
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	1	0.0%
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	2	0.1%
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	1	0.0%
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	4	0.2%
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	1	0.0%
33	ACADIAN	2	0.1%
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	4	0.2%
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	1	0.0%
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	2	0.1%
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	0	
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	6	0.3%
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	1	0.0%
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	11	0.5%
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.0%
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	3	0.1%
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.0%
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	2	0.1%
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	10	0.4%
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	10	0.4%
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	1	0.0%
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	31	1.3%
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	3	0.1%
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	2	0.1%
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	2	0.1%
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	2	0.1%
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	3	0.1%
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	10	0.4%
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	3	0.1%
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	2	0.1%
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE	4	0.2%
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	5	0.2%
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	1	0.0%
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	1	0.0%
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	9	0.4%

v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	4	0.2%
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	12	0.5%
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	17	0.7%
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	16	0.7%
352	I'M BILINGUAL	4	0.2%
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	1	0.0%
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	15	0.6%
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	5	0.2%
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	2	0.1%
358	ITALIAN	3	0.1%
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	5	0.2%
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	1	0.0%
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	11	0.5%
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	34	1.4%
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	4	0.2%
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	31	1.3%
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	5	0.2%
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	11	0.5%
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	43	1.8%
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	23	1.0%
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	69	2.9%
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	3	0.1%
432	RAISED FAMILY	2	0.1%
433	MOTHER	60	2.5%
434	MARRIED	13	0.5%
435	MAN	6	0.3%
436	WOMAN	26	1.1%
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	52	2.2%
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	0	
440	SINGLE	2	0.1%
441	WORKING MOTHER	14	0.6%
442	BREADWINNER	9	0.4%
443	GOOD PARENT	8	0.3%
445	WIDOW	5	0.2%
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	0	
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	5	0.2%
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	7	0.3%
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	3	0.1%
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	7	0.3%
503	CHRISTIAN	7	0.3%
504	GOD-FEARING	3	0.1%
505	CHILD OF GOD	0	
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	

v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
507	JEWISH	2	0.1%
508	CATHOLIC	13	0.5%
509	PROTESTANT	1	0.0%
527	PENSIONER	8	0.3%
528	FARMER	20	0.8%
529	BUSINESS PERSON	12	0.5%
530	HONEST WORKER	12	0.5%
531	HARD WORKER	97	4.0%
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	29	1.2%
533	ENJOYS JOB	24	1.0%
534	I WORK	33	1.4%
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	16	0.7%
537	UNEMPLOYED	6	0.3%
538	UNDERPAID	2	0.1%
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	2	0.1%
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	2	0.1%
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	3	0.1%
542	RETIRED	22	0.9%
543	STUDENT	21	0.9%
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	2	0.1%
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	2	0.1%
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	4	0.2%
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	6	0.3%
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	3	0.1%
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	4	0.2%
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	1	0.0%
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	8	0.3%
556	ON WELFARE	2	0.1%
557	MANUAL WORKER	15	0.6%
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	8	0.3%
559	CLERICAL	9	0.4%
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	1	0.0%
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	0	
602	LIKES SPORTS	8	0.3%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	5	0.2%
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	1	0.0%
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	2	0.1%
606	LIKES THE ARTS	3	0.1%
607	LIKES GARDENING	4	0.2%
608	LIKES MUSIC	1	0.0%
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	8	0.3%
610	LIKES ANIMALS	1	0.0%
611	LIKES TO READ	3	0.1%

v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	5	0.2%
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	4	0.2%
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	3	0.1%
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	2	0.1%
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	0	
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	4	0.2%
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	1	0.0%
631	WELL-EDUCATED	4	0.2%
651	TAXPAYER	19	0.8%
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	5	0.2%
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	3	0.1%
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	28	1.2%
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	11	0.5%
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	3	0.1%
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	5	0.2%
658	LIBERAL	2	0.1%
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	21	0.9%
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	6	0.3%
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	1	0.0%
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	2	0.1%
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	10	0.4%
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	13	0.5%
667	CONSERVATIVE	4	0.2%
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	1	0.0%
669	SOCIALIST	2	0.1%
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	3	0.1%
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	7	0.3%
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	3	0.1%
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	28	1.2%
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	1	0.0%
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	3	0.1%
677	LAW-ABIDING	6	0.3%
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	2	0.1%
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	5	0.2%
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	10	0.4%
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	4	0.2%
682		1	0.0%
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	4	0.2%

v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	1	0.0%
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	1	0.0%
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	1	0.0%
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	2	0.1%
689	INFORMED VOTER	1	0.0%
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	6	0.3%
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	1	0.0%
701	NOBODY	1	0.0%
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	12	0.5%
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	10	0.4%
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	2	0.1%
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	8	0.3%
708	LONER	0	
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	10	0.4%
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	30	1.3%
711	CURIOUS	6	0.3%
712	CREATIVE	0	
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	44	1.8%
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	4	0.2%
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	27	1.1%
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	3	0.1%
717	INDEPENDENT	25	1.0%
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	8	0.3%
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	53	2.2%
720	HAPPY	19	0.8%
721	GOOD, HONEST	38	1.6%
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	7	0.3%
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	4	0.2%
725	REAL PERSON	1	0.0%
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	3	0.1%
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	48	2.0%
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	8	0.3%
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	10	0.4%
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	7	0.3%
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	2	0.1%
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	13	0.5%
733	LOVES CHILDREN	1	0.0%
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	10	0.4%
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	24	1.0%

v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
740	AGGRESSIVE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
741	COMPETITIVE	0	
742	SHY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
745	INTELLIGENT	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
747	CAN DO BETTER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
750	IDEALISTIC	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
776	SUCCESSFUL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
777	MIDDLE AGED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	56	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	19	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
786	HEALTHY	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	0	
807	OPEN-MINDED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	0	
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0	
996	NO COMMENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	357	
998	DO NOT KNOW	6	

# v1457: 'WHO AM I'-2ND RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1458: 'WHO AM I'-2ND DETAILS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.22 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 2ND RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.22 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	376	<div><div></div></div> 13.6%
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	817	<div><div></div></div> 29.6%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	1038	<div><div></div></div> 37.6%
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	330	<div><div></div></div> 12.0%
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	126	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	46	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1908 /-] [Invalid=853 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.31 "WHO AM I?" (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.31 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	59	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
2	PROUD CANADIAN	25	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	44	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	22	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	0	
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
33	ACADIAN	0	
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	0	
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	0	
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	4	0.2%
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	2	0.1%
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	1	0.1%
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	1	0.1%
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	1	0.1%
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	4	0.2%
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	4	0.2%
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	6	0.3%
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE B	5	0.3%
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	1	0.1%
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	2	0.1%
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	5	0.3%
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	1	0.1%
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	6	0.3%
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	12	0.6%
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	13	0.7%
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	6	0.3%
352	I'M BILINGUAL	5	0.3%
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	0	
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	8	0.4%
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	1	0.1%
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	0	
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	2	0.1%
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	2	0.1%
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	10	0.5%
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	8	0.4%
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	1	0.1%
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	19	1.0%
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	1	0.1%
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	8	0.4%
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	30	1.6%
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	28	1.5%
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	38	2.0%
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	7	0.4%
432	RAISED FAMILY	7	0.4%
433	MOTHER	39	2.0%
434	MARRIED	17	0.9%
435	MAN	6	0.3%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
436	WOMAN	12	0.6%
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	41	2.1%
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	0	
440	SINGLE	6	0.3%
441	WORKING MOTHER	6	0.3%
442	BREADWINNER	6	0.3%
443	GOOD PARENT	13	0.7%
445	WIDOW	4	0.2%
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	0	
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	1	0.1%
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	2	0.1%
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	7	0.4%
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	8	0.4%
503	CHRISTIAN	6	0.3%
504	GOD-FEARING	1	0.1%
505	CHILD OF GOD	0	
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	
507	JEWISH	2	0.1%
508	CATHOLIC	6	0.3%
509	PROTESTANT	1	0.1%
527	PENSIONER	7	0.4%
528	FARMER	7	0.4%
529	BUSINESS PERSON	12	0.6%
530	HONEST WORKER	4	0.2%
531	HARD WORKER	64	3.4%
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	21	1.1%
533	ENJOYS JOB	12	0.6%
534	I WORK	9	0.5%
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	8	0.4%
537	UNEMPLOYED	6	0.3%
538	UNDERPAID	4	0.2%
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	3	0.2%
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	0	
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	2	0.1%
542	RETIRED	7	0.4%
543	STUDENT	5	0.3%
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	1	0.1%
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	6	0.3%
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	5	0.3%
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	7	0.4%
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	0	
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	0	
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	2	0.1%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
556	ON WELFARE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
557	MANUAL WORKER	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
559	CLERICAL	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
602	LIKES SPORTS	19	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
606	LIKES THE ARTS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
607	LIKES GARDENING	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
608	LIKES MUSIC	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
610	LIKES ANIMALS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
611	LIKES TO READ	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
631	WELL-EDUCATED	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
651	TAXPAYER	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	21	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
658	LIBERAL	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	21	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
667	CONSERVATIVE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
669	SOCIALIST	1	0.1%
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	2	0.1%
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	13	0.7%
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	3	0.2%
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	33	1.7%
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	3	0.2%
677	LAW-ABIDING	6	0.3%
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	0	
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	1	0.1%
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	5	0.3%
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	1	0.1%
682		2	0.1%
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	3	0.2%
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	2	0.1%
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	0	
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	1	0.1%
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	4	0.2%
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	1	0.1%
689	INFORMED VOTER	2	0.1%
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	14	0.7%
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	3	0.2%
701	NOBODY	1	0.1%
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	12	0.6%
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	4	0.2%
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	3	0.2%
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	10	0.5%
708	LONER	0	
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	9	0.5%
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	56	2.9%
711	CURIOUS	2	0.1%
712	CREATIVE	3	0.2%
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	19	1.0%
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	10	0.5%
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	19	1.0%
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	2	0.1%
717	INDEPENDENT	18	0.9%
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	3	0.2%
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	57	3.0%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
720	HAPPY	28	1.5%
721	GOOD, HONEST	20	1.0%
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	2	0.1%
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	9	0.5%
725	REAL PERSON	2	0.1%
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	5	0.3%
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	35	1.8%
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	3	0.2%
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	9	0.5%
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	3	0.2%
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	2	0.1%
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	2	0.1%
733	LOVES CHILDREN	1	0.1%
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	6	0.3%
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	16	0.8%
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	3	0.2%
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	12	0.6%
740	AGGRESSIVE	0	
741	COMPETITIVE	0	
742	SHY	4	0.2%
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	9	0.5%
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	2	0.1%
745	INTELLIGENT	4	0.2%
747	CAN DO BETTER	5	0.3%
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	5	0.3%
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	3	0.2%
750	IDEALISTIC	2	0.1%
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	0	
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	4	0.2%
776	SUCCESSFUL	3	0.2%
777	MIDDLE AGED	3	0.2%
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	57	3.0%
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	2	0.1%
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	8	0.4%
782	SHORT	1	0.1%
783	YOUNG	6	0.3%
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	8	0.4%
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	6	0.3%
786	HEALTHY	12	0.6%
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	2	0.1%
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	7	0.4%
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	3	0.2%
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	2	0.1%

v1459: 'WHO AM I'-3RD RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	25	1.3%
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	3	0.2%
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	1	0.1%
807	OPEN-MINDED	7	0.4%
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	10	0.5%
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	2	0.1%
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	7	0.4%
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	0	
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0	
996	NO COMMENT	0	
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	0	
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	850	
998	DO NOT KNOW	2	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	1	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1460: 'WHO AM I'-3RD DETAILS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'
Literal question	Q100.32 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 3RD RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.32 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	854	30.9%
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	584	21.2%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	833	30.2%
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	329	11.9%
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	109	3.9%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	31	1.1%
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	12	0.4%
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	3	0.1%
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	4	0.1%
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	0.0%
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	0.0%
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=613 /-] [Invalid=2148 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.41 "WHO AM I?" (FOURTH MENTION)		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.41 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
2	PROUD CANADIAN	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	0	
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	0	
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	0	
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	0	
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	0	
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	12	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	0	
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	0	
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	0	
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	0	
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	0	
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
33	ACADIAN	0	
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDERLANDER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	0	
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	1	0.2%
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.2%
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.2%
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	0	
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	3	0.5%
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	1	0.2%
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	5	0.8%
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	0	
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	1	0.2%
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	1	0.2%
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	0	
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	1	0.2%
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	0	
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	0	
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE B	0	
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	1	0.2%
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	0	
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	1	0.2%
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	0	
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	1	0.2%
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	3	0.5%
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	4	0.7%
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	1	0.2%
352	I'M BILINGUAL	2	0.3%
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	0	
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	3	0.5%
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	0	
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	0	
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	0	
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	0	
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	3	0.5%

v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	5	0.8%
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	1	0.2%
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	1	0.2%
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	0	
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	6	1.0%
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	4	0.7%
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	10	1.6%
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	3	0.5%
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	6	1.0%
432	RAISED FAMILY	6	1.0%
433	MOTHER	5	0.8%
434	MARRIED	5	0.8%
435	MAN	0	
436	WOMAN	5	0.8%
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	15	2.4%
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	1	0.2%
440	SINGLE	0	
441	WORKING MOTHER	1	0.2%
442	BREADWINNER	1	0.2%
443	GOOD PARENT	2	0.3%
445	WIDOW	2	0.3%
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	1	0.2%
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	1	0.2%
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	2	0.3%
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	4	0.7%
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	2	0.3%
503	CHRISTIAN	1	0.2%
504	GOD-FEARING	2	0.3%
505	CHILD OF GOD	2	0.3%
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	
507	JEWISH	0	
508	CATHOLIC	0	
509	PROTESTANT	2	0.3%
527	PENSIONER	1	0.2%
528	FARMER	1	0.2%
529	BUSINESS PERSON	1	0.2%
530	HONEST WORKER	0	
531	HARD WORKER	17	2.8%
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	8	1.3%
533	ENJOYS JOB	7	1.1%
534	I WORK	0	
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	1	0.2%
537	UNEMPLOYED	0	

v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
538	UNDERPAID	0	
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	0	
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
542	RETIRED	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
543	STUDENT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	0	
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	0	
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	0	
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
556	ON WELFARE	0	
557	MANUAL WORKER	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
559	CLERICAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	0	
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
602	LIKES SPORTS	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
606	LIKES THE ARTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
607	LIKES GARDENING	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
608	LIKES MUSIC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
610	LIKES ANIMALS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
611	LIKES TO READ	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	0	
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	0	
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
631	WELL-EDUCATED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
651	TAXPAYER	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	0	
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%

v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	15	<div></div> 2.4%
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	4	<div></div> 0.7%
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	4	<div></div> 0.7%
658	LIBERAL	0	
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	2	<div></div> 0.3%
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	2	<div></div> 0.3%
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	1	<div></div> 0.2%
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	2	<div></div> 0.3%
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	0	
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	5	<div></div> 0.8%
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	8	<div></div> 1.3%
667	CONSERVATIVE	1	<div></div> 0.2%
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	1	<div></div> 0.2%
669	SOCIALIST	1	<div></div> 0.2%
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	2	<div></div> 0.3%
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	3	<div></div> 0.5%
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	1	<div></div> 0.2%
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	0	
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	3	<div></div> 0.5%
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	0	
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	2	<div></div> 0.3%
677	LAW-ABIDING	1	<div></div> 0.2%
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	2	<div></div> 0.3%
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	5	<div></div> 0.8%
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	1	<div></div> 0.2%
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	1	<div></div> 0.2%
682		3	<div></div> 0.5%
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	0	
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	0	
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	0	
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	1	<div></div> 0.2%
689	INFORMED VOTER	0	
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	2	<div></div> 0.3%
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	2	<div></div> 0.3%
701	NOBODY	0	
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	2	<div></div> 0.3%
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	2	<div></div> 0.3%
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	1	<div></div> 0.2%

v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	2	0.3%
708	LONER	1	0.2%
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	3	0.5%
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	15	2.4%
711	CURIOUS	1	0.2%
712	CREATIVE	0	
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	6	1.0%
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	1	0.2%
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	8	1.3%
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	0	
717	INDEPENDENT	3	0.5%
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	1	0.2%
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	28	4.6%
720	HAPPY	18	2.9%
721	GOOD, HONEST	8	1.3%
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	0	
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	7	1.1%
725	REAL PERSON	1	0.2%
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	0	
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	5	0.8%
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	1	0.2%
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	2	0.3%
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	3	0.5%
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	0	
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	4	0.7%
733	LOVES CHILDREN	3	0.5%
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	1	0.2%
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	4	0.7%
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	1	0.2%
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	2	0.3%
740	AGGRESSIVE	1	0.2%
741	COMPETETIVE	0	
742	SHY	1	0.2%
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	7	1.1%
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	0	
745	INTELLIGENT	1	0.2%
747	CAN DO BETTER	1	0.2%
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	2	0.3%
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	0	
750	IDEALISTIC	5	0.8%
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	1	0.2%
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	1	0.2%

# v1461: 'WHO AM I'-4TH RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
776	SUCCESSFUL	0	
777	MIDDLE AGED	0	
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	18	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	0	
786	HEALTHY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	0	
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	0	
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	0	
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
807	OPEN-MINDED	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	0	
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
996	NO COMMENT	0	
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	0	
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	2146	
998	DO NOT KNOW	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1462: 'WHO AM I'-4TH DETAILS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.42 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 4TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.42 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	2151	<div><div></div></div> 77.9%

v1462: 'WHO AM I'-4TH DETAILS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	149	5.4%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	257	9.3%
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	130	4.7%
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	41	1.5%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	24	0.9%
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	5	0.2%
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	4	0.1%
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=175 /-] [Invalid=2586 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'
Literal question	Q100.51 "WHO AM I?" (FIFTH MENTION)
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.51 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	5	2.9%
2	PROUD CANADIAN	4	2.3%
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	0	
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	7	4.0%
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	0	
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	0	
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	1	0.6%
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	3	1.7%
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	0	
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	0	
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	0	
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	1	0.6%
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	3	1.7%
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	0	

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	0	
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	0	
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	0	
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	0	
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	1	0.6%
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	0	
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	0	
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	0	
33	ACADIAN	0	
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	0	
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	0	
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	0	
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	0	
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	1	0.6%
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	1	0.6%
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	1	0.6%
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	0	
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	2	1.1%
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	0	
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	0	
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	0	
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	0	
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	0	
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	0	
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	1	0.6%
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE B	0	
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	0	

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	0	
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	1	0.6%
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	0	
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	0	
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	2	1.1%
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	0	
352	I'M BILINGUAL	0	
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	2	1.1%
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	2	1.1%
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	0	
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	0	
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	0	
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	0	
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	0	
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	2	1.1%
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	0	
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	0	
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	0	
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	0	
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	1	0.6%
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	1	0.6%
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	0	
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	0	
432	RAISED FAMILY	0	
433	MOTHER	1	0.6%
434	MARRIED	0	
435	MAN	0	
436	WOMAN	2	1.1%
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	2	1.1%
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	0	
440	SINGLE	0	
441	WORKING MOTHER	0	
442	BREADWINNER	0	
443	GOOD PARENT	3	1.7%
445	WIDOW	1	0.6%
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	1	0.6%
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	1	0.6%
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	1	0.6%
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	0	
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	2	1.1%
503	CHRISTIAN	0	
504	GOD-FEARING	1	0.6%

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
505	CHILD OF GOD	0	
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	
507	JEWISH	0	
508	CATHOLIC	0	
509	PROTESTANT	0	
527	PENSIONER	0	
528	FARMER	1	0.6%
529	BUSINESS PERSON	0	
530	HONEST WORKER	0	
531	HARD WORKER	5	2.9%
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	1	0.6%
533	ENJOYS JOB	1	0.6%
534	I WORK	0	
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	0	
537	UNEMPLOYED	0	
538	UNDERPAID	0	
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	0	
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	1	0.6%
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	0	
542	RETIRED	0	
543	STUDENT	0	
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	0	
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	1	0.6%
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	0	
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	0	
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	0	
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	0	
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	0	
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	0	
556	ON WELFARE	0	
557	MANUAL WORKER	1	0.6%
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	1	0.6%
559	CLERICAL	1	0.6%
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	0	
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	0	
602	LIKES SPORTS	7	4.0%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	2	1.1%
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	0	
606	LIKES THE ARTS	1	0.6%
607	LIKES GARDENING	0	
608	LIKES MUSIC	2	1.1%
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	2	1.1%

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
610	LIKES ANIMALS	0	
611	LIKES TO READ	1	0.6%
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	0	
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	1	0.6%
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	0	
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	0	
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	1	0.6%
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	0	
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	1	0.6%
631	WELL-EDUCATED	0	
651	TAXPAYER	0	
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	0	
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	0	
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	1	0.6%
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	3	1.7%
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	1	0.6%
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	0	
658	LIBERAL	0	
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	4	2.3%
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	1	0.6%
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	0	
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	3	1.7%
667	CONSERVATIVE	1	0.6%
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	0	
669	SOCIALIST	1	0.6%
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	0	
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	0	
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	2	1.1%
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	0	
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	3	1.7%
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	0	
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	3	1.7%
677	LAW-ABIDING	3	1.7%
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	0	
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	0	
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	1	0.6%
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	0	

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	0	
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	1	0.6%
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	0	
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	1	0.6%
689	INFORMED VOTER	0	
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	1	0.6%
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	0	
701	NOBODY	0	
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	1	0.6%
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	0	
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	1	0.6%
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	0	
708	LONER	0	
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	3	1.7%
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	5	2.9%
711	CURIOUS	3	1.7%
712	CREATIVE	0	
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	3	1.7%
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	0	
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	1	0.6%
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	0	
717	INDEPENDENT	2	1.1%
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	2	1.1%
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	5	2.9%
720	HAPPY	0	
721	GOOD, HONEST	1	0.6%
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	0	
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	1	0.6%
725	REAL PERSON	0	
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	0	
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	2	1.1%
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	3	1.7%
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	1	0.6%
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	0	
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	2	1.1%
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	0	
733	LOVES CHILDREN	1	0.6%
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	0	
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	0	

v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	0	
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	1	0.6%
740	AGGRESSIVE	0	
741	COMPETITIVE	0	
742	SHY	0	
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	0	
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	0	
745	INTELLIGENT	1	0.6%
747	CAN DO BETTER	1	0.6%
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	0	
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	1	0.6%
750	IDEALISTIC	1	0.6%
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	0	
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	0	
776	SUCCESSFUL	0	
777	MIDDLE AGED	0	
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	6	3.4%
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	0	
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	1	0.6%
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	0	
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	0	
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	0	
786	HEALTHY	1	0.6%
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	0	
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	0	
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	0	
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	0	
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	1	0.6%
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	0	
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	0	
807	OPEN-MINDED	2	1.1%
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	3	1.7%
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	1	0.6%
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	0	
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	0	
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0	
996	NO COMMENT	0	
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	0	
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	2586	
998	DO NOT KNOW	0	

# v1463: 'WHO AM I'-5TH RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1464: 'WHO AM I'-5TH DETAILS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.52 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 5TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.52 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	2586	<div></div> 93.7%
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	57	<div></div> 2.1%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	63	<div></div> 2.3%
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	33	<div></div> 1.2%
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	12	<div></div> 0.4%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	8	<div></div> 0.3%
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div></div> 0.0%
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div></div> 0.0%
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=48 /-] [Invalid=2713 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.61 "WHO AM I?" (SIXTH MENTION)		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.61 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	0	
2	PROUD CANADIAN	1	<div></div> 2.1%
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	1	<div></div> 2.1%
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	

v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	3	6.2%
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	0	
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	0	
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	0	
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	1	2.1%
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	0	
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	0	
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	0	
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	0	
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	0	
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	0	
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	0	
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	0	
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	0	
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	0	
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	0	
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	0	
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	0	
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	0	
33	ACADIAN	0	
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	0	
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	0	
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	0	
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	0	
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	0	
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	0	
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	0	
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	1	2.1%
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	0	

v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	0	
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	0	
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	0	
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	0	
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	0	
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	0	
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	0	
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE B	1	2.1%
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	0	
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	1	2.1%
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	0	
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	0	
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	0	
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	0	
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	1	2.1%
352	I'M BILINGUAL	0	
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	0	
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	0	
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	0	
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	0	
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	0	
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	0	
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	0	
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	0	
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	0	
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	0	
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	0	
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	2	4.2%
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	0	
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	0	
432	RAISED FAMILY	0	
433	MOTHER	0	
434	MARRIED	0	
435	MAN	0	

v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
436	WOMAN	0	
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	1	2.1%
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	0	
440	SINGLE	0	
441	WORKING MOTHER	1	2.1%
442	BREADWINNER	0	
443	GOOD PARENT	0	
445	WIDOW	0	
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	0	
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	0	
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	0	
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	0	
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	0	
503	CHRISTIAN	0	
504	GOD-FEARING	0	
505	CHILD OF GOD	0	
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	1	2.1%
507	JEWISH	0	
508	CATHOLIC	0	
509	PROTESTANT	0	
527	PENSIONER	0	
528	FARMER	0	
529	BUSINESS PERSON	0	
530	HONEST WORKER	0	
531	HARD WORKER	1	2.1%
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	0	
533	ENJOYS JOB	1	2.1%
534	I WORK	0	
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	0	
537	UNEMPLOYED	0	
538	UNDERPAID	0	
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	0	
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	0	
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	0	
542	RETIRED	1	2.1%
543	STUDENT	0	
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	0	
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	0	
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	0	
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	1	2.1%
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	0	
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	0	
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	0	

v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	0	
556	ON WELFARE	0	
557	MANUAL WORKER	1	2.1%
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	1	2.1%
559	CLERICAL	0	
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	0	
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	0	
602	LIKES SPORTS	1	2.1%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	1	2.1%
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	0	
606	LIKES THE ARTS	0	
607	LIKES GARDENING	0	
608	LIKES MUSIC	1	2.1%
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	0	
610	LIKES ANIMALS	0	
611	LIKES TO READ	1	2.1%
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	1	2.1%
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	1	2.1%
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	0	
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	0	
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	0	
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	0	
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	0	
631	WELL-EDUCATED	0	
651	TAXPAYER	0	
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	0	
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	0	
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	1	2.1%
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	0	
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	0	
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	0	
658	LIBERAL	0	
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	1	2.1%
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	0	
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	0	
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	1	2.1%
667	CONSERVATIVE	1	2.1%
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	0	

v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
669	SOCIALIST	0	
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	0	
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	0	
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	0	
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	0	
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	0	
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	0	
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	0	
677	LAW-ABIDING	1	2.1%
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	0	
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	0	
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	0	
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	0	
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	0	
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	0	
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	0	
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	0	
689	INFORMED VOTER	0	
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	0	
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	0	
701	NOBODY	0	
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	0	
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	0	
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	0	
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	1	2.1%
708	LONER	0	
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	1	2.1%
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	3	6.2%
711	CURIOUS	0	
712	CREATIVE	0	
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	0	
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	0	
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	0	
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	0	
717	INDEPENDENT	0	
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	0	
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	4	8.3%
720	HAPPY	0	

v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
721	GOOD, HONEST	0	
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	0	
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	0	
725	REAL PERSON	0	
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	0	
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	0	
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	0	
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	0	
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	0	
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	0	
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	0	
733	LOVES CHILDREN	0	
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	0	
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	0	
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	0	
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	1	2.1%
740	AGGRESSIVE	0	
741	COMPETITIVE	1	2.1%
742	SHY	0	
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	0	
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	0	
745	INTELLIGENT	0	
747	CAN DO BETTER	0	
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	0	
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	0	
750	IDEALISTIC	0	
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	0	
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	0	
776	SUCCESSFUL	0	
777	MIDDLE AGED	0	
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	1	2.1%
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	0	
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	1	2.1%
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	0	
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	1	2.1%
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	0	
786	HEALTHY	0	
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	0	
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	0	
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	0	
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	0	
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	1	2.1%

# v1465: 'WHO AM I'-6TH RESPONSE				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	0	<div><div></div></div>	
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	0		
807	OPEN-MINDED	0		
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	0		
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	0		
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	1		<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	0		
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0		
996	NO COMMENT	0		
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	0		
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	2713	<div><div></div></div>	
998	DO NOT KNOW	0		
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1466: 'WHO AM I'-6TH DETAILS				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'			
Literal question	Q100.62 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 6TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".			
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.62 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	2713	<div><div></div></div> 98.3%	
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%	
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	24	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%	
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%	
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%	
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%	
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%	
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	<div><div></div></div>	
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]			

# v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE			
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=13 /-] [Invalid=2748 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'	
Literal question		Q100.71 "WHO AM I?" (SEVENTH MENTION)	
Notes		Q100.11, Q100.71 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	0	
2	PROUD CANADIAN	0	
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	0	
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	0	
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	0	
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	0	
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	0	
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	0	
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	0	
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	0	
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	1	7.7%
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	0	
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	0	
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	0	
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	0	
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	0	
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	0	
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	0	
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	0	
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	0	
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	0	
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	0	
33	ACADIAN	0	
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	0	
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	0	
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	

v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	0	
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	0	
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	0	
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	0	
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	0	
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	1	7.7%
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	1	7.7%
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	0	
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	0	
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	0	
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	0	
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	0	
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	0	
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	0	
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE B	0	
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	0	
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	0	
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	0	
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	0	
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	0	
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	0	
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	0	
352	I'M BILINGUAL	0	
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	0	
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	0	
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	0	
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	0	
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	0	
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	0	
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	

v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	0	
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	0	
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	0	
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	0	
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	0	
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	0	
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	0	
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	0	
432	RAISED FAMILY	0	
433	MOTHER	0	
434	MARRIED	1	7.7%
435	MAN	0	
436	WOMAN	0	
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	0	
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	0	
440	SINGLE	0	
441	WORKING MOTHER	0	
442	BREADWINNER	1	7.7%
443	GOOD PARENT	0	
445	WIDOW	1	7.7%
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	0	
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	0	
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	0	
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	0	
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	0	
503	CHRISTIAN	0	
504	GOD-FEARING	0	
505	CHILD OF GOD	0	
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	
507	JEWISH	0	
508	CATHOLIC	0	
509	PROTESTANT	0	
527	PENSIONER	0	
528	FARMER	0	
529	BUSINESS PERSON	0	
530	HONEST WORKER	0	
531	HARD WORKER	0	
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	0	
533	ENJOYS JOB	0	
534	I WORK	0	
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	0	
537	UNEMPLOYED	0	
538	UNDERPAID	0	

v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	0	
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	0	
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	0	
542	RETIRED	0	
543	STUDENT	0	
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	0	
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	0	
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	0	
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	0	
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	0	
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	0	
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	0	
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	0	
556	ON WELFARE	0	
557	MANUAL WORKER	0	
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	0	
559	CLERICAL	0	
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	0	
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	0	
602	LIKES SPORTS	1	7.7%
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	2	15.4%
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	0	
606	LIKES THE ARTS	0	
607	LIKES GARDENING	0	
608	LIKES MUSIC	0	
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	0	
610	LIKES ANIMALS	0	
611	LIKES TO READ	1	7.7%
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	0	
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	0	
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	0	
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	0	
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	0	
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	0	
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	0	
631	WELL-EDUCATED	0	
651	TAXPAYER	0	
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	0	
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	1	7.7%
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	0	
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	0	

v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	0	
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	0	
658	LIBERAL	0	
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	0	
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	0	
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	0	
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	0	
667	CONSERVATIVE	0	
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	0	
669	SOCIALIST	0	
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	0	
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	0	
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	0	
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	0	
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	0	
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	0	
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	0	
677	LAW-ABIDING	0	
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	0	
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	0	
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	0	
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	0	
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	0	
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	0	
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	0	
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	0	
689	INFORMED VOTER	0	
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	0	
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	0	
701	NOBODY	0	
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	0	
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	0	
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	0	
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	0	
708	LONER	0	

v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	0	
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	1	7.7%
711	CURIOUS	0	
712	CREATIVE	1	7.7%
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	0	
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	0	
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	0	
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	0	
717	INDEPENDENT	0	
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	0	
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	0	
720	HAPPY	0	
721	GOOD, HONEST	0	
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	0	
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	0	
725	REAL PERSON	0	
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	0	
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	0	
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	0	
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	0	
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	0	
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	0	
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	0	
733	LOVES CHILDREN	0	
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	0	
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	0	
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	0	
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	0	
740	AGGRESSIVE	0	
741	COMPETITIVE	0	
742	SHY	0	
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	0	
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	0	
745	INTELLIGENT	0	
747	CAN DO BETTER	0	
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	0	
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	0	
750	IDEALISTIC	0	
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	0	
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	0	
776	SUCCESSFUL	0	
777	MIDDLE AGED	0	

# v1467: 'WHO AM I'-7TH RESPONSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	0	
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	0	
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	0	
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	0	
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	0	
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	0	
786	HEALTHY	0	
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	0	
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	0	
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	0	
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	0	
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	0	
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	0	
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	0	
807	OPEN-MINDED	0	
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	0	
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	0	
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	0	
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	0	
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0	
996	NO COMMENT	0	
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	0	
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	2748	
998	DO NOT KNOW	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1468: 'WHO AM I'-7TH DETAILS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.72 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 7TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.72 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	2748	99.5%
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	4	0.1%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	5	0.2%

# v1468: 'WHO AM I'-7TH DETAILS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	0.0%
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	2	0.1%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	0.0%
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2 /-] [Invalid=2759 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'		
Literal question	Q100.81 "WHO AM I?" (EIGHTH MENTION)		
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.81 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	I'M A CANADIAN	0	
2	PROUD CANADIAN	0	
4	GOOD CANADIAN, GOOD OR TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	0	
5	I'M A CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
6	I ENJOY LIVING IN CANADA, LIKE CANADA, LOVE CANADA, LOVE MY	0	
7	PROGRESSIVE CANADIAN	0	
8	BORN AND BRED CANADIAN	0	
10	FOUGHT FOR COUNTRY, SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES	0	
12	I LIVE IN THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD	0	
13	LOVES CANADA BUT LOVES PROVINCE OR REGION MORE	0	
14	AVERAGE CANADIAN, AVERAGE CITIZEN, ORDINARY CANADIAN CITIZEN	0	
15	VERY LOYAL TO OR STRONGLY SUPPORTS CANADA, VERY PRO-CANADIAN	0	
19	NATURALIZED CANADIAN, LANDED IMMIGRANT	0	
21	WANTS TO OR FEELS THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CANADA	0	
22	INTERESTED IN THE COUNTRY OR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE	0	
23	HAPPY CANADIAN	0	
24	HAS NEW LIFESTYLE SINCE COMING TO CANADA	0	
25	RESIDENT OF FOREIGN DESCENT	0	

v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	REFERENCES TO POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIANS	0	
28	DOES NOT WANT TO BE CANADIAN, LIVE IN CANADA	0	
29	CANDIAN NATIONALIST	0	
30	CITIZEN OF A COMMUNITY LARGER THAN CANADA (NORTH AMERICA, TH	0	
31	WESTERNER, LOVES THE WEST OR PRAIRIES	0	
32	MARITIMER, LOVES THE MARITIMES OR ATLANTIC REGION	0	
33	ACADIAN	0	
51	I LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND, AM A NEWFOUNDLANDER	0	
52	GOOD CITIZEN OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
53	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
54	CONCERNED ABOUT NEWFOUNDLAND'S FUTURE OR POVERTY	0	
55	WANTS TO FEEL THAT HE/SHE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
75	I LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, AM AN ISLANDER	0	
76	PROUD OF PRICE EDWARD ISLAND	0	
101	I LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA, AM NOVA SCOTIAN OR A BLUENOSER	0	
102	PROUD OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
103	ENJOYS LIVING IN NOVA SCOTIA	0	
104	LONG TIME RESIDENT OF NOVA SCOTIA	0	
126	I LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
127	ENJOYS LIVING IN NEW BRUNSWICK	0	
151	I LIVE IN QUEBEC	0	
152	ENJOYS LIVING IN QUEBEC	0	
153	SUPPORTS QUEBEC NATIONALISM	0	
154	I AM A QUEBECOIS	0	
155	I AM A QUEBECOIS CANADIEN	0	
176	ENJOYS LIVING IN ONTARIO	0	
177	CITIZEN OF ONTARIO	0	
178	BELIEVES IN A STRONG NORTHERN ONTARIO	0	
201	I LIVE IN MANITOBA, AM MANITOBAN	0	
202	CITIZEN OF MANITOBA	0	
226	I LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
227	ENJOYS LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN	0	
251	I LIVE IN ALBERTA	0	
252	ENJOYS LIVING IN, PROUD OF ALBERTA	0	
276	I LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AM BRITISH COLUMBIAN OR B.C.ER	0	
277	ENJOYS LIVING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA IS THE B	0	
278	PROUD OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
301	CITIZEN OF RURAL COMMUNITY	0	
302	ENJOYS RURAL OR SMALL TOWN LIFE	0	
303	HOMETOWN BOY, LONGTIME LOCAL RESIDENT	0	

v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
304	GOOD UPSTANDING LOCAL CITIZEN	0	
334	LIVES IN (NAMED CITY OR TOWN)	0	
335	INVOLVED VERY MUCH IN THE COMMUNITY	0	
351	ENGLISH, ANGLO-CELTIC DESCENT	0	
352	I'M BILINGUAL	0	
353	HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING SERVICES IN HIS/HER LANGUAGE	0	
354	FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
356	CAUCASION, WHITE	0	
357	CHINESE, ORIENTAL	0	
358	ITALIAN	0	
359	EASTERN EUROPEAN	0	
360	PROUD INDIAN, NATIVE PERSON	0	
376	MEMBER OF THE WORKING CLASS	0	
377	MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
378	AVERAGE WORKING PERSON	0	
379	WORKING PERSON, I'M A WORKER	0	
380	IN BADLY TREATED SOCIAL CLASS	0	
427	GENERAL FEMALE FAMILY ROLE (DAUGHTER, SISTER, MOTHER, GRANDM	0	
428	GOOD WIFE AND MOTHER	0	
429	FAMILY PERSON, LOVES FAMILY	0	
430	HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	1	50.0%
431	PROUD OF DAUGHTER, SON OR FAMILY	0	
432	RAISED FAMILY	0	
433	MOTHER	0	
434	MARRIED	0	
435	MAN	0	
436	WOMAN	0	
437	HUSBAND, FATHER, FAMILY MAN	0	
439	HOUSEWIFE INVOLVED PART-TIME IN FAMILY BUSINESS	0	
440	SINGLE	0	
441	WORKING MOTHER	0	
442	BREADWINNER	0	
443	GOOD PARENT	0	
445	WIDOW	0	
446	SPECIFIES NUMERICAL RANKING IN FAMILY (E.G. FIRSTBORN THE <T	0	
447	LIBERATED WOMAN	0	
448	DIVORCED, SEPARATED, SINGLE PARENT	0	
501	VERY RELIGIOUS, REGULAR CHURCH ATTENDER	0	
502	RELIGIOUS, CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS VALUES	0	
503	CHRISTIAN	0	
504	GOD-FEARING	0	
505	CHILD OF GOD	0	
506	CONCERNED ABOUT RELIGIOUS FACTIONALISM	0	

v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
507	JEWISH	0	
508	CATHOLIC	0	
509	PROTESTANT	0	
527	PENSIONER	0	
528	FARMER	0	
529	BUSINESS PERSON	0	
530	HONEST WORKER	0	
531	HARD WORKER	0	
532	INTERESTED IN MAKING A GOOD LIVING	0	
533	ENJOYS JOB	0	
534	I WORK	0	
535	HAS HAD DIFFICULTY FINDING WORK, WANTS TO WORK AND IS TIRED	0	
537	UNEMPLOYED	0	
538	UNDERPAID	0	
539	RETIRED AND LIKES BEING RETIRED	0	
540	TRANSPORTATION WORK (AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RAILWAYS EMPLOYEE, TR	0	
541	MEDICAL WORK (DOCTOR, NURSE, THERAPIST)	0	
542	RETIRED	0	
543	STUDENT	0	
545	HAS WORKED IN OTHER PROVINCES	0	
547	NOT RESTRICTED TO ONE CAREER OR OCCUPATION	0	
548	ARTIST, AUTHOR	0	
549	VOLUNTEER WORK	0	
552	RETIRED AND DOES NOT LIKE BEING RETIRED	0	
553	CONSTRUCTION WORK	0	
554	DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT	0	
555	CIVIL SERVICE, WORKS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR PROVINCIAL GO	0	
556	ON WELFARE	0	
557	MANUAL WORKER	0	
558	TEACHER, PROFESSOR	0	
559	CLERICAL	0	
560	LEGAL PROFESSION	0	
561	SELF-EMPLOYED	0	
602	LIKES SPORTS	0	
603	LIKES TO TRAVEL	0	
604	LISTENS TO RADIO FOR INFORMATION, PUBLIC AFFAIRS	0	
605	PREFERS RECREATION TO POLITICS	0	
606	LIKES THE ARTS	0	
607	LIKES GARDENING	0	
608	LIKES MUSIC	0	
609	LIKES OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES	0	
610	LIKES ANIMALS	0	
611	LIKES TO READ	0	

v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
612	LIKES SOCIAL LIFE, PARTIES	0	
613	LIKES COOKING, HOME ACTIVITIES	0	
626	HAS A LOT OF LEARNING TO DO	0	
627	QUIT SCHOOL OR TRAINING FOR VARIOUS REASONS	0	
628	WANTS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A BETTER JOB OR BETTER SALARY	0	
629	HAS ATTENDED UNIVERSITY	0	
630	INTERESTED IN OR ENJOYS LEARNING	0	
631	WELL-EDUCATED	0	
651	TAXPAYER	0	
652	BELIEVES IN OR LIKES STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	0	
653	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW GOVERNMENT AFFECTS INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL	0	
654	INTERESTED IN POLITICS	1	50.0%
655	DOES NOT WANT TO SEE COUNTRY SEPARATED OR FRAGMENTED, PRO A	0	
656	PAYS TOO MANY TAXES, TOO MUCH TAX	0	
657	PUBLIC-MINDED	0	
658	LIBERAL	0	
659	PATRIOTIC, LIKES FREE COUNTRY	0	
660	LIBERAL PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
661	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
662	NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY IDENTIFIER	0	
664	POLITICALLY INDEPENDENT	0	
665	CONCERNED OR CYNICAL ABOUT GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES	0	
666	CONCERNED ABOUT HOW COUNTRY IS RUN	0	
667	CONSERVATIVE	0	
668	FEELS THAT THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IS IMPORTANT	0	
669	SOCIALIST	0	
670	DISLIKES EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE	0	
671	SATISFIED CITIZEN	0	
672	TRIES TO EXERT POLITICAL RIGHTS	0	
673	WANTS TO MAINTAIN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	0	
674	NOT INTERESTED IN POLITICS	0	
675	WANTS NO GOVERNMENT	0	
676	DISAGREES FREQUENTLY WITH GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES OR ACTIONS	0	
677	LAW-ABIDING	0	
678	CONCERNED ABOUT EXTENT OF WELFARE STATISM	0	
679	WANTS MORE GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE OR BENEFITS	0	
680	NOT ACTIVE ENOUGH IN POLITICS	0	
681	PRO-MONARCHY, PRO-CANADA'S TIES TO BRITISH MONARCHY OR TO BR	0	
683	CONCERNED ABOUT ECOLOGY OR ENVIRONMENT	0	
684	ANTAGONIZED BY PLACE OF QUEBEC OR FRENCH IN POLITICAL SYSTEM	0	

v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
685	WESTERN PROVINCES EXPLOITED BY REST OF COUNTRY	0	
686	ENGLISH CANADA DOES NOT UNDERSTAND FRENCH CANADA OR QUEBEC	0	
687	SUPPORTS INDEPENDENT QUEBEC, PRO-SEPARATISM	0	
688	IMPORTANT TO KNOW ENGLISH	0	
689	INFORMED VOTER	0	
690	CONCERNED ABOUT ECONOMY OR INFLATION	0	
700	CONCERNED ABOUT OR WORKS WITH HANDICAPPED PEOPLE	0	
701	NOBODY	0	
702	I'M AN INDIVIDUAL, I'M ME	0	
703	CONFIDENT, STRONG-WILLED	0	
706	ENJOYS CHALLENGES	0	
707	LIKES RECOGNITION FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS	0	
708	LONER	0	
709	FORTHRIGHT, SAY WHAT'S ON MY MIND, TO THE POINT	0	
710	ENJOY'S LIFE	0	
711	CURIOUS	0	
712	CREATIVE	0	
713	I'M JUST A PERSON, AN ORDINARY PERSON	0	
714	WILLING TO DO FAIR SHARE, WILLING TO DO EVERYTHING	0	
715	CONGENIAL, GETS ALONG WITH EVERYONE	0	
716	I'M A HUMAN BEING	0	
717	INDEPENDENT	0	
718	HUMBLE, MODEST	0	
719	CONCERNED ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE, LIKES TO HELP PEOPLE	0	
720	HAPPY	0	
721	GOOD, HONEST	0	
722	SHOULD EXPRESS OPINIONS MORE OFTEN	0	
724	ENJOYS FRIENDS	0	
725	REAL PERSON	0	
726	LIVES FROM DAY TO DAY	0	
727	AVERAGE PERSON TRYING TO MAKE ENDS MEET, TRYING TO DO THE BE	0	
728	CONCENTRATES ON PERSONAL INTERESTS	0	
729	I'M AN INDIVIDUALIST	0	
730	FORTUNATE, LUCKY	0	
731	LIKES TO LISTEN TO OPINIONS OF OTHER PEOPLE	0	
732	DETERMINED, WORKS TOWARD OWN GOALS	0	
733	LOVES CHILDREN	0	
735	UNHAPPY, UNFORTUNATE, USELESS	0	
737	TRYING TO BE GOOD	0	
738	SMALL PERSON TRYING TO GET ALONG, BUFFETED BY WORLD	0	
739	MINDS OWN BUSINESS	0	

v1469: 'WHO AM I'-8TH RESPONSE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
740	AGGRESSIVE	0	
741	COMPETETIVE	0	
742	SHY	0	
743	OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE	0	
744	DISGRUNTLED OR FRUSTRATED YOUTH	0	
745	INTELLIGENT	0	
747	CAN DO BETTER	0	
748	CYNICAL, PESSIMISTIC	0	
749	MELLOWED WITH AGE, HAS BECOME SET IN OWN WAYS	0	
750	IDEALISTIC	0	
751	ON EARTH TO FULFILL GOD'S PURPOSE	0	
752	WANTS TO ENGAGE OR IS ENGAGED IN SELF-DISCOVERY	0	
776	SUCCESSFUL	0	
777	MIDDLE AGED	0	
778	SATISFIED WITH LIFE	0	
780	OLD, SENIOR CITIZEN	0	
781	AMBITIOUS OR MATERIALISTIC	0	
782	SHORT	0	
783	YOUNG	0	
784	LIVES COMFORTABLY	0	
785	UNHEALTHY, PHYSICALLY DISABLED, SICK	0	
786	HEALTHY	0	
787	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	0	
799	RESPONDENT GIVES HIS/HER OWN NAME	0	
801	EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO EXPRESS HIS/HER OPINIONS	0	
803	I HAVE RIGHTS	0	
804	EVERYONE DESERVES A FAIR CHANCE OR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, EQU	0	
805	CONCERNED ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS	0	
806	COMPROMISE IS IMPORTANT	0	
807	OPEN-MINDED	0	
808	CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN OR MANKIND OR HUM	0	
809	BELIEVES THAT WOMEN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY IS CHANGING OR SHOULD	0	
811	BELIEVES THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO VOTE OR PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE,	0	
994	"WHO AM I?" QUESTION IS AN UNUSUAL QUESTION	0	
995	RESPONDENT WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE	0	
996	NO COMMENT	0	
997	DO NOT KNOW HOW TO ANSWER QUESTION	0	
0	BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE, NO RESPONSES RECORDED	2759	
998	DO NOT KNOW	0	
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1470: 'WHO AM I'-8TH DETAILS	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q100.11 NOW HERE IS AN INTERESTING QUESTION THAT I THINK YOU CAN ENJOY. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY ABOUT YOURSELF IN THREE SENTENCES IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, 'WHO AM I?'
Literal question	Q100.82 NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN 8TH RESPONSE OF "WHO AM I?".
Notes	Q100.11, Q100.82 in the documentation. UP TO EIGHT SEPARATE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE CODED. ALONG WITH THE CONTENT OF EACH RESPONSE, THE NUMBER OF CODEABLE DETAILS IN THAT RESPONSE WAS CODED. CONTENT OF FIRST MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO CODEABLE DETAILS	2759	<div></div> 99.9%
1	1 CODEABLE DETAIL	1	<div></div> 0.0%
2	2 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
3	3 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
4	4 CODEABLE DETAILS	1	<div></div> 0.0%
5	5 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
6	6 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
7	7 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
8	8 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
9	9 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
10	10 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
11	11 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
12	12 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	
13	13 CODEABLE DETAILS	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1471: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	Q101AB. WHAT IS (WAS) YOUR OCCUPATION? WHAT EXACTLY DO (DID) YOU DO?
Notes	Q101AB in the documentation. RETIRED OR UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS ARE CODED 02 OR 04 HERE. Q101C THROUGH Q101M ARE ASKED ABOUT THESE RESPONDENTS' REGULAR OR FORMER OCCUPATIONS.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HOUSEWIFE	618	<div></div> 22.5%
2	RETIRED	288	<div></div> 10.5%
3	STUDENT	121	<div></div> 4.4%
4	UNEMPLOYED	65	<div></div> 2.4%
5	NEVER WORKED	10	<div></div> 0.4%
6	OTHER REASONS FOR NO OCCUPATION	10	<div></div> 0.4%
11	PROFESSIONAL	185	<div></div> 6.7%
12	SEMI PROFESSIONAL	115	<div></div> 4.2%
21	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (LARGE)	86	<div></div> 3.1%
22	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (SMALL)	233	<div></div> 8.5%
30	CLERICAL AND SALES	322	<div></div> 11.7%
41	SKILLED LABOUR	168	<div></div> 6.1%

# v1471: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	SEMI SKILLED LABOUR	217	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
43	UNSKILLED LABOUR	207	<div><div></div></div> 7.5%
50	FARMERS AND ALL FARM OCCUPATIONS	96	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
88	UNCLASSIFIED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
99	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1472: OCCUPATION-TYPE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1954 /-] [Invalid=807 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Interviewer's instructions	(INTERVIEWER:) RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS (WAS) NON-MANUAL, MANUAL OR FARMING.		
Notes	Q101C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NON-MANUAL	974	<div><div></div></div> 49.8%
2	MANUAL	855	<div><div></div></div> 43.8%
3	FARMING	125	<div><div></div></div> 6.4%
9	N.A., INAP., 1, 3, 5, 6, 88 OR 99 IN Q101AB	807	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1473: COMPANY ACTIVITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1773 /-] [Invalid=988 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q101D.1 WHAT DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY DO?		
Notes	Q101D.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	AGRICULTURE	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
2	MINING	29	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
3	CONSTRUCTION	103	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
4	MANUFACTURING (DURABLES)	284	<div><div></div></div> 16.0%
5	MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING (NON-DURABLES)	87	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
6	UTILITIES, TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS	176	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
7	WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE	314	<div><div></div></div> 17.7%
8	FINANCE, INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE, ADVERTISING	80	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
9	REPAIR SERVICES	36	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
10	PERSONAL SERVICES	95	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
11	ENTERTAINMENT, RECREATION	24	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
12	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	277	<div><div></div></div> 15.6%
13	ALL GOVERNMENT	253	<div><div></div></div> 14.3%
99	N.A., INAP. CODED 3 OR 9 IN Q101C	988	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1474: MAIN FARM PRODUCT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		

# v1474: MAIN FARM PRODUCT			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=121 /-] [Invalid=2640 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a farming occupation.		
Literal question	WHAT IS (WAS) THE MAIN PRODUCT?		
Notes	Q101D.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SUBSISTENCE, GENERAL	1	<div></div> 0.8%
2	SOYBEANS, PEANUTS, LINSEED	1	<div></div> 0.8%
3	TEXTILE PRODUCTS	0	
4	FRUIT OR VEGETABLE	2	<div></div> 1.7%
5	TOBACCO	2	<div></div> 1.7%
6	POTATOES	7	<div></div> 5.8%
7	SUGAR BEETS	0	
8	BEEF CATTLE	10	<div></div> 8.3%
9	OTHER LIVESTOCK	9	<div></div> 7.4%
10	DAIRY	27	<div></div> 22.3%
11	HAY, ALFALFA, ETC.	1	<div></div> 0.8%
12	POULTRY, EGGS	3	<div></div> 2.5%
13	WHEAT	15	<div></div> 12.4%
14	OTHER GRAINS	17	<div></div> 14.0%
15	MISCELLANEOUS, UNSPECIFIED, TRUCK FARM	26	<div></div> 21.5%
99	N.A., INAP. CODED 1, 2 OR 9 IN Q101C	2640	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1475: MANUAL-SPECIAL TRAINING			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=836 /-] [Invalid=1925 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a manual occupation.		
Literal question	DID YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR YOUR JOB?		
Post-question	(IF 'YES') WHAT SORT OF TRAINING?		
Notes	Q101EF.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	APPRENTICESHIP	120	<div></div> 14.4%
2	SPECIAL CLASSES	125	<div></div> 15.0%
3	BOTH OF ABOVE	74	<div></div> 8.9%
4	ALL OTHER TYPES OF SPECIAL TRAINING	28	<div></div> 3.3%
5	NO SPECIAL TRAINING (NO TO PART E)	489	<div></div> 58.5%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	142	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 2 IN Q101C	1783	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1476: SIZE OF FARM			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=115 /-] [Invalid=2646 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents with a farming occupation.		
Notes	Q101E.2 in the documentation.		

v1476: SIZE OF FARM

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0-5 ACRES	0	
2	6-10 ACRES	0	
3	11-20 ACRES	1	0.9%
4	21-49 ACRES	4	3.5%
5	50-99 ACRES	14	12.2%
6	100-499 ACRES	67	58.3%
7	500-999 ACRES	12	10.4%
8	1000 ACRES OR MORE	17	14.8%
0	INAP. CODED 1, 2 OR 9 IN Q101C	2636	
9	N.A.	10	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1477: SELF-EMPLOYED?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1935 /-] [Invalid=826 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	ARE (WERE) YOU SELF-EMPLOYED OR DO (DID) YOU WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE?
Notes	Q101G in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SELF-EMPLOYED	324	16.7%
2	WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE	1610	83.2%
3	OTHER, COMBINATION, ETC.	1	0.1%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	826	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1478: ORGANIZATION SIZE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1844 /-] [Invalid=917 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES YOURSELF, DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY?
Notes	Q101H in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	170	9.2%
1	ONE	47	2.5%
2	2-4	150	8.1%
3	5-10	177	9.6%
4	11-49	256	13.9%
5	50-99	143	7.8%
6	100-999	398	21.6%
7	1000 OR MORE	503	27.3%
8	D.K., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	100	
9	N.A.	817	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1479: WORK UNDER R				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1767 /-] [Invalid=994 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		Q101H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES YOURSELF, DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY?		
Literal question		Q101I. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER YOU?		
Notes		Q101H, Q101I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	NONE	1077	<div><div></div></div> 61.0%	
1	ONE	86	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%	
2	2-4	225	<div><div></div></div> 12.7%	
3	5-10	174	<div><div></div></div> 9.8%	
4	11-49	141	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%	
5	50-99	38	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%	
6	100-999	25	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%	
7	1000 OR MORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%	
8	D.K., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	25		
9	N.A., INAP., CODED 0 IN Q101H	969		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1480: SUPERVISE WORK?				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=768 /-] [Invalid=1993 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		Q101H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES YOURSELF, DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY? ; Q101I. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER YOU?		
Literal question		Q101J. DO (DID) YOU SUPERVISE THEIR WORK?		
Notes		Q101H, Q101I, Q101J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	YES	649	<div><div></div></div> 84.5%	
2	NO	119	<div><div></div></div> 15.5%	
8	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17		
9	N.A., INAP., CODED Q101I	1976		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1481: SAY IN HIRING,FIRING				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=702 /-] [Invalid=2059 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		Q101H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES YOURSELF, DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY? ; Q101I. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER YOU?		
Literal question		Q101K. HOW MUCH SAY DO (DID) YOU HAVE IN THEIR HIRING, FIRING, PAY OR PROMOTIONS?		
Notes		Q101H, Q101I, Q101K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	NO SAY	175	<div><div></div></div> 24.9%	
2	SOME SAY	206	<div><div></div></div> 29.3%	

# v1481: SAY IN HIRING,FIRING			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	GREAT DEAL	321	<div></div> 45.7%
8	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
9	N.A., INAP., CODED 0 IN Q101I OR 2 IN Q101J	2042	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1482: SAY IN OWN WORK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1744 /-] [Invalid=1017 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q101H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES YOURSELF, DOES (DID) YOUR COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY? ; Q101I. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER YOU?		
Literal question	Q101L. HOW MUCH SAY DO (DID) YOU HAVE IN WHAT YOU YOURSELF DO (DID) IN YOUR WORK?		
Notes	Q101H, Q101I, Q101L in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NO SAY	352	<div></div> 20.2%
2	SOME SAY	574	<div></div> 32.9%
3	GREAT DEAL	818	<div></div> 46.9%
9	N.A., INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1017	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1483: NO. OF YEARS AT SAME JOB			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1868 /-] [Invalid=893 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q101M. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?		
Notes	Q101M in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	LESS THAN 1 YEAR	2	<div></div> 0.1%
1	1 YEAR	198	<div></div> 10.6%
2	2 YEARS	129	<div></div> 6.9%
3	3 YEARS	128	<div></div> 6.9%
4	4 YEARS	110	<div></div> 5.9%
5	5 YEARS	119	<div></div> 6.4%
6	6 YEARS	88	<div></div> 4.7%
7	7 YEARS	75	<div></div> 4.0%
8	8 YEARS	53	<div></div> 2.8%
9	9 YEARS	32	<div></div> 1.7%
10	10 YEARS	95	<div></div> 5.1%
11	11 YEARS	26	<div></div> 1.4%
12	12 YEARS	38	<div></div> 2.0%
13	13 YEARS	34	<div></div> 1.8%
14	14 YEARS	39	<div></div> 2.1%
15	15 YEARS	68	<div></div> 3.6%
16	16 YEARS	31	<div></div> 1.7%
17	17 YEARS	28	<div></div> 1.5%

v1483: NO. OF YEARS AT SAME JOB

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 YEARS	30	1.6%
19	19 YEARS	22	1.2%
20	20 YEARS	79	4.2%
21	21 YEARS	10	0.5%
22	22 YEARS	24	1.3%
23	23 YEARS	21	1.1%
24	24 YEARS	18	1.0%
25	25 YEARS	55	2.9%
26	26 YEARS	14	0.7%
27	27 YEARS	18	1.0%
28	28 YEARS	14	0.7%
29	29 YEARS	12	0.6%
30	30 YEARS	64	3.4%
31	31 YEARS	7	0.4%
32	32 YEARS	17	0.9%
33	33 YEARS	12	0.6%
34	34 YEARS	8	0.4%
35	35 YEARS	19	1.0%
36	36 YEARS	3	0.2%
37	37 YEARS	8	0.4%
38	38 YEARS	11	0.6%
39	39 YEARS	4	0.2%
40	40 YEARS	34	1.8%
41	41 YEARS	6	0.3%
42	42 YEARS	2	0.1%
43	43 YEARS	4	0.2%
44	44 YEARS	6	0.3%
45	45 YEARS	6	0.3%
46	46 YEARS	4	0.2%
47	47 YEARS	2	0.1%
48	48 YEARS	0	
49	49 YEARS	1	0.1%
50	50 YEARS	25	1.3%
51	51 YEARS	1	0.1%
52	52 YEARS	1	0.1%
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	2	0.1%
55	55 YEARS	3	0.2%
56	56 YEARS	1	0.1%
57	57 YEARS	1	0.1%
58	58 YEARS	1	0.1%
59	59 YEARS	0	
60	60 YEARS	4	0.2%
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	0	

# v1483: NO. OF YEARS AT SAME JOB			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	63 YEARS	1	0.1%
99	N.A.	893	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1484: BLISHEN SCORE-R			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1824-9999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=5973.35 /-] [StdDev=2844.481 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
# v1485: MARITAL STATUS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ARE YOU MARRIED, WIDOWED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR ARE YOU SINGLE?		
Notes	Q102 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MARRIED	1911	69.7%
2	WIDOWED	175	6.4%
3	SEPARATED	45	1.6%
4	DIVORCED	49	1.8%
5	SINGLE	546	19.9%
6	COMMON LAW	17	0.6%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1486: STREAM CODE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	Q102A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	RESPONDENT'S HUSBAND, WIFE, OR COMMON LAW SPOUSE	1670	60.9%
2	RESPONDENT'S FORMER HUSBAND/WIFE	253	9.2%
3	RESPONDENT'S FATHER	548	20.0%
4	OTHER	269	9.8%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	21	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1487: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2705 /-] [Invalid=56 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		

# v1487: OCCUPATION-SHORT FORM-SPOUSE			
Notes		Q103AB in the documentation. RETIRED OR UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS ARE CODED 02 OR 04 HERE. Q103C THROUGH Q103M ARE ASKED ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS' SPOUSES' REGULAR OR FORMER OCCUPATIONS.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HOUSEWIFE	191	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
2	RETIRED	150	<div><div></div></div> 5.5%
3	STUDENT	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	UNEMPLOYED	20	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
5	NEVER WORKED	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
6	OTHER REASONS FOR NO OCCUPATION	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	PROFESSIONAL	218	<div><div></div></div> 8.1%
12	SEMI PROFESSIONAL	120	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
21	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (LARGE)	116	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
22	PROPRIETORS, MANAGERS, OR OFFICIALS (SMALL)	329	<div><div></div></div> 12.2%
30	CLERICAL AND SALES	354	<div><div></div></div> 13.1%
31		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
41	SKILLED LABOUR	305	<div><div></div></div> 11.3%
42	SEMI SKILLED LABOUR	349	<div><div></div></div> 12.9%
43	UNSKILLED LABOUR	279	<div><div></div></div> 10.3%
50	FARMERS AND ALL FARM OCCUPATIONS	265	<div><div></div></div> 9.8%
88	UNCLASSIFIED	2	
99	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	54	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1488: OCCUPATION-TYPE-SPOUSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2498 /-] [Invalid=263 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)	
Interviewer's instructions		Q103C. (INTERVIEWER:) RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS NONMANUAL, MANUAL, OR FARMING.	
Notes		Q103AB, Q103C in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NON-MANUAL	999	<div><div></div></div> 40.0%
2	MANUAL	1203	<div><div></div></div> 48.2%
3	FARMING	296	<div><div></div></div> 11.8%
9	N.A., INAP., 1, 3, 5, 6, 88 OR 99 IN Q103AB	263	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1489: COMPANY ACTIVITY-SPOUSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2113 /-] [Invalid=648 /-]	
Universe		Q103D.1 asked only if spouse's occupation is non-manual or manual.	
Pre-question		Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM); Q103C. (INTERVIEWER:) RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS NONMANUAL, MANUAL, OR FARMING.	
Literal question		WHAT DOES (DID) HIS/HER COMPANY DO?	

# v1489: COMPANY ACTIVITY-SPOUSE			
Notes		Q103AB, Q103C, Q103D.1 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	AGRICULTURE	15	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
2	MINING	54	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
3	CONSTRUCTION	173	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
4	MANUFACTURING (DURABLES)	374	<div><div></div></div> 17.7%
5	MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING (NON-DURABLES)	77	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
6	UTILITIES, TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS	215	<div><div></div></div> 10.2%
7	WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE	364	<div><div></div></div> 17.2%
8	FINANCE, INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE, ADVERTISING	88	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
9	REPAIR SERVICES	64	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
10	PERSONAL SERVICES	83	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
11	ENTERTAINMENT, RECREATION	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
12	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	289	<div><div></div></div> 13.7%
13	ALL GOVERNMENT	301	<div><div></div></div> 14.2%
98	INAP., CODED 3 IN Q103C	296	
99	N.A., INAP., 1, 3, 5, 6, 88 OR 99 IN Q103AB	352	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1490: MAIN FARM PRODUCT-SPOUSE			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=285 /-] [Invalid=2476 /-]	
Universe		Q103D.2 asked only if spouse's occupation is farming.	
Pre-question		Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM); Q103C. (INTERVIEWER:) RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS NONMANUAL, MANUAL, OR FARMING.	
Literal question		WHAT IS (WAS) THE MAIN PRODUCT?	
Notes		Q103AB, Q103C, Q103D.2 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SUBSISTENCE, GENERAL	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
2	SOYBEANS, PEANUTS, LINSEED	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
3	TEXTILE PRODUCTS	0	
4	FRUIT OR VEGETABLE	12	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
5	TOBACCO	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
6	POTATOES	10	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
7	SUGAR BEETS	0	
8	BEEF CATTLE	24	<div><div></div></div> 8.4%
9	OTHER LIVESTOCK	12	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
10	DAIRY	70	<div><div></div></div> 24.6%
11	HAY, ALFALFA, ETC.	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
12	POULTRY, EGGS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
13	WHEAT	44	<div><div></div></div> 15.4%
14	OTHER GRAINS	21	<div><div></div></div> 7.4%
15	MISCELLANEOUS, UNSPECIFIED, TRUCK FARM	76	<div><div></div></div> 26.7%
98	INAP., NOT CODED 3 IN Q103C OR CODED 1,3,5,6,88 OR 99 IN Q10	2448	

# v1490: MAIN FARM PRODUCT-SPOUSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
99	N.A.	28	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1491: MANUAL-SPECIAL TRAINING-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1163 /-] [Invalid=1598 /-]		
Universe	Q103EF.1 asked only if spouse's occupation is manual.		
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	DID HE/SHE HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING FOR HIS/HER JOB? (IF 'YES') WHAT SORT OF TRAINING?		
Notes	Q103AB, Q103EF.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	APPRENTICESHIP	172	<div><div></div></div> 14.8%
2	SPECIAL CLASSES	160	<div><div></div></div> 13.8%
3	BOTH OF ABOVE	92	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
4	ALL OTHER TYPES OF SPECIAL TRAINING	53	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%
5	NO SPECIAL TRAINING	686	<div><div></div></div> 59.0%
0	INAP., CODED 3 IN Q103C, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	313	
8	D.K.	2	
9	N.A.	1283	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1492: SIZE OF FARM-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=244 /-] [Invalid=2517 /-]		
Universe	Q103E.2 asked only if spouse's occupation is farming.		
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM) ; Q103C. (INTERVIEWER:) RECORD WHETHER THE OCCUPATION IS NONMANUAL, MANUAL, OR FARMING.		
Literal question	Q103E.2 HOW MANY ACRES IS (WAS) THE FARM? (FARMING ONLY)		
Notes	Q103AB, Q103C, Q103E.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0-5 ACRES	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
2	6-10 ACRES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
3	11-20 ACRES	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
4	21-49 ACRES	9	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
5	50-99 ACRES	27	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
6	100-499 ACRES	139	<div><div></div></div> 57.0%
7	500-999 ACRES	39	<div><div></div></div> 16.0%
8	1000 ACRES OR MORE	22	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
0	INAP., CODED 1 OR 2 IN Q103C, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2465	
9	N.A.	52	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1493: SELF EMPLOYED?-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		

# v1493: SELF EMPLOYED?-SPOUSE			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2487 /-] [Invalid=274 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q103G. IS (WAS) HE/SHE SELF-EMPLOYED OR DOES (DID) HE/SHE WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE?		
Notes	Q103AB, Q103G in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SELF-EMPLOYED	671	<div></div> 27.0%
2	WORK FOR SOMEONE ELSE	1815	<div></div> 73.0%
3	OTHER, COMBINATION, ETC.	1	0.0%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	274	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1494: ORGANIZATION SIZE-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2169 /-] [Invalid=592 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q103H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES HIM/HER, DOES (DID) HIS/HER COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY?		
Notes	Q103AB, Q103H in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	382	<div></div> 17.6%
1	ONE	77	<div></div> 3.6%
2	2-4	214	<div></div> 9.9%
3	5-10	199	<div></div> 9.2%
4	11-49	271	<div></div> 12.5%
5	50-99	123	<div></div> 5.7%
6	100-999	400	<div></div> 18.4%
7	1000 OR MORE	503	<div></div> 23.2%
8	D.K.	295	
9	N.A., INAP., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	297	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1495: WORK UNDER SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1896 /-] [Invalid=865 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM) ; Q103H. HOW MANY PEOPLE, BESIDES HIM/HER, DOES (DID) HIS/HER COMPANY (FARM) EMPLOY		
Literal question	Q103I. HOW MANY ARE (WERE) WORKING UNDER HIM/HER?		
Notes	Q103AB, Q103H, Q103I in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	1097	<div></div> 57.9%
1	ONE	99	<div></div> 5.2%

# v1495: WORK UNDER SPOUSE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	2-4	259	<div><div></div></div> 13.7%
3	5-10	194	<div><div></div></div> 10.2%
4	11-49	179	<div><div></div></div> 9.4%
5	50-99	31	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
6	100-999	28	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
7	1000 OR MORE	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	D.K.	213	
9	N.A., INAP., CODED 0 IN Q103H, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	652	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1496: SUPERVISE WORK?-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1032 /-] [Invalid=1729 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DOES (DID) HE/SHE SUPERVISE THEIR WORK?		
Notes	Q103J in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	849	<div><div></div></div> 82.3%
2	NO	183	<div><div></div></div> 17.7%
8	D.K.	14	
9	N.A., INAP., CODED 0 IN Q103I, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1715	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1497: SAY IN HIRING,FIRING-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=893 /-] [Invalid=1868 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MUCH SAY DOES (DID) HE/SHE HAVE IN THEIR HIRING, FIRING, PAY OR PROMOTIONS?		
Notes	Q103K in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NO SAY	187	<div><div></div></div> 20.9%
2	SOME SAY	220	<div><div></div></div> 24.6%
3	GREAT DEAL	486	<div><div></div></div> 54.4%
8	D.K., THERE ARE PEOPLE WORKING UNDER SPOUCE BUT DO NOT KNOW	15	
9	N.A., INAP., CODED 2 IN Q103J, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1853	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1498: SAY IN OWN WORK-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2001 /-] [Invalid=760 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)		
Literal question	Q103L. HOW MUCH SAY DOES (DID) HE/SHE HAVE IN WHAT HE/SHE DOES (DID) IN HIS/HER WORK?		

v1498: SAY IN OWN WORK-SPOUSE

Notes		Q103AB, Q103L in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NO SAY	492	24.6%
2	SOME SAY	636	31.8%
3	GREAT DEAL	873	43.6%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTRVIEW	760	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v1499: NO. OF YEARS AT SAME WORK

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q103AB. WHAT IS (WAS) HIS/HER OCCUPATION ? WHAT EXACTLY DOES (DID) HE/SHE DO? (OCCUPATION - SHORT FORM)
Literal question	Q103M. HOW MANY YEARS HAS(HAD) HE/SHE BEEN DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?
Notes	Q103AB, Q103M in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	1 YEAR	111	4.0%
2	2 YEARS	82	3.0%
3	3 YEARS	100	3.6%
4	4 YEARS	86	3.1%
5	5 YEARS	130	4.7%
6	6 YEARS	62	2.2%
7	7 YEARS	58	2.1%
8	8 YEARS	66	2.4%
9	9 YEARS	28	1.0%
10	10 YEARS	146	5.3%
11	11 YEARS	48	1.7%
12	12 YEARS	62	2.2%
13	13 YEARS	40	1.4%
14	14 YEARS	30	1.1%
15	15 YEARS	97	3.5%
16	16 YEARS	28	1.0%
17	17 YEARS	24	0.9%
18	18 YEARS	33	1.2%
19	19 YEARS	12	0.4%
20	20 YEARS	184	6.7%
21	21 YEARS	11	0.4%
22	22 YEARS	26	0.9%
23	23 YEARS	27	1.0%
24	24 YEARS	18	0.7%
25	25 YEARS	136	4.9%
26	26 YEARS	11	0.4%
27	27 YEARS	30	1.1%
28	28 YEARS	28	1.0%
29	29 YEARS	7	0.3%

v1499: NO. OF YEARS AT SAME WORK

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	30 YEARS	163	5.9%
31	31 YEARS	8	0.3%
32	32 YEARS	23	0.8%
33	33 YEARS	20	0.7%
34	34 YEARS	10	0.4%
35	35 YEARS	75	2.7%
36	36 YEARS	12	0.4%
37	37 YEARS	9	0.3%
38	38 YEARS	11	0.4%
39	39 YEARS	9	0.3%
40	40 YEARS	89	3.2%
41	41 YEARS	4	0.1%
42	42 YEARS	7	0.3%
43	43 YEARS	11	0.4%
44	44 YEARS	4	0.1%
45	45 YEARS	28	1.0%
46	46 YEARS	5	0.2%
47	47 YEARS	8	0.3%
48	48 YEARS	1	0.0%
49	49 YEARS	2	0.1%
50	50 YEARS	66	2.4%
51	51 YEARS	2	0.1%
52	52 YEARS	0	
53	53 YEARS	3	0.1%
54	54 YEARS	1	0.0%
55	55 YEARS	5	0.2%
56	56 YEARS	2	0.1%
57	57 YEARS	1	0.0%
58	58 YEARS	0	
59	59 YEARS	3	0.1%
60	60 YEARS	20	0.7%
61	61 YEARS	0	
62	62 YEARS	1	0.0%
63	63 YEARS	0	
64	64 YEARS	0	
65	65 YEARS	5	0.2%
66	66 YEARS	0	
67	67 YEARS	1	0.0%
68	68 YEARS	0	
69	69 YEARS	0	
70	70 YEARS	7	0.3%
71	71 YEARS	0	
72	72 YEARS	1	0.0%
73	73 YEARS	0	
74	74 YEARS	0	

# v1499: NO. OF YEARS AT SAME WORK			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	75 YEARS	2	0.1%
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	1	0.0%
99		420	15.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1500: BLISHEN SCORE-SPOUSE			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1824-9999] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=4659.84 /-] [StdDev=2182.113 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
# v1501: NO. OF YEARS OF SCHOOL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2683 /-] [Invalid=78 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOL DID YOU ATTEND?		
Notes	Q104A in the documentation. ACTUAL NUMBER OF YEARS CODED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SCHOOLING	9	0.3%
1	1 YEAR	7	0.3%
2	2 YEARS	11	0.4%
3	3 YEARS	17	0.6%
4	4 YEARS	45	1.7%
5	5 YEARS	57	2.1%
6	6 YEARS	77	2.9%
7	7 YEARS	144	5.4%
8	8 YEARS	232	8.6%
9	9 YEARS	208	7.8%
10	10 YEARS	286	10.7%
11	11 YEARS	274	10.2%
12	12 YEARS	562	20.9%
13	13 YEARS	183	6.8%
14	14 YEARS	145	5.4%
15	15 YEARS	137	5.1%
16	16 YEARS	112	4.2%
17	17 YEARS	78	2.9%
18	18 YEARS	45	1.7%
19	19 YEARS	18	0.7%
20	20 YEARS	17	0.6%
21	21 YEARS	8	0.3%
22	22 YEARS	5	0.2%
23	23 YEARS	3	0.1%
24	24 YEARS	1	0.0%
25	25 YEARS	0	
26	26 YEARS	0	

# v1501: NO. OF YEARS OF SCHOOL			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	27 YEARS	0	
28	28 YEARS	1	0.0%
29	29 YEARS	0	
30	30 YEARS	1	0.0%
99	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	78	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1502: EDUCATION-HIGHEST GRADE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2651 /-] [Invalid=110 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR LEVEL OF SCHOOL YOU REACHED?		
Notes	Q104B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO EDUCATION	10	0.4%
1	GRADE 1	38	1.4%
2	GRADE 2	12	0.5%
3	GRADE 3	18	0.7%
4	GRADE 4	42	1.6%
5	GRADE 5	55	2.1%
6	GRADE 6	81	3.1%
7	GRADE 7	129	4.9%
8	GRADE 8	242	9.1%
9	GRADE 9	195	7.4%
10	GRADE 10	280	10.6%
11	GRADE 11	281	10.6%
12	GRADE 12	523	19.7%
13	GRADE 13	80	3.0%
21	COMMUNITY COLLEGE OR SIMILAR POST SECONDARY	194	7.3%
22	UNIVERSITY (ALL LEVELS)	345	13.0%
23	ALL OTHER POST SECONDARY	77	2.9%
24	POST GRADUATE, PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS, ETC.	49	1.8%
99	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	110	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1503: COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2675 /-] [Invalid=86 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DID YOU COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL?		
Notes	Q104C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	1381	51.6%
2	NO	1294	48.4%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	86	

# v1503: COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL			
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1504: POST SECONDARY EDUCATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have more than 11 years of schooling.		
Literal question	DID YOU EVER ATTEND UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, OR SOME OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL?		
Notes	Q104D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	935	<div><div></div></div> 33.9%
2	NO	827	<div><div></div></div> 30.0%
9	N.A., NO 1979 INTERVIEW	999	<div><div></div></div> 36.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1505: DEGREE OBTAINED?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=911 /-] [Invalid=1850 /-]		
Universe	Q104E asked only to respondents who have attended university, college, or some other post-secondary school.		
Pre-question	Q104D. DID YOU EVER ATTEND UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, OR SOME OTHER POST-SECONDARY SCHOOL?		
Literal question	Q104E. DID YOU OBTAIN A DEGREE OR DEGREES?		
Notes	Q104D, Q104E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	545	<div><div></div></div> 59.8%
2	NO	366	<div><div></div></div> 40.2%
9	N.A, INAP., CODED 2 OR 9 IN Q104D	1850	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1506: RELIGION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2724 /-] [Invalid=37 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION?		
Notes	Q105A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	154	<div><div></div></div> 5.7%
1	ROMAN CATHOLIC	1232	<div><div></div></div> 45.2%
2	UNITED CHURCH	509	<div><div></div></div> 18.7%
3	ANGLICAN	324	<div><div></div></div> 11.9%
4	PRESBYTERIAN	104	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
5	BAPTIST	92	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
6	LUTHERAN	65	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
7	UKRAINIAN (GREEK) CATHOLIC	18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
8	GREEK ORTHODOX	21	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
9	JEWISH	41	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
10	PENTECOSTAL	23	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
11	SALVATION ARMY	12	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%

# v1506: RELIGION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	JEHOVAH WITNESS	8	0.3%
13	MENNONITE	12	0.4%
14	BRETHREN (UNSPECIFIED)	5	0.2%
15	NO REGULAR CHURCH	2	0.1%
16	EVANGELICAL	3	0.1%
17	CHRISTIAN REFORMED	10	0.4%
18	CHRISTIAN	11	0.4%
19	LATTER DAY SAINTS	8	0.3%
20	CHURCH OF CHRIST, CHURCH OF GOD	6	0.2%
21	PROTESTANT (UNSPECIFIED)	20	0.7%
22	CHRISTIAN SCIENCE	1	0.0%
23	SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST	3	0.1%
24	CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE	4	0.1%
25	OTHER SPECIFIC PROTESTANT	19	0.7%
26	BUDDHIST	3	0.1%
27	SIKH	0	
28	MOSLEM	5	0.2%
29	OTHER VAGUE ANSWERS	9	0.3%
88	REFUSED, NO ANSWER	20	
99	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1507: FREQUENCY CHURCH ATTEND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2556 /-] [Invalid=205 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ABOUT HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO TO CHURCH (SYNAGOGUE)? AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK, TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH, ONCE A MONTH, A FEW TIMES A YEAR OR LESS, OR NEVER?		
Notes	Q105B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ONCE A WEEK	824	32.2%
2	TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH	251	9.8%
3	ONCE A MONTH	146	5.7%
4	FEW TIMES A YEAR OR LESS	956	37.4%
5	NEVER	379	14.8%
8	D.K./REFUSED	14	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q105A	191	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1508: SUBJECTIVE RELIGIOSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2553 /-] [Invalid=208 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON, A FAIRLY RELIGIOUS PERSON, OR A NOT VERY RELIGIOUS PERSON?		
Notes	Q105C in the documentation.		

# v1508: SUBJECTIVE RELIGIOSITY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY RELIGIOUS	527	<div><div></div></div> 20.6%
2	FAIRLY RELIGIOUS	1437	<div><div></div></div> 56.3%
3	NOT VERY RELIGIOUS	589	<div><div></div></div> 23.1%
8	D.K./REFUSED	17	
9	INAP., CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q105A	191	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1509: LANGUAGE SPOKEN AS CHILD			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT LANGUAGE DID YOU FIRST LEARN AS A CHILD THAT YOU STILL SPEAK OR UNDERSTAND?		
Notes	Q106A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ENGLISH	1668	<div><div></div></div> 60.8%
2	FRENCH	749	<div><div></div></div> 27.3%
3	ENGLISH AND FRENCH	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
4	ENGLISH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	FRENCH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
6	ENGLISH AND FRENCH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	0	
7	ALL OTHER COMBINATIONS	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
8	OTHER ONLY	303	<div><div></div></div> 11.0%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1510: LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-7] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USUALLY SPEAK AT HOME?		
Notes	Q106B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ENGLISH ONLY	1859	<div><div></div></div> 67.8%
2	FRENCH ONLY	683	<div><div></div></div> 24.9%
3	ENGLISH AND FRENCH EQUALLY	68	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
4	ENGLISH AND OTHER EQUALLY (SPECIFIED)	104	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
5	OTHER ONLY (SPECIFIED)	24	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
6	ENGLISH AND FRENCH AND OTHER EQUALLY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
7	FRENCH AND OTHER EQUALLY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1511: SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGES?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 /-] [Invalid=17 /-]		

# v1511: SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGES?				
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q106B. WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USUALLY SPEAK AT HOME?			
Literal question	Q106CD. DO YOU SPEAK ANY OTHER LANGUAGES THAN THOSE YOU HAVE JUST MENTIONED?			
Post-question	(IF YES) WHICH ONES?			
Notes	Q106B, Q106CD in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	DOES NOT SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGE	2074	<div></div>	75.6%
1	ENGLISH	317	<div></div>	11.6%
2	FRENCH	159	<div></div>	5.8%
3	ENGLISH AND FRENCH	9	<div></div>	0.3%
4	ONE OTHER LANGUAGE	88	<div></div>	3.2%
5	ENGLISH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	28	<div></div>	1.0%
6	FRENCH AND ONE OR MORE OTHER	39	<div></div>	1.4%
7	TWO OR MORE OTHER LANGUAGES (NOT ENGLISH OR FRENCH)	30	<div></div>	1.1%
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	17		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1512: TRADE UNION MEMBER				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2738 /-] [Invalid=23 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	DO YOU BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?			
Notes	Q107A in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	YES	616	<div></div>	22.5%
2	NO	2122	<div></div>	77.5%
8	D.K.	5		
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v1513: RESPONDENT'S UNION				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=589 /-] [Invalid=2172 /-]			
Universe	Q107B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q107A.			
Pre-question	Q107A. DO YOU BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?			
Literal question	Q107B. (IF YES) WHICH ONE?			
Notes	Q107A, Q107B in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA (U.S.W.A.)	11	<div></div>	1.9%
2	UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WOR	15	<div></div>	2.5%
3	UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA	18	<div></div>	3.1%
4	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOU	13	<div></div>	2.2%

# v1513: RESPONDENT'S UNION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
6	OTHER SPECIFIC INTERNATIONAL	119	<div><div></div></div> 20.2%
7	INTERNATIONAL UNSPECIFIED (C.I.O.)	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
8	CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (C.U.P.E.)	47	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
9	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SERVICES	36	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
10	CORPORATION DES ENSEIGNANTS DU QUEBEC (C.E.Q.)	18	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
11	FEDERATION DES TRAVAILLEURS DU QUEBEC (F.T.Q.)	13	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
12	OTHER SPECIFIC NATIONAL	95	<div><div></div></div> 16.1%
13	OTHER NATIONAL UNSPECIFIED	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
14	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (CIVIL SERVICE, PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANCE)	68	<div><div></div></div> 11.5%
15	TEACHERS' FEDERATION OR ASSOCIATION (ALL LEVELS)	45	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
16	OTHER PROFESSIONAL FEDERATIONS OR ASSOCIATIONS (U.P.A.)	29	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
17	FARMERS' OR AGRICULTURAL GROUPS	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
18	LABOUR UNION UNSPECIFIED	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
19	OTHER VAGUE ANSWERS (UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER INTERNATIONAL)	32	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
88	D.K. (BUT YES TO Q107A)	27	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q107A	2145	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1514: FAMILY UNION MEMBERSHIP			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2661 /-] [Invalid=100 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	DOES ANY MEMBER OF YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY (BESIDES YOURSELF) BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?		
Notes	Q107C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	723	<div><div></div></div> 27.2%
2	NO	1938	<div><div></div></div> 72.8%
8	D.K.	82	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1515: FAMILY: WHICH UNION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=587 /-] [Invalid=2174 /-]		
Universe	Q107D asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q107C.		
Pre-question	Q107C. DOES ANY MEMBER OF YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY (BESIDES YOURSELF) BELONG TO A TRADE OR LABOUR UNION?		
Notes	Q107C, Q107D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA (U.S.W.A.)	23	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%

# v1515: FAMILY: WHICH UNION?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS	18	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
3	UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA	19	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
4	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
5	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS	20	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
6	OTHER SPECIFIC INTERNATIONAL	102	<div><div></div></div> 17.4%
7	INTERNATIONAL UNSPECIFIED (C.I.O.)	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
8	CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (C.U.P.E.)	49	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%
9	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SERVICES	37	<div><div></div></div> 6.3%
10	CORPORATION DES ENSEIGNANTS DU QUEBEC (C.E.Q.)	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
11	FEDERATION DES TRAVAILLEURS DU QUEBEC (F.T.Q.)	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
12	OTHER SPECIFIC NATIONAL	95	<div><div></div></div> 16.2%
13	OTHER NATIONAL UNSPECIFIED	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
14	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (CIVIL SERVICE, PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANCE)	74	<div><div></div></div> 12.6%
15	TEACHERS' FEDERATION OR ASSOCIATION (ALL LEVELS)	39	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
16	OTHER PROFESSIONAL FEDERATIONS OR ASSOCIATIONS (U.P.A.)	22	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
17	FARMERS' OR AGRICULTURAL GROUPS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
18	LABOUR UNION UNSPECIFIED	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
19	OTHER VAGUE ANSWERS (UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER INTERNATIONAL)	23	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
88	D.K. (BUT YES TO Q107C)	136	
99	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q107C	2038	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1516: FAMILY INCOME			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2659 /-] [Invalid=102 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q108. IN WHICH OF THESE GROUPS DOES THE APPROXIMATE INCOME OF THE FAMILY FALL--THAT IS, THE INCOME OR EARNINGS OF ALL THE FAMILY MEMBERS LIVING HERE ADDED TOGETHER?		
Interviewer's instructions	(INTERVIEWER: ESTIMATE, IF NECESSARY) (HAND CARD 4)		
Notes	Q108 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LESS THAN \$7500 PER YEAR	373	<div><div></div></div> 14.0%
2	\$7500 - \$9999 PER YEAR	228	<div><div></div></div> 8.6%
3	\$10000 - \$14999 PER YEAR	364	<div><div></div></div> 13.7%
4	\$15000 - \$16999 PER YEAR	239	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
5	\$17000 - \$19999 PER YEAR	284	<div><div></div></div> 10.7%
6	\$20000 - \$24999 PER YEAR	351	<div><div></div></div> 13.2%
7	\$25000 - \$29999 PER YEAR	269	<div><div></div></div> 10.1%
8	\$30000 OR MORE PER YEAR	551	<div><div></div></div> 20.7%
0	D.K. (NO ESTIMATE), NO 1979 INTERVIEW	68	

# v1516: FAMILY INCOME			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	REFUSED (NO ESTIMATE)	34	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1517: COUNTRY OF BIRTH			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2718 /-] [Invalid=43 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.		
Literal question	IN WHAT COUNTRY WERE YOU BORN?		
Notes	Q109A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CANADA	2336	<div></div> 85.9%
2	BRITISH ISLES	121	<div></div> 4.5%
3	FRANCE	8	<div></div> 0.3%
4	GERMANY	29	<div></div> 1.1%
5	HUNGARY	9	<div></div> 0.3%
6	ITALY	25	<div></div> 0.9%
7	NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND)	22	<div></div> 0.8%
8	POLAND	12	<div></div> 0.4%
9	RUSSIA	7	<div></div> 0.3%
10	OTHER EUROPEAN (SPECIFY)	75	<div></div> 2.8%
11	UNITED STATES	35	<div></div> 1.3%
12	ALL OTHER (SPECIFY)	39	<div></div> 1.4%
99	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	43	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1518: YEAR CAME TO CANADA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=376 /-] [Invalid=2385 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Asked only to respondents who were born outside of Canada.		
Literal question	IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU COME TO LIVE IN CANADA?		
Notes	Q109B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	1900 OR EARLIER	1	<div></div> 0.3%
1	1901	0	
2	1902	0	
3	1903	1	<div></div> 0.3%
4	1904	2	<div></div> 0.5%
5	1905	3	<div></div> 0.8%
6	1906	1	<div></div> 0.3%
7	1907	1	<div></div> 0.3%
8	1908	1	<div></div> 0.3%
9	1909	3	<div></div> 0.8%

v1518: YEAR CAME TO CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	1910	3	0.8%
11	1911	4	1.1%
12	1912	7	1.9%
13	1913	4	1.1%
14	1914	1	0.3%
15	1915	1	0.3%
16	1916	2	0.5%
17	1917	0	
18	1918	1	0.3%
19	1919	3	0.8%
20	1920	4	1.1%
21	1921	3	0.8%
22	1922	5	1.3%
23	1923	2	0.5%
24	1924	5	1.3%
25	1925	3	0.8%
26	1926	1	0.3%
27	1927	8	2.1%
28	1928	9	2.4%
29	1929	6	1.6%
30	1930	4	1.1%
31	1931	1	0.3%
32	1932	1	0.3%
33	1933	2	0.5%
34	1934	0	
35	1935	0	
36	1936	0	
37	1937	0	
38	1938	3	0.8%
39	1939	0	
40	1940	1	0.3%
41	1941	1	0.3%
42	1942	0	
43	1943	1	0.3%
44	1944	0	
45	1945	1	0.3%
46	1946	8	2.1%
47	1947	8	2.1%
48	1948	10	2.7%
49	1949	10	2.7%
50	1950	10	2.7%
51	1951	17	4.5%
52	1952	13	3.5%
53	1953	15	4.0%
54	1954	12	3.2%

v1518: YEAR CAME TO CANADA

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
55	1955	6	1.6%
56	1956	19	5.1%
57	1957	25	6.6%
58	1958	11	2.9%
59	1959	9	2.4%
60	1960	8	2.1%
61	1961	7	1.9%
62	1962	1	0.3%
63	1963	7	1.9%
64	1964	8	2.1%
65	1965	13	3.5%
66	1966	12	3.2%
67	1967	15	4.0%
68	1968	6	1.6%
69	1969	5	1.3%
70	1970	2	0.5%
71	1971	4	1.1%
72	1972	5	1.3%
73	1973	1	0.3%
74	1974	6	1.6%
75	1975	2	0.5%
76	1976	0	
77	1977	1	0.3%
78	1978	0	
88	DON'T REMEMBER, NO STATED	5	
99	INAP., CODED 01 IN Q109A, OR NO 1979 INTERVIEW	2380	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.







v1519: HOW LONG LIVED IN PROVINCE

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2712 /-] [Invalid=49 /-]
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.
Literal question	HOW MUCH OF YOUR LIFE HAVE YOU LIVED IN (NAME PROVINCE)?
Notes	Q109C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	ALL OF YOUR LIFE	1733	63.9%
2	MOST OF IT	583	21.5%
3	SOME OF IT	370	13.6%
4	ONLY A YEAR OR SO	26	1.0%
8	D.K.	4	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	45	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1520: EVER LIVED IN OTHR PROVINCE?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2721 /-] [Invalid=40 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.		
Literal question	HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Notes	Q109D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	756	<div><div></div></div> 27.8%
2	NO	1965	<div><div></div></div> 72.2%
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	40	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1521: LIVED IN NEWFOUNDLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=747 /-] [Invalid=2014 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E.1 asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.1 (DID R LIVE IN NEWFOUNDLAND?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN NEWFOUNDLAND	714	<div><div></div></div> 95.6%
1	YES	33	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	49	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1522: LIVED IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=747 /-] [Invalid=2014 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E.2 asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.2 (DID R LIVE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	732	<div><div></div></div> 98.0%
1	YES	15	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	49	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1523: LIVED IN NOVA SCOTIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		

# v1523: LIVED IN NOVA SCOTIA			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=748 /-] [Invalid=2013 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E.3 asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.3 (DID R LIVE IN NOVA SCOTIA?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN NOVA SCOTIA	665	 88.9%
1	YES	83	 11.1%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	48	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1524: LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=747 /-] [Invalid=2014 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E.4 asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.4 (DID R LIVE IN NEW BRUNSWICK)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E. in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK	681	 91.2%
1	YES	66	 8.8%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	49	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v1525: LIVED IN QUEBEC			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=749 /-] [Invalid=2012 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E.5 asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.5 (DID R LIVE IN QUEBEC?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E. in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN QUEBEC	597	 79.7%
1	YES	152	 20.3%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	47	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			

# v1526: LIVED IN ONTARIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=750 /-] [Invalid=2011 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E. asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.6 (DID R LIVE IN ONTARIO?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.6 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN ONTARIO	498	<div></div> 66.4%
1	YES	252	<div></div> 33.6%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	46	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1527: LIVED IN MANITOBA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=748 /-] [Invalid=2013 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E.7 asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.7 (DID R LIVE IN MANITOBA?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.7 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN MANITOBA	634	<div></div> 84.8%
1	YES	114	<div></div> 15.2%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	48	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1528: LIVED IN SASKATCHEWAN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=748 /-] [Invalid=2013 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E. asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.8 (DID R LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.8 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN SASKATCHEWAN	616	<div></div> 82.4%
1	YES	132	<div></div> 17.6%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	48	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1529: LIVED IN ALBERTA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=748 /-] [Invalid=2013 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E. asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.9 (DID R LIVE IN ALBERTA?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.9 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN ALBERTA	616	<div></div> 82.4%
1	YES	132	<div></div> 17.6%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	48	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1530: LIVED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=748 /-] [Invalid=2013 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE. Q109E. asked only to respondents who have lived in another province.		
Pre-question	Q109D. HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCES?		
Literal question	Q109E.10 (DID R LIVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA?)		
Notes	Q109D, Q109E.10 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEVER LIVED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA	627	<div></div> 83.8%
1	YES	121	<div></div> 16.2%
8	NEVER LIVED IN ANY OTHER PROVINCE	1965	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	48	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1531: HOW LONG LIVED HERE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1400 /-] [Invalid=1361 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.		
Literal question	ABOUT HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?		
Notes	Q109F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	LESS THAN ONE YEAR	62	<div></div> 4.4%
1	1 YEAR	106	<div></div> 7.6%
2	2 YEARS	104	<div></div> 7.4%
3	3 YEARS	63	<div></div> 4.5%
4	4 YEARS	79	<div></div> 5.6%
5	5 YEARS	65	<div></div> 4.6%

v1531: HOW LONG LIVED HERE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	6 YEARS	54	3.9%
7	7 YEARS	47	3.4%
8	8 YEARS	42	3.0%
9	9 YEARS	29	2.1%
10	10 YEARS	56	4.0%
11	11 YEARS	23	1.6%
12	12 YEARS	35	2.5%
13	13 YEARS	26	1.9%
14	14 YEARS	25	1.8%
15	15 YEARS	40	2.9%
16	16 YEARS	25	1.8%
17	17 YEARS	22	1.6%
18	18 YEARS	42	3.0%
19	19 YEARS	35	2.5%
20	20 YEARS	63	4.5%
21	21 YEARS	28	2.0%
22	22 YEARS	30	2.1%
23	23 YEARS	29	2.1%
24	24 YEARS	13	0.9%
25	25 YEARS	27	1.9%
26	26 YEARS	18	1.3%
27	27 YEARS	11	0.8%
28	28 YEARS	7	0.5%
29	29 YEARS	8	0.6%
30	30 YEARS	25	1.8%
31	31 YEARS	5	0.4%
32	32 YEARS	11	0.8%
33	33 YEARS	7	0.5%
34	34 YEARS	7	0.5%
35	35 YEARS	16	1.1%
36	36 YEARS	3	0.2%
37	37 YEARS	9	0.6%
38	38 YEARS	3	0.2%
39	39 YEARS	1	0.1%
40	40 YEARS	9	0.6%
41	41 YEARS	4	0.3%
42	42 YEARS	3	0.2%
43	43 YEARS	5	0.4%
44	44 YEARS	6	0.4%
45	45 YEARS	5	0.4%
46	46 YEARS	3	0.2%
47	47 YEARS	2	0.1%
48	48 YEARS	5	0.4%
49	49 YEARS	1	0.1%
50	50 YEARS	3	0.2%

v1531: HOW LONG LIVED HERE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
51	51 YEARS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
52	52 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
53	53 YEARS	0	
54	54 YEARS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
55	55 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
56	56 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
57	57 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
58	58 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
59	59 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
60	60 YEARS	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
61	61 YEARS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
62	62 YEARS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
63	63 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
64	64 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
65	65 YEARS	0	
66	66 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
67	67 YEARS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
68	68 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
69	69 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
70	70 YEARS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
71	71 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
72	72 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
73	73 YEARS	0	
74	74 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
75	75 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
76	76 YEARS	0	
77	77 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
78	78 YEARS	0	
79	79 YEARS	0	
80	80 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
81	81 YEARS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
82	82 YEARS	0	
83	83 YEARS	0	
84	84 YEARS	0	
85	85 YEARS	0	
86	86 YEARS	0	
87	87 YEARS	0	
88	88 YEARS	0	
89	89 YEARS	0	
90	90 YEARS	0	
91	ALL MY LIFE (CAN'T DETERMINE FROM AGE)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
98	D.K., N.A.	27	
99	DATA NOT AVAILABLE FOR 1974 PANEL CASES, NO 1979 INTERVIEW	1334	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1532: ETHNICITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2564 /-] [Invalid=197 /-]		
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.		
Literal question	CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT ETHNIC OR CULTURAL GROUP YOUR ANCESTORS WHO FIRST CAME TO NORTH AMERICA BELONGED TO? (ON THE MALE SIDE)		
Notes	Q110 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CZECHOSLOVAKIAN, SLOVAKIAN	15	0.6%
2	CHINESE, JAPANESE, OTHER ORIENTAL	16	0.6%
3	ENGLISH	558	21.8%
4	FINNISH, ESTONIAN	7	0.3%
5	FRENCH	635	24.8%
6	GERMAN, AUSTRIAN	167	6.5%
7	GREEK, MALTESE	11	0.4%
8	HUNGARIAN	17	0.7%
9	IRISH	269	10.5%
10	ITALIAN	47	1.8%
11	JEWISH, HEBREW	25	1.0%
12	LATVIAN, LITHUANIAN	9	0.4%
13	NETHERLAND (DUTCH), BELGIAN	63	2.5%
14	POLISH	36	1.4%
15	SCANDINAVIAN (DANISH, ICELANDIC, NORWEGIAN, SWEDISH)	67	2.6%
16	SCOTTISH	294	11.5%
17	RUSSIAN	17	0.7%
18	UKRAINIAN	68	2.7%
19	YUGOSLAVIAN	11	0.4%
20	WELSH	23	0.9%
21	NATIVE INDIAN OR INUIT	28	1.1%
22	SPAIN, PORTUGAL	8	0.3%
23	WEST INDIAN	5	0.2%
24	AFRICAN	3	0.1%
25	OTHER EUROPEAN	15	0.6%
26	OTHER ASIAN	17	0.7%
27	ENGLISH AND FRENCH, BRITISH ISLES AND FRENCH	18	0.7%
28	BRITISH ISLES, ENGLISH, IRISH, SCOTTISH, WELSH, MIXTURES	62	2.4%
29	BRITISH ISLES AND ONE OR MORE OTHER EUROPEAN (NOT FRENCH)	23	0.9%
30	FRENCH AND OTHER (NOT BRITISH ISLES)	9	0.4%
31	ALL OTHER COMBINATIONS	21	0.8%
88	D.K., NOT STATED	156	
99	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	41	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v1533: GREW UP:CITY,FARM,ETC	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2722 /-] [Invalid=39 /-]
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.
Literal question	WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, WHERE DID YOU LIVE - MOSTLY IN A CITY OR SUBURB, MOSTLY IN A VILLAGE OR SMALL TOWN, OR MOSTLY ON A FARM OR RURAL AREA?
Notes	Q111A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	LIVED EVERYWHERE, MOVED AROUND A LOT	7	0.3%
1	CITY	912	33.5%
2	SUBURB	242	8.9%
3	VILLAGE, SMALL TOWN	857	31.5%
4	FARM OR RURAL AREA	695	25.5%
5	CITY AND FARM	3	0.1%
6	SUBURB AND FARM	0	
7	VILLAGE AND FARM	4	0.1%
8	CITY AND VILLAGE	2	0.1%
9	CITY AND SUBURB	0	
99	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	39	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1534: GREW UP NEAR LARGE CITY?	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2689 /-] [Invalid=72 /-]
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.
Literal question	WAS THE (SUBURB, TOWN, VILLAGE, FARM) THAT YOU LIVED IN NEAR A LARGE CITY, OR NOT VERY NEAR?
Notes	Q111B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	CITY (LIVE IN A LARGE CITY)	912	33.9%
2	LIVED NEAR A LARGE CITY	762	28.3%
3	DID NOT LIVE NEAR A LARGE CITY	1001	37.2%
4	SOME WERE AND SOME WERE NOT	14	0.5%
8	D.K.	23	
9	NO 1979 INTERVIEW, N.A.	49	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v1535: AGE OF RESPONDENT	
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2721 /-] [Invalid=40 /-]
Universe	QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 WERE NOT ASKED OF 1974 RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REINTERVIEWED IN 1979. FOR THESE PANEL CASES QUESTIONS 109 THROUGH 112 CONTAIN 1974 RESPONSES WHERE AVAILABLE.
Literal question	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?

v1535: AGE OF RESPONDENT

Notes

Q112 in the documentation. FOR 1979 PANEL RESPONDENTS, AGE IN 1979 WAS CALCULATED AS 1974 AGE PLUS 5 YEARS.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 YEARS OLD	53	1.9%
19	19 YEARS OLD	81	3.0%
20	20 YEARS OLD	58	2.1%
21	21 YEARS OLD	53	1.9%
22	22 YEARS OLD	65	2.4%
23	23 YEARS OLD	88	3.2%
24	24 YEARS OLD	73	2.7%
25	25 YEARS OLD	55	2.0%
26	26 YEARS OLD	55	2.0%
27	27 YEARS OLD	48	1.8%
28	28 YEARS OLD	47	1.7%
29	29 YEARS OLD	54	2.0%
30	30 YEARS OLD	61	2.2%
31	31 YEARS OLD	50	1.8%
32	32 YEARS OLD	52	1.9%
33	33 YEARS OLD	66	2.4%
34	34 YEARS OLD	42	1.5%
35	35 YEARS OLD	50	1.8%
36	36 YEARS OLD	52	1.9%
37	37 YEARS OLD	41	1.5%
38	38 YEARS OLD	42	1.5%
39	39 YEARS OLD	45	1.7%
40	40 YEARS OLD	38	1.4%
41	41 YEARS OLD	34	1.2%
42	42 YEARS OLD	36	1.3%
43	43 YEARS OLD	42	1.5%
44	44 YEARS OLD	40	1.5%
45	45 YEARS OLD	53	1.9%
46	46 YEARS OLD	44	1.6%
47	47 YEARS OLD	38	1.4%
48	48 YEARS OLD	52	1.9%
49	49 YEARS OLD	35	1.3%
50	50 YEARS OLD	58	2.1%
51	51 YEARS OLD	48	1.8%
52	52 YEARS OLD	60	2.2%
53	53 YEARS OLD	58	2.1%
54	54 YEARS OLD	39	1.4%
55	55 YEARS OLD	49	1.8%
56	56 YEARS OLD	36	1.3%
57	57 YEARS OLD	42	1.5%
58	58 YEARS OLD	41	1.5%
59	59 YEARS OLD	40	1.5%
60	60 YEARS OLD	44	1.6%

# v1535: AGE OF RESPONDENT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
61	61 YEARS OLD	33	<div></div> 1.2%
62	62 YEARS OLD	37	<div></div> 1.4%
63	63 YEARS OLD	32	<div></div> 1.2%
64	64 YEARS OLD	29	<div></div> 1.1%
65	65 YEARS OLD	35	<div></div> 1.3%
66	66 YEARS OLD	34	<div></div> 1.2%
67	67 YEARS OLD	37	<div></div> 1.4%
68	68 YEARS OLD	40	<div></div> 1.5%
69	69 YEARS OLD	32	<div></div> 1.2%
70	70 YEARS OLD	26	<div></div> 1.0%
71	71 YEARS OLD	26	<div></div> 1.0%
72	72 YEARS OLD	28	<div></div> 1.0%
73	73 YEARS OLD	17	<div></div> 0.6%
74	74 YEARS OLD	15	<div></div> 0.6%
75	75 YEARS OLD	23	<div></div> 0.8%
76	76 YEARS OLD	10	<div></div> 0.4%
77	77 YEARS OLD	17	<div></div> 0.6%
78	78 YEARS OLD	12	<div></div> 0.4%
79	79 YEARS OLD	10	<div></div> 0.4%
80	80 YEARS OLD	21	<div></div> 0.8%
81	81 YEARS OLD	4	<div></div> 0.1%
82	82 YEARS OLD	5	<div></div> 0.2%
83	83 YEARS OLD	4	<div></div> 0.1%
84	84 YEARS OLD	5	<div></div> 0.2%
85	85 YEARS OLD	2	<div></div> 0.1%
86	86 YEARS OLD	5	<div></div> 0.2%
87	87 YEARS OLD	6	<div></div> 0.2%
88	88 YEARS OLD	3	<div></div> 0.1%
89	89 YEARS OLD	2	<div></div> 0.1%
90	90 YEARS OLD	10	<div></div> 0.4%
91	91 YEARS OLD	2	<div></div> 0.1%
92	92 YEARS OLD	0	
93	93 YEARS OLD	1	<div></div> 0.0%
94	94 YEARS OLD	0	
95	95 YEARS OLD	0	
96	96 YEARS OLD	0	
97	97 YEARS OLD	0	
98	98 YEARS OLD	0	
99	99 YEARS OR OVER	0	
0	REFUSED (NO ESTIMATE), NO 1979 INTERVIEW	40	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1536: COMMUNITY SIZE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v1536: COMMUNITY SIZE			
Literal question		COMMUNITY SIZE	
Notes		DETERMINED BY INTERVIEWER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OVER 500000 (CITY CORE)	475	<div><div></div></div> 17.3%
2	OVER 500000 (ADJACENT SUBURB)	246	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
3	OVER 500000 (DISTANT SUBURB)	224	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
4	100000 - 500000	354	<div><div></div></div> 12.9%
5	30000 - 100000	219	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
6	10000 - 30000	210	<div><div></div></div> 7.7%
7	1000 - 10000	256	<div><div></div></div> 9.3%
8	RURAL NON-FARM	591	<div><div></div></div> 21.5%
9	FARM	168	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW	18	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v1537: SEX OF RESPONDENT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		RESPONDENT'S SEX	
Notes		Q114 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		18	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
1	MALE	1312	<div><div></div></div> 47.5%
2	FEMALE	1431	<div><div></div></div> 51.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION 1980			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9182] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=3112.327 /-] [StdDev=2996.248 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
Notes		THE 1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS ARE UNIQUE ONES; THEY ARE NOT THE SAME AS THE 1979 IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS, EVEN FOR PANEL CASES.	
# v2003: HALF SAMPLE 1980 ELECTION			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	<div><div></div></div> 36.7%
1	HALF-SAMPLE 1	903	<div><div></div></div> 32.7%
2	HALF-SAMPLE 2	845	<div><div></div></div> 30.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2004: 1980 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.91] [Missing=*]	

# v2004: 1980 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.647 /-] [StdDev=0.561 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		WEIGHTING SECTION	
Notes		(FOR COMPLETE WEIGHTING INFORMATION SEE CODE BOOK INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE NO. 4001 TO 4038.) 1980 CROSS-SECTION WEIGHTS NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 1786. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v2005: 1980 FILTER:1			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 CROSS-SECTION FILTER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1980 CROSS-SECTION	1013	<div><div></div></div> 36.7%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1980 CROSS-SECTION	1748	<div><div></div></div> 63.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2006: 1980 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2.28] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.109 /-] [StdDev=0.359 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		1980 MARITIME CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 300. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v2007: 1980 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2.17] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.136 /-] [StdDev=0.386 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 375. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v2008: 1980 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.74] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Notes		1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 271. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2495	<div><div></div></div> 90.4%
0.77		81	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
0.98		66	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
1.12		8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

# v2008: 1980 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1.2		107	<div></div> 3.9%
1.42		1	0.0%
1.74		3	0.1%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2009: 1980 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.8] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.166 /-] [StdDev=0.384 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Notes	1980 WESTERN PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 457. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v2012: DATE OF INTERVIEW			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	<div></div> 36.7%
1	WEEK OF MARCH 17	223	<div></div> 8.1%
2	WEEK OF MARCH 24	712	<div></div> 25.8%
3	WEEK OF MARCH 31	465	<div></div> 16.8%
4	WEEK OF APRIL 7	232	<div></div> 8.4%
5	WEEK OF ARPIL 14	43	<div></div> 1.6%
6	WEEK OF APRIL 21	18	<div></div> 0.7%
7	WEEK OF APRIL 28	45	<div></div> 1.6%
8	WEEK OF MAY 5	3	0.1%
9	WEEK OF MAY 12	7	0.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2013: LANGUAGE OF INTERVW			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED:		
Notes	Q42 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	<div></div> 36.7%
1	ENGLISH	1318	<div></div> 47.7%
2	FRENCH	430	<div></div> 15.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9247] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Literal question	1974 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
Notes	CASES WITHOUT 1974 INTERVIEW, OR WITHOUT 1980 INTERVIEW, ARE CODED 0000.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1974 INTERVIEW OR NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1936	70.1%
3		1	0.0%
4		1	0.0%
6		1	0.0%
8		1	0.0%
12		1	0.0%
14		1	0.0%
16		1	0.0%
17		1	0.0%
23		1	0.0%
25		1	0.0%
26		1	0.0%
27		1	0.0%
34		1	0.0%
36		1	0.0%
38		1	0.0%
42		1	0.0%
43		1	0.0%
45		1	0.0%
48		1	0.0%
49		1	0.0%
53		1	0.0%
55		1	0.0%
60		1	0.0%
62		1	0.0%
66		1	0.0%
69		1	0.0%
70		1	0.0%
71		1	0.0%
75		1	0.0%
78		1	0.0%
81		1	0.0%
84		1	0.0%
85		1	0.0%
87		1	0.0%
89		1	0.0%
91		1	0.0%
94		1	0.0%
96		1	0.0%
97		1	0.0%
98		1	0.0%
1001		1	0.0%
1007		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1008		1	0.0%
1009		1	0.0%
1010		1	0.0%
1012		1	0.0%
1014		1	0.0%
1018		1	0.0%
1021		1	0.0%
1023		1	0.0%
1025		1	0.0%
1026		1	0.0%
1027		1	0.0%
1029		1	0.0%
1030		1	0.0%
1032		1	0.0%
1035		1	0.0%
1037		1	0.0%
1038		1	0.0%
1039		1	0.0%
1040		1	0.0%
1043		1	0.0%
1044		1	0.0%
1045		1	0.0%
1049		1	0.0%
1050		1	0.0%
1051		1	0.0%
1055		1	0.0%
1057		1	0.0%
1058		1	0.0%
1063		1	0.0%
1065		1	0.0%
1066		1	0.0%
1067		1	0.0%
1070		1	0.0%
1071		1	0.0%
1073		1	0.0%
1075		1	0.0%
1077		1	0.0%
1079		1	0.0%
1084		1	0.0%
1085		1	0.0%
1086		1	0.0%
1090		1	0.0%
1093		1	0.0%
1094		1	0.0%
2004		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2009		1	0.0%
2011		1	0.0%
2013		1	0.0%
2017		1	0.0%
2018		1	0.0%
2019		1	0.0%
2022		1	0.0%
2023		1	0.0%
2030		1	0.0%
2035		1	0.0%
2039		1	0.0%
2040		1	0.0%
2042		1	0.0%
2045		1	0.0%
2046		1	0.0%
2051		1	0.0%
2056		1	0.0%
2057		1	0.0%
2058		1	0.0%
2064		1	0.0%
2065		1	0.0%
2066		1	0.0%
2069		1	0.0%
2071		1	0.0%
2074		1	0.0%
2075		1	0.0%
2076		1	0.0%
2079		1	0.0%
2081		1	0.0%
2086		1	0.0%
2089		1	0.0%
2092		1	0.0%
2095		1	0.0%
2096		1	0.0%
2098		1	0.0%
2101		1	0.0%
2102		1	0.0%
2103		1	0.0%
2104		1	0.0%
2106		1	0.0%
2107		1	0.0%
2113		1	0.0%
2116		1	0.0%
2117		1	0.0%
2122		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2123		1	0.0%
2126		1	0.0%
2127		1	0.0%
2129		1	0.0%
2130		1	0.0%
2132		1	0.0%
2136		1	0.0%
2141		1	0.0%
2143		1	0.0%
2145		1	0.0%
2147		1	0.0%
2148		1	0.0%
2149		1	0.0%
2150		1	0.0%
2152		1	0.0%
2153		1	0.0%
2154		1	0.0%
2156		1	0.0%
2159		1	0.0%
2164		1	0.0%
2165		1	0.0%
2166		1	0.0%
2168		1	0.0%
2169		1	0.0%
2170		1	0.0%
2171		1	0.0%
2172		1	0.0%
2173		1	0.0%
2174		1	0.0%
2180		1	0.0%
3004		1	0.0%
3007		1	0.0%
3008		1	0.0%
3010		1	0.0%
3012		1	0.0%
3014		1	0.0%
3020		1	0.0%
3025		1	0.0%
3028		1	0.0%
3032		1	0.0%
3038		1	0.0%
3047		1	0.0%
3050		1	0.0%
3052		1	0.0%
3061		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3062		1	0.0%
3078		1	0.0%
3079		2	0.1%
3081		1	0.0%
3082		1	0.0%
3093		1	0.0%
3094		1	0.0%
3098		1	0.0%
3100		1	0.0%
3103		1	0.0%
3106		1	0.0%
3108		1	0.0%
3109		1	0.0%
3119		1	0.0%
3120		1	0.0%
3122		1	0.0%
3130		1	0.0%
3134		1	0.0%
4001		1	0.0%
4007		1	0.0%
4008		1	0.0%
4009		1	0.0%
4011		1	0.0%
4014		1	0.0%
4015		1	0.0%
4017		1	0.0%
4018		1	0.0%
4019		1	0.0%
4021		1	0.0%
4025		1	0.0%
4026		1	0.0%
4028		1	0.0%
4034		1	0.0%
4046		1	0.0%
4055		1	0.0%
4056		1	0.0%
4057		1	0.0%
4061		1	0.0%
4064		1	0.0%
4067		1	0.0%
4068		1	0.0%
4069		1	0.0%
4074		1	0.0%
4079		1	0.0%
4081		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4082		1	0.0%
4087		1	0.0%
4091		1	0.0%
4092		1	0.0%
4093		1	0.0%
4102		1	0.0%
4116		1	0.0%
4118		1	0.0%
4120		1	0.0%
4122		1	0.0%
4125		1	0.0%
4137		1	0.0%
4146		1	0.0%
4149		1	0.0%
4157		1	0.0%
4164		1	0.0%
4165		1	0.0%
4166		1	0.0%
4167		1	0.0%
4170		1	0.0%
4172		1	0.0%
4176		1	0.0%
4185		1	0.0%
4186		1	0.0%
4191		1	0.0%
4193		1	0.0%
4200		1	0.0%
4202		1	0.0%
4206		1	0.0%
4210		1	0.0%
4214		1	0.0%
4215		1	0.0%
4220		1	0.0%
4227		1	0.0%
4228		1	0.0%
4231		1	0.0%
4232		1	0.0%
4241		1	0.0%
4242		1	0.0%
4250		1	0.0%
4251		1	0.0%
4252		1	0.0%
4273		1	0.0%
4280		1	0.0%
4296		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4300		1	0.0%
4310		1	0.0%
4311		1	0.0%
4314		1	0.0%
4315		1	0.0%
4319		1	0.0%
4320		1	0.0%
4331		1	0.0%
4332		1	0.0%
4333		1	0.0%
4334		1	0.0%
4340		1	0.0%
4342		1	0.0%
4343		1	0.0%
4344		1	0.0%
4347		1	0.0%
4352		1	0.0%
4355		1	0.0%
4358		1	0.0%
4360		1	0.0%
4363		1	0.0%
4365		1	0.0%
4367		1	0.0%
4368		1	0.0%
4369		1	0.0%
4378		1	0.0%
4379		1	0.0%
4382		1	0.0%
4383		1	0.0%
4385		1	0.0%
4388		1	0.0%
4389		1	0.0%
4393		1	0.0%
4406		1	0.0%
4409		1	0.0%
4413		1	0.0%
4415		1	0.0%
4419		1	0.0%
4420		1	0.0%
4421		1	0.0%
4423		1	0.0%
4429		1	0.0%
4431		1	0.0%
4442		1	0.0%
4449		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4453		1	0.0%
4454		1	0.0%
4455		1	0.0%
4468		1	0.0%
4473		1	0.0%
4474		1	0.0%
4481		1	0.0%
4482		1	0.0%
4484		1	0.0%
4485		1	0.0%
4486		1	0.0%
4493		1	0.0%
4494		1	0.0%
4505		1	0.0%
4506		1	0.0%
4508		1	0.0%
4511		1	0.0%
4512		1	0.0%
4513		1	0.0%
4514		1	0.0%
4515		1	0.0%
4524		1	0.0%
4525		1	0.0%
4527		1	0.0%
4528		1	0.0%
4533		1	0.0%
4535		1	0.0%
4545		1	0.0%
4548		1	0.0%
4549		1	0.0%
4551		1	0.0%
4553		1	0.0%
4559		1	0.0%
4561		1	0.0%
4572		1	0.0%
4576		1	0.0%
4578		1	0.0%
4585		1	0.0%
4586		1	0.0%
4588		1	0.0%
4589		1	0.0%
4598		1	0.0%
4599		1	0.0%
4600		1	0.0%
4611		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4613		1	0.0%
4614		1	0.0%
4632		1	0.0%
4634		1	0.0%
4635		1	0.0%
4636		1	0.0%
4644		1	0.0%
4650		1	0.0%
4651		1	0.0%
4652		1	0.0%
4653		1	0.0%
4663		1	0.0%
4667		1	0.0%
4669		1	0.0%
4670		1	0.0%
4671		1	0.0%
4672		1	0.0%
4673		1	0.0%
4674		1	0.0%
4676		1	0.0%
4678		1	0.0%
4681		1	0.0%
4682		1	0.0%
4683		1	0.0%
4688		1	0.0%
4689		1	0.0%
4696		1	0.0%
4697		1	0.0%
4700		1	0.0%
4701		1	0.0%
5006		1	0.0%
5008		1	0.0%
5009		1	0.0%
5010		1	0.0%
5014		1	0.0%
5016		1	0.0%
5020		1	0.0%
5021		1	0.0%
5033		1	0.0%
5045		1	0.0%
5046		1	0.0%
5048		1	0.0%
5049		1	0.0%
5053		1	0.0%
5055		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5056		1	0.0%
5057		1	0.0%
5065		1	0.0%
5066		1	0.0%
5067		1	0.0%
5070		1	0.0%
5071		1	0.0%
5074		1	0.0%
5075		1	0.0%
5088		1	0.0%
5100		1	0.0%
5102		1	0.0%
5103		1	0.0%
5104		1	0.0%
5106		1	0.0%
5107		1	0.0%
5110		1	0.0%
5111		1	0.0%
5115		1	0.0%
5117		1	0.0%
5118		1	0.0%
5121		1	0.0%
5126		1	0.0%
5128		1	0.0%
5131		1	0.0%
5132		1	0.0%
5150		1	0.0%
5152		1	0.0%
5153		1	0.0%
5157		1	0.0%
5160		1	0.0%
5165		1	0.0%
5169		1	0.0%
5172		1	0.0%
5173		1	0.0%
5174		1	0.0%
5180		1	0.0%
5184		1	0.0%
5187		1	0.0%
5196		1	0.0%
5201		1	0.0%
5202		1	0.0%
5212		1	0.0%
5215		1	0.0%
5227		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5228		1	0.0%
5234		1	0.0%
5238		1	0.0%
5239		1	0.0%
5240		1	0.0%
5248		1	0.0%
5249		1	0.0%
5250		1	0.0%
5251		1	0.0%
5252		1	0.0%
5256		1	0.0%
5258		1	0.0%
5263		1	0.0%
5264		1	0.0%
5266		1	0.0%
5270		1	0.0%
5272		1	0.0%
5275		1	0.0%
5279		1	0.0%
5287		1	0.0%
5290		1	0.0%
5292		1	0.0%
5295		1	0.0%
5299		1	0.0%
5300		1	0.0%
5301		1	0.0%
5304		1	0.0%
5305		1	0.0%
5307		1	0.0%
5312		1	0.0%
5314		1	0.0%
5316		1	0.0%
5318		1	0.0%
5322		1	0.0%
5325		1	0.0%
5326		1	0.0%
5327		1	0.0%
5330		1	0.0%
5332		1	0.0%
5334		1	0.0%
5336		1	0.0%
5337		1	0.0%
5338		1	0.0%
5341		1	0.0%
5353		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5355		1	0.0%
5356		1	0.0%
5357		1	0.0%
5360		1	0.0%
5363		1	0.0%
5368		1	0.0%
5376		1	0.0%
5378		1	0.0%
5379		1	0.0%
5384		1	0.0%
5387		1	0.0%
5391		1	0.0%
5392		1	0.0%
5393		1	0.0%
5395		1	0.0%
5403		1	0.0%
5405		1	0.0%
5407		1	0.0%
5412		1	0.0%
5413		1	0.0%
5416		1	0.0%
5423		1	0.0%
5426		1	0.0%
5430		2	0.1%
5432		1	0.0%
5433		1	0.0%
5438		1	0.0%
5440		1	0.0%
5443		1	0.0%
5444		1	0.0%
5447		1	0.0%
5448		1	0.0%
5449		1	0.0%
5450		1	0.0%
5451		1	0.0%
5452		1	0.0%
5453		1	0.0%
5455		1	0.0%
5457		1	0.0%
5458		1	0.0%
5460		1	0.0%
5463		1	0.0%
5470		1	0.0%
5473		1	0.0%
5475		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5476		1	0.0%
5477		1	0.0%
5478		1	0.0%
5482		1	0.0%
5483		1	0.0%
5484		1	0.0%
5485		1	0.0%
5489		1	0.0%
5492		1	0.0%
5496		1	0.0%
5500		1	0.0%
5501		1	0.0%
5505		1	0.0%
5513		1	0.0%
5514		1	0.0%
5516		1	0.0%
5517		1	0.0%
5529		1	0.0%
5539		1	0.0%
5540		1	0.0%
5543		1	0.0%
5552		1	0.0%
5558		1	0.0%
5564		1	0.0%
5574		1	0.0%
5579		1	0.0%
5587		1	0.0%
5591		1	0.0%
5595		1	0.0%
5596		1	0.0%
5599		1	0.0%
5603		1	0.0%
5610		1	0.0%
5613		1	0.0%
5618		1	0.0%
5621		1	0.0%
5624		1	0.0%
5625		1	0.0%
5627		1	0.0%
5633		1	0.0%
5637		1	0.0%
5641		1	0.0%
5644		1	0.0%
5649		1	0.0%
5652		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5657		1	0.0%
5658		1	0.0%
5659		1	0.0%
5662		1	0.0%
5663		1	0.0%
5666		1	0.0%
5672		1	0.0%
5673		1	0.0%
5680		1	0.0%
5685		1	0.0%
5687		1	0.0%
5690		1	0.0%
5691		1	0.0%
5692		1	0.0%
5696		1	0.0%
5702		1	0.0%
5708		1	0.0%
6001		1	0.0%
6004		2	0.1%
6005		1	0.0%
6006		1	0.0%
6007		1	0.0%
6011		1	0.0%
6016		1	0.0%
6019		1	0.0%
6025		1	0.0%
6026		1	0.0%
6028		1	0.0%
6034		1	0.0%
6035		1	0.0%
6037		1	0.0%
6042		1	0.0%
6044		1	0.0%
6045		1	0.0%
6050		1	0.0%
6051		1	0.0%
6053		1	0.0%
6054		1	0.0%
6055		1	0.0%
6058		1	0.0%
6063		1	0.0%
6071		1	0.0%
6072		1	0.0%
6074		1	0.0%
6075		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6081		1	0.0%
6082		1	0.0%
6083		1	0.0%
6085		1	0.0%
6086		1	0.0%
6087		1	0.0%
6091		1	0.0%
6092		1	0.0%
6095		1	0.0%
6097		1	0.0%
6098		1	0.0%
6099		1	0.0%
6100		1	0.0%
6102		1	0.0%
6103		1	0.0%
6106		1	0.0%
6107		1	0.0%
6110		1	0.0%
6111		1	0.0%
7002		1	0.0%
7003		1	0.0%
7004		1	0.0%
7007		1	0.0%
7008		1	0.0%
7010		1	0.0%
7011		1	0.0%
7015		1	0.0%
7018		1	0.0%
7019		1	0.0%
7022		1	0.0%
7025		1	0.0%
7026		1	0.0%
7030		1	0.0%
7031		1	0.0%
7035		1	0.0%
7037		1	0.0%
7039		1	0.0%
7046		1	0.0%
7047		1	0.0%
7049		1	0.0%
7053		1	0.0%
7054		1	0.0%
7056		1	0.0%
7059		1	0.0%
7060		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7061		1	0.0%
7062		1	0.0%
7064		1	0.0%
7065		1	0.0%
7069		1	0.0%
7070		1	0.0%
7071		1	0.0%
7072		1	0.0%
7080		1	0.0%
7085		1	0.0%
7088		1	0.0%
7090		1	0.0%
7091		1	0.0%
7092		1	0.0%
7094		1	0.0%
7098		1	0.0%
7100		1	0.0%
7891		1	0.0%
8004		1	0.0%
8008		1	0.0%
8011		1	0.0%
8013		1	0.0%
8015		1	0.0%
8019		1	0.0%
8021		1	0.0%
8023		1	0.0%
8024		1	0.0%
8027		1	0.0%
8031		1	0.0%
8032		1	0.0%
8038		1	0.0%
8041		1	0.0%
8042		1	0.0%
8043		1	0.0%
8045		1	0.0%
8051		1	0.0%
8057		1	0.0%
8058		1	0.0%
8060		1	0.0%
8062		1	0.0%
8069		1	0.0%
8070		1	0.0%
8071		1	0.0%
8073		1	0.0%
8077		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8087		1	0.0%
8093		1	0.0%
8095		1	0.0%
8100		2	0.1%
8101		1	0.0%
8107		1	0.0%
8112		1	0.0%
8113		1	0.0%
8121		1	0.0%
8123		1	0.0%
8127		1	0.0%
8132		1	0.0%
8136		1	0.0%
8137		1	0.0%
8138		1	0.0%
8152		1	0.0%
8153		1	0.0%
8154		1	0.0%
8156		1	0.0%
8158		1	0.0%
8163		1	0.0%
8169		1	0.0%
8171		1	0.0%
8172		1	0.0%
8174		1	0.0%
8191		1	0.0%
9005		1	0.0%
9006		1	0.0%
9009		1	0.0%
9010		1	0.0%
9011		1	0.0%
9012		1	0.0%
9013		1	0.0%
9017		1	0.0%
9021		1	0.0%
9024		1	0.0%
9025		1	0.0%
9027		1	0.0%
9029		1	0.0%
9036		1	0.0%
9042		1	0.0%
9043		1	0.0%
9044		1	0.0%
9047		1	0.0%
9048		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9052		1	0.0%
9056		1	0.0%
9061		1	0.0%
9062		1	0.0%
9067		1	0.0%
9068		1	0.0%
9080		1	0.0%
9081		1	0.0%
9083		1	0.0%
9086		1	0.0%
9092		1	0.0%
9099		1	0.0%
9100		1	0.0%
9101		1	0.0%
9111		1	0.0%
9113		1	0.0%
9114		1	0.0%
9117		1	0.0%
9119		1	0.0%
9120		1	0.0%
9128		1	0.0%
9129		1	0.0%
9131		1	0.0%
9132		1	0.0%
9134		1	0.0%
9136		1	0.0%
9137		1	0.0%
9149		1	0.0%
9154		1	0.0%
9161		1	0.0%
9162		1	0.0%
9164		1	0.0%
9171		1	0.0%
9177		1	0.0%
9180		1	0.0%
9187		1	0.0%
9188		1	0.0%
9199		1	0.0%
9203		1	0.0%
9205		1	0.0%
9207		1	0.0%
9212		1	0.0%
9215		1	0.0%
9216		1	0.0%
9217		1	0.0%

v2157: 1974 RESPONDENT ID NO-MATCH

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9218		1	0.0%
9223		1	0.0%
9224		1	0.0%
9225		1	0.0%
9231		1	0.0%
9233		1	0.0%
9236		1	0.0%
9238		1	0.0%
9239		1	0.0%
9240		1	0.0%
9241		1	0.0%
9242		1	0.0%
9246		1	0.0%
9247		1	0.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2158: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION 1979

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9273] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
Notes	CASES WITHOUT 1979 INTERVIEW ARE CODED 0000, AS ARE CASES WITHOUT 1980 INTERVIEW.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW OR NO 1980 INTERVIEW		

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2002: PROVINCE OF INTERVIEW 80

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	PROVINCE

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEWFOUNDLAND	73	2.6%
1	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	82	3.0%
2	NOVIA SCOTIA	133	4.8%
3	NEW BRUNSWICK	78	2.8%
4	QUEBEC	446	16.2%
5	ONTARIO	488	17.7%
6	MANITOBA	89	3.2%
7	SASKATCHEWAN	67	2.4%
8	ALBERTA	110	4.0%
9	BRITISH COLUMBIA	182	6.6%
99	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	36.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2010: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-912] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1748 /-] [Invalid=1013 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1980 CONSTITUENCY NUMBER		
Notes	Q10D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BONAVISTA-TRINITY-CONCEPTION (086, 132, 178, 190)	15	0.9%
2	GANDER TWILLINGATE (028, 137, 187, 210)	18	1.0%
3	HUMBER-PORT-AU-PORT-ST. BARBE (006, 073, 143, 179)	20	1.1%
4	ST. JOHN'S EAST (005, 014, 160, 189, 205)	19	1.1%
101	CARDIGAN (013, 037, 045, 052, 082)	24	1.4%
102	EGMONT (003, 024, 044, 068)	16	0.9%
103	HILLSBOROUGH (012, 023, 035, 036, 046, 047, 052, 054)	33	1.9%
104	MALPEQUE (006, 007, 039, 056, 062, 077)	12	0.7%
201	ANNAPOLIS VALLEY-HANTS (069, 097, 112, 171)	17	1.0%
202	CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS-CANSO (013, 142, 148, 195, 217)	23	1.3%
203	CENTRAL NOVA (060, 094, 101, 146, 168)	21	1.2%
204	CUMBERLAND-COLCHESTER (011, 020, 087, 120, 146, 143)	17	1.0%
205	DARTMOUTH-HALIFAX EAST (010, 011, 054, 055, 057, 131, 136, 2	26	1.5%
206	HALIFAX (152)	7	0.4%
207	HALIFAX WEST (062, 123, 153, 174)	19	1.1%
208	SOUTH NOVA (039)	4	0.2%
301	FUNDY-ROYAL (024, 025, 051, 059, 063)	21	1.2%
302	MADAWASKA-VICTORIA (020, 055, 076, 113, 116)	13	0.7%
303	RESTIGOUCHE (024, 063, 079, 080, 081, 139, 149)	16	0.9%
304	SAINT JOHN (051, 052, 058, 059, 071, 095, 096, 097, 098, 10	28	1.6%
401	ARGENTEUIL (040)	3	0.2%
402	CHICOUTIMI (004, 005, 058, 059, 159)	19	1.1%
403	FRONTENAC (012, 044, 150, 174)	16	0.9%
404	GASPE (041, 097, 139, 146)	10	0.6%
405	HULL (040, 049, 085, 233)	14	0.8%
406	JONQUIERE (050, 051, 076, 077, 078, 086, 091)	19	1.1%
407	LAPRAIRIE (038, 188, 189, 190)	9	0.5%
408	LEVIS (075, 152, 219, 235)	14	0.8%
409	LONGUEUIL (017, 018, 066, 131, 133, 135, 220, 222, 224)	17	1.0%
410	LOTBINIERE (089, 090, 113, 114, 115, 169, 231)	15	0.9%
411	SAINT DENIS (089, 090, 113, 114, 115, 169, 231)	5	0.3%
412	BOURASSA (096, 100, 227, 228, 229)	6	0.3%
413	DOLLARD (093, 134, 173)	11	0.6%
414	GAMELIN (005, 080, 108, 111, 180, 191)	18	1.0%
415	LACHINE (112, 175)	6	0.3%
416	SAINTE-MAIRE (HACHELAGA) (007, 045, 046)	8	0.5%
417	ROSEMONT (178, 217, 210, 211)	13	0.7%
418	MOUNT ROYAL (004, 014, 181)	11	0.6%

v2010: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
419	PORTNEUF (101, 171, 178)	16	0.9%
420	QUEBEC EAST (094, 095, 096, 163, 194, 216, 242)	19	1.1%
421	RICHMOND (015, 087, 092, 164)	17	1.0%
422	ROBERVAL (068, 085, 087, 128, 161)	14	0.8%
423	SAINT-HYACINTHE (120, 122, 174, 189, 224, 226)	14	0.8%
424	SAINT-MAURICE (097, 103, 110, 162)	15	0.9%
425	SHERBROOKE (004, 114, 145, 231)	13	0.7%
426	TERREBONNE (110, 125, 218, 267, 335)	9	0.5%
427	TROIS-RIVIERES (061, 112)	10	0.6%
428	VAUDREUIL (068, 114, 115, 167, 168, 169, 177, 224, 267)	21	1.2%
429	BLAINVILLE-DEUX-MONTAGNES (025, 026, 104, 105, 199, 200, 20)	20	1.1%
430	CHATEAUQUAY (039, 040, 107, 108, 113, 115)	11	0.6%
431	CHAMBLY (014, 015)	1	0.1%
432	LAVAL-DES RAPIDES (193, 203, 210, 211, 250)	14	0.8%
433	SAINT MICHEL (138, 139, 145, 148)	9	0.5%
434	NOTRE DAME-DE-GRACE (035, 047)	7	0.4%
435	SAINT HENRI-WESTMOUNT (179)	6	0.3%
436	HACHELAGA-MAISONNEUVE (002)	3	0.2%
437	CHAMPLAIN (037, 053, 054)	13	0.7%
501	ALGOMA (037, 056, 119, 156)	20	1.1%
502	BRANT (037, 118, 120, 283, 284)	13	0.7%
503	THUNDER BAY-ATIHOKAN (044, 072, 083, 128)	13	0.7%
504	HALTON (028, 147, 234, 269)	16	0.9%
505	HAMILTON EAST (063, 066, 086)	13	0.7%
506	PRINCE EDWARD-HASTINGS (082, 103, 156)	14	0.8%
507	HURON-BRUCE (033, 059, 162, 168)	14	0.8%
508	KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS (013, 090, 182, 270, 274, 275, 276)	16	0.9%
509	KITCHENER (125, 177, 223)	14	0.8%
510	KENT (100, 200)	11	0.6%
511	LONDON-MIDDLESEX (009, 010, 087, 138)	13	0.7%
512	DURHAM-NORTHUMBERLAND (057, 058, 070)	10	0.6%
513	ONTARIO (052, 060, 065, 066, 194, 229)	14	0.8%
514	OTTAWA WEST (028, 180, 181, 205)	10	0.6%
515	SIMCOE SOUTH (015, 017, 158, 159)	8	0.5%
516	MISSISSAUGA NORTH (009, 013, 019)	12	0.7%
517	SARNIA (040, 041, 099, 114, 115, 198, 199)	20	1.1%
518	SIMCOE-NORTH (059, 070, 074, 148, 178)	11	0.6%
519	BROADVIEW GREENWOOD (052, 055, 056)	5	0.3%
520	DON VALLEY (121, 166, 281, 312)	13	0.7%
521	ETOBICOKE-LAKESHORE (077, 130, 159, 194)	18	1.0%
522	ROSEDALE (059, 060, 143, 217, 210, 215)	21	1.2%
523	ST. PAULS (102, 103, 181, 188)	15	0.9%
524	YORK CENTRE (145, 180, 182, 196, 197, 198, 206)	12	0.7%
525	YORK-SCARBOROUGH (218, 219)	5	0.3%

v2010: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
526	YORK-WEST (118, 143, 151, 173, 174)	17	1.0%
527	WELLINGTON-DUFFERIN-SIMCOE (050, 051, 064, 065, 072)	15	0.9%
528	WINDSOR-WALKERVILLE (061, 104, 112, 113, 134)	20	1.1%
529	BRAMPTON-GEORGETOWN (010, 048, 051, 073, 077, 078, 173, 299)	12	0.7%
530	HAMILTON WEST (250)	3	0.2%
531	HASTINGS-FRONTENAC (029)	4	0.2%
532	WATERLOO (043, 044)	4	0.2%
533	ESSEX-KENT (020)	5	0.3%
534	LONDON-MIDDLESEX (017, 179, 180)	12	0.7%
535	NORTHUMBERLAND (057, P058, 070)	9	0.5%
536	VICTORIA-HALIBURTON (177)	1	0.1%
537	OTTAWA CENTRE (135, 142, 143)	10	0.6%
538	YORK-PEEL (257)	3	0.2%
539	MISSISSAUGA SOUTH (084, 254)	8	0.5%
540	SPADINA (062)	3	0.2%
541	YORK EAST (230)	7	0.4%
542	DON VALLEY EAST (068, 072, 223, 244, 248)	15	0.9%
543	SCARBOROUGH CENTRE (032)	3	0.2%
544	YORK SOUTH-WESTON (055)	3	0.2%
545	GUELPH (196, 197)	2	0.1%
601	BRANDON-SOURIS (027, 038, 080, 156, 157, 158, 200)	23	1.3%
602	PORTAGE-MARQUETTE (043, 080, 107, 141)	24	1.4%
603	WINNIPEG NORTH (004, 052, 053, 079, 089, 090, 108, 138, 139,	20	1.1%
604	WINNIPEG-ST. JAMES (063, 064, 065, 075, 079, 111, 181)	9	0.5%
605	WINNIPEG-ASSINIBOINE (122, 123, 124, 161, 216)	13	0.7%
701	KINDERSLEY-LLOYDMINSTER (068, 081, 095, 151)	15	0.9%
702	MOOSE JAW (022, 048, 070, 136)	20	1.1%
703	REGINA EAST (004, 043, 101, 122, 204)	15	0.9%
704	SASKATOON EAST (001, 113)	8	0.5%
705	HUMBOLDT-LAKE CENTRE (091, 179, 180)	8	0.5%
801	CROWFOOT (020, 074, 086, 087, 088, 152)	8	0.5%
802	CALGARY SOUTH (093, 110)	8	0.5%
803	EDMONTON-WEST (092, 116)	6	0.3%
804	MEDICINE HAT (078, 110, 230, 206, 238, 239, 240)	17	1.0%
805	BOW RIVER (026, 225)	5	0.3%
806	WETASKIWIN (012, 013, 092, 093, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 157	15	0.9%
807	VEGREVILLE (008, 025)	10	0.6%
808	CALGARY WEST (117, 166, 168, 233, 236)	19	1.1%
809	CALGARY EAST (232)	5	0.3%
810	EDMONTON NORTH (039)	1	0.1%
811	EDMONTON EAST (170)	3	0.2%
812	CALGARY NORTH (014, 161, 162)	8	0.5%
813	YELLOWHEAD (170, 171)	5	0.3%
901	RICHMOND-SOUTH DELTA (007, 008, 027, 031, 032, 165, 166, 258	20	1.1%

# v2010: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
902	NORTH VANCOUVER-BURNABY (006, 105, 176, 182)	13	<div></div> 0.7%
903	FRASER VALLEY WEST (006, 024, 075, 077, 215, 230, 252)	20	<div></div> 1.1%
904	KOOTENAY EAST-REVELSTOKE (032, 033, 123, 155, 156, 157)	14	<div></div> 0.8%
905	SURREY, WHITE ROCK-NORTH DELTA (017, 085, 087, 088, 089, 138)	22	<div></div> 1.3%
906	VANCOUVER KINGSWAY (031, 041, 064, 137, 168)	20	<div></div> 1.1%
907	VANCOUVER QUADRA (004, 018, 051, 142, 219)	22	<div></div> 1.3%
908	VICTORIA (147, 174, 195, 196, 212, 223)	17	<div></div> 1.0%
909	BURNABY (034, 036)	9	<div></div> 0.5%
910	MIS ION-PORT MOODY (064, 065, 066, 070, 071, 151)	14	<div></div> 0.8%
911	NEW WESTMINSTER-COQUITLAM (017, 018)	3	<div></div> 0.2%
912	OKANAGAN NORTH (028, 084, 085)	7	<div></div> 0.4%
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW; RESPONDENT MOVED FROM ONE PROVINCE TO AN	1013	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2011: POLL NUMBER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-335] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1980 POLL NUMBER		
Notes	Q10D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1013	<div></div> 36.7%
1	POLL NUMBER 1	5	<div></div> 0.2%
2	POLL NUMBER 2	3	<div></div> 0.1%
3	POLL NUMBER 3	3	<div></div> 0.1%
4	POLL NUMBER 4	25	<div></div> 0.9%
5	POLL NUMBER 5	12	<div></div> 0.4%
6	POLL NUMBER 6	16	<div></div> 0.6%
7	POLL NUMBER 7	9	<div></div> 0.3%
8	POLL NUMBER 8	6	<div></div> 0.2%
9	POLL NUMBER 9	9	<div></div> 0.3%
10	POLL NUMBER 10	8	<div></div> 0.3%
11	POLL NUMBER 11	7	<div></div> 0.3%
12	POLL NUMBER 12	14	<div></div> 0.5%
13	POLL NUMBER 13	17	<div></div> 0.6%
14	POLL NUMBER 14	14	<div></div> 0.5%
15	POLL NUMBER 15	7	<div></div> 0.3%
16		3	<div></div> 0.1%
17	POLL NUMBER 17	17	<div></div> 0.6%
18	POLL NUMBER 18	5	<div></div> 0.2%
19	POLL NUMBER 19	4	<div></div> 0.1%
20	POLL NUMBER 20	10	<div></div> 0.4%
22	POLL NUMBER 22	4	<div></div> 0.1%
23	POLL NUMBER 23	7	<div></div> 0.3%

# v2011: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	POLL NUMBER 24	6	0.2%
25	POLL NUMBER 25	13	0.5%
26	POLL NUMBER 26	3	0.1%
27	POLL NUMBER 27	11	0.4%
28	POLL NUMBER 28	16	0.6%
29	POLL NUMBER 29	4	0.1%
31	POLL NUMBER 31	4	0.1%
32	POLL NUMBER 32	5	0.2%
33	POLL NUMBER 33	4	0.1%
34	POLL NUMBER 34	5	0.2%
35	POLL NUMBER 35	9	0.3%
36	POLL NUMBER 36	4	0.1%
37	POLL NUMBER 37	14	0.5%
38	POLL NUMBER 38	10	0.4%
39	POLL NUMBER 39	14	0.5%
40	POLL NUMBER 40	11	0.4%
41	POLL NUMBER 41	5	0.2%
43	POLL NUMBER 43	12	0.4%
44	POLL NUMBER 44	6	0.2%
45	POLL NUMBER 45	6	0.2%
46	POLL NUMBER 46	11	0.4%
47	POLL NUMBER 47	10	0.4%
48	POLL NUMBER 48	6	0.2%
49	POLL NUMBER 49	2	0.1%
50	POLL NUMBER 50	10	0.4%
51	POLL NUMBER 51	13	0.5%
52	POLL NUMBER 52	30	1.1%
53	POLL NUMBER 53	6	0.2%
54	POLL NUMBER 54	7	0.3%
55	POLL NUMBER 55	7	0.3%
56	POLL NUMBER 56	10	0.4%
57	POLL NUMBER 57	3	0.1%
58	POLL NUMBER 58	7	0.3%
59	POLL NUMBER 59	16	0.6%
60	POLL NUMBER 60	8	0.3%
61	POLL NUMBER 61	10	0.4%
62	POLL NUMBER 62	7	0.3%
63	POLL NUMBER 63	17	0.6%
64	POLL NUMBER 64	15	0.5%
65	POLL NUMBER 65	4	0.1%
66	POLL NUMBER 66	11	0.4%
68	POLL NUMBER 68	22	0.8%
69	POLL NUMBER 69	6	0.2%
70	POLL NUMBER 70	10	0.4%
71	POLL NUMBER 71	4	0.1%

# v2011: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
72	POLL NUMBER 72	10	0.4%
73	POLL NUMBER 73	7	0.3%
74	POLL NUMBER 74	4	0.1%
75	POLL NUMBER 75	15	0.5%
76	POLL NUMBER 76	9	0.3%
77	POLL NUMBER 77	10	0.4%
78	POLL NUMBER 78	0	
79	POLL NUMBER 79	7	0.3%
80	POLL NUMBER 80	16	0.6%
81	POLL NUMBER 81	6	0.2%
82	POLL NUMBER 82	6	0.2%
83	POLL NUMBER 83	5	0.2%
84	POLL NUMBER 84	6	0.2%
85	POLL NUMBER 85	15	0.5%
86	POLL NUMBER 86	10	0.4%
87	POLL NUMBER 87	12	0.4%
88	POLL NUMBER 88	0	
89	POLL NUMBER 89	8	0.3%
90	POLL NUMBER 90	7	0.3%
91	POLL NUMBER 91	10	0.4%
92	POLL NUMBER 92	12	0.4%
93	POLL NUMBER 93	6	0.2%
94	POLL NUMBER 94	8	0.3%
95	POLL NUMBER 95	7	0.3%
96	POLL NUMBER 96	5	0.2%
97	POLL NUMBER 97	9	0.3%
98	POLL NUMBER 98	0	
99	POLL NUMBER 99	6	0.2%
100	POLL NUMBER 100	5	0.2%
101	POLL NUMBER 101	13	0.5%
102	POLL NUMBER 102	6	0.2%
103	POLL NUMBER 103	15	0.5%
104	POLL NUMBER 104	7	0.3%
105	POLL NUMBER 105	4	0.1%
107	POLL NUMBER 107	10	0.4%
108	POLL NUMBER 108	7	0.3%
109		6	0.2%
110	POLL NUMBER 110	6	0.2%
111	POLL NUMBER 111	0	
112	POLL NUMBER 112	16	0.6%
113	POLL NUMBER 113	12	0.4%
114	POLL NUMBER 114	11	0.4%
115	POLL NUMBER 115	0	
116	POLL NUMBER 116	4	0.1%
117	POLL NUMBER 117	7	0.3%








v2011: POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
118	POLL NUMBER 118	6	0.2%
119	POLL NUMBER 119	6	0.2%
120	POLL NUMBER 120	7	0.3%
121	POLL NUMBER 121	6	0.2%
122	POLL NUMBER 122	12	0.4%
123	POLL NUMBER 123	13	0.5%
124	POLL NUMBER 124	0	
125	POLL NUMBER 125	5	0.2%
126	POLL NUMBER 126	0	
127	POLL NUMBER 127	0	
128	POLL NUMBER 128	5	0.2%
129	POLL NUMBER 129	0	
130	POLL NUMBER 130	6	0.2%
131	POLL NUMBER 131	11	0.4%
132	POLL NUMBER 132	4	0.1%
133	POLL NUMBER 133	0	
134	POLL NUMBER 134	9	0.3%
135	POLL NUMBER 135	4	0.1%
136	POLL NUMBER 136	9	0.3%
137	POLL NUMBER 137	9	0.3%
138	POLL NUMBER 138	18	0.7%
139	POLL NUMBER 139	8	0.3%
140	POLL NUMBER 140	2	0.1%
141	POLL NUMBER 141	6	0.2%
142	POLL NUMBER 142	18	0.7%
143	POLL NUMBER 143	13	0.5%
145	POLL NUMBER 145	7	0.3%
146	POLL NUMBER 146	12	0.4%
147	POLL NUMBER 147	11	0.4%
148	POLL NUMBER 148	16	0.6%
149	POLL NUMBER 149	4	0.1%
150	POLL NUMBER 150	5	0.2%
151	POLL NUMBER 151	10	0.4%
152	POLL NUMBER 152	15	0.5%
153	POLL NUMBER 153	5	0.2%
155	POLL NUMBER 155	10	0.4%
156	POLL NUMBER 156	9	0.3%
157	POLL NUMBER 157	1	0.0%
158	POLL NUMBER 158	4	0.1%
159	POLL NUMBER 159	9	0.3%
160	POLL NUMBER 160	5	0.2%
161	POLL NUMBER 161	13	0.5%
162	POLL NUMBER 162	5	0.2%
163	POLL NUMBER 163	1	0.0%
164	POLL NUMBER 164	5	0.2%

v2011: POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
165	POLL NUMBER 165	3	0.1%
166	POLL NUMBER 166	3	0.1%
167	POLL NUMBER 167	3	0.1%
168	POLL NUMBER 168	10	0.4%
169	POLL NUMBER 169	3	0.1%
170	POLL NUMBER 170	8	0.3%
171	POLL NUMBER 171	9	0.3%
173	POLL NUMBER 173	12	0.4%
174	POLL NUMBER 174	14	0.5%
175	POLL NUMBER 175	3	0.1%
176	POLL NUMBER 176	5	0.2%
177	POLL NUMBER 177	6	0.2%
178	POLL NUMBER 178	15	0.5%
179	POLL NUMBER 179	22	0.8%
180	POLL NUMBER 180	12	0.4%
181	POLL NUMBER 181	9	0.3%
182	POLL NUMBER 182	6	0.2%
187	POLL NUMBER 187	4	0.1%
188	POLL NUMBER 188	9	0.3%
189	POLL NUMBER 189	8	0.3%
190	POLL NUMBER 190	3	0.1%
191	POLL NUMBER 191	2	0.1%
193	POLL NUMBER 193	4	0.1%
194	POLL NUMBER 194	12	0.4%
195	POLL NUMBER 195	8	0.3%
196	POLL NUMBER 196	6	0.2%
197	POLL NUMBER 197	0	
198	POLL NUMBER 198	6	0.2%
199	POLL NUMBER 199	4	0.1%
200	POLL NUMBER 200	10	0.4%
201	POLL NUMBER 201	0	
203	POLL NUMBER 203	0	
204	POLL NUMBER 204	4	0.1%
205	POLL NUMBER 205	5	0.2%
206	POLL NUMBER 206	4	0.1%
208	POLL NUMBER 208	7	0.3%
210	POLL NUMBER 210	16	0.6%
211	POLL NUMBER 211	0	
212	POLL NUMBER 212	3	0.1%
215	POLL NUMBER 215	9	0.3%
216	POLL NUMBER 216	7	0.3%
217	POLL NUMBER 217	14	0.5%
218	POLL NUMBER 218	5	0.2%
219	POLL NUMBER 219	6	0.2%
220	POLL NUMBER 220	3	0.1%

# v2011: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
222	POLL NUMBER 222	0	
223	POLL NUMBER 223	13	0.5%
224	POLL NUMBER 224	9	0.3%
225	POLL NUMBER 225	2	0.1%
226	POLL NUMBER 226	0	
227	POLL NUMBER 227	2	0.1%
228	POLL NUMBER 228	0	
229	POLL NUMBER 229	4	0.1%
230	POLL NUMBER 230	15	0.5%
231	POLL NUMBER 231	5	0.2%
232	POLL NUMBER 232	5	0.2%
233	POLL NUMBER 233	7	0.3%
234	POLL NUMBER 234	6	0.2%
235	POLL NUMBER 235	4	0.1%
236	POLL NUMBER 236	5	0.2%
238	POLL NUMBER 238	5	0.2%
239	POLL NUMBER 239	0	
240	POLL NUMBER 240	0	
242	POLL NUMBER 242	8	0.3%
243	POLL NUMBER 243	0	
244	POLL NUMBER 244	5	0.2%
248	POLL NUMBER 248	0	
250	POLL NUMBER 250	8	0.3%
251	POLL NUMBER 251	5	0.2%
252	POLL NUMBER 252	0	
254	POLL NUMBER 254	5	0.2%
255	POLL NUMBER 255	6	0.2%
256	POLL NUMBER 256	0	
257	POLL NUMBER 257	3	0.1%
258	POLL NUMBER 258	6	0.2%
262		5	0.2%
267	POLL NUMBER 267	3	0.1%
269	POLL NUMBER 269	3	0.1%
270	POLL NUMBER 270	4	0.1%
274	POLL NUMBER 274	0	
275	POLL NUMBER 275	0	
276	POLL NUMBER 276	0	
281	POLL NUMBER 281	0	
283	POLL NUMBER 283	5	0.2%
284	POLL NUMBER 284	4	0.1%
295	POLL NUMBER 295	3	0.1%
296	POLL NUMBER 296	0	
297	POLL NUMBER 297	0	
299	POLL NUMBER 299	3	0.1%
312	POLL NUMBER 312	0	

# v2011: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
335	POLL NUMBER 335	0	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2014: INTEREST IN ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1746 /-] [Invalid=1015 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WE HAVE FOUND THAT PEOPLE SOMETIMES DON'T PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO ELECTIONS. HOW ABOUT YOURSELF? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE VERY INTERESTED IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, FAIRLY INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, OR NOT AT ALL INTERESTED IN IT?		
Notes	Q1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY INTERESTED	728	 41.7%
2	FAIRLY INTERESTED	630	 36.1%
3	SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	282	 16.2%
4	NOT AT ALL INTERESTED	106	 6.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	2	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2015: INTEREST IN POLITICS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1744 /-] [Invalid=1017 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER YOU PAY MUCH ATTENTION TO POLITICS GENERALLY. I MEAN FROM DAY TO DAY, WHEN THERE ISN'T A BIG ELECTION CAMPAIGN GOING ON. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU FOLLOW POLITICS VERY CLOSELY, FAIRLY CLOSELY, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL?		
Notes	Q2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY CLOSELY	287	 16.5%
2	FAIRLY CLOSELY	921	 52.8%
3	NOT MUCH AT ALL	536	 30.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	4	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2016: MATERIAL SATISFACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=900 /-] [Invalid=1861 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ARE DOING THESE DAYS. FIRST, LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE -- THE THINGS YOU CAN BUY AND DO -- ALL THE THINGS THAT MAKE UP YOUR MATERIAL STANDARD OF LIVING. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?		
Notes	Q3A in the documentation.		

# v2016: MATERIAL SATISFACTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY SATISFIED	186	<div><div></div></div> 20.7%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	493	<div><div></div></div> 54.8%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	166	<div><div></div></div> 18.4%
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	55	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
8	D.K.	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2017: GOVERNMENT IMPACT MATERIAL SATISFACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=887 /-] [Invalid=1874 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q3A. NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU HOW YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ARE DOING THESE DAYS. FIRST, LET'S THINK ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE -- THE THINGS YOU CAN BUY AND DO -- ALL THE THINGS THAT MAKE UP YOUR MATERIAL STANDARD OF LIVING. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH THE MATERIAL SIDE OF YOUR LIFE RIGHT NOW?		
Literal question	Q3B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?		
Notes	Q3A, Q3B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL	264	<div><div></div></div> 29.8%
2	SOMETHING	325	<div><div></div></div> 36.6%
3	NOT MUCH	298	<div><div></div></div> 33.6%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
8	D.K.	13	
9	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q3A	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2018: MATERIAL SATISFACTION IN 4 YEARS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=847 /-] [Invalid=1914 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	STILL THINKING ABOUT THE MATERIAL SIDE OF THINGS AND LOOKING AHEAD OVER THE NEXT THREE OR FOUR YEARS, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WILL BE BETTER OFF, WORSE OFF, OR WILL THINGS STAY ABOUT THE SAME?		
Notes	Q4 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BETTER OFF	188	<div><div></div></div> 22.2%
2	WORSE OFF	255	<div><div></div></div> 30.1%
3	ABOUT THE SAME	404	<div><div></div></div> 47.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
8	D.K.	56	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2019: LIFE SATISFACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		

# v2019: LIFE SATISFACTION			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=899 /-] [Invalid=1862 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?		
Notes	Q5A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY SATISFIED	257	<div><div></div></div> 28.6%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	518	<div><div></div></div> 57.6%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	100	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	24	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
8	D.K.	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2020: GOVERNMENT IMPACT LIFE SATISFACTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=889 /-] [Invalid=1872 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q5A. NOW LET'S THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, FAIRLY SATISFIED, A LITTLE DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR LIFE AS A WHOLE RIGHT NOW?		
Literal question	Q5B. DO YOU THINK THAT GOVERNMENT HAS HAD A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL TO DO WITH THIS?		
Notes	Q5A, Q5B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GREAT DEAL	143	<div><div></div></div> 16.1%
2	SOMETHING	316	<div><div></div></div> 35.5%
3	NOT MUCH	430	<div><div></div></div> 48.4%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
8	D.K.	10	
9	INAP., CODED 8 IN Q5A	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2021: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-1ST MENTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1353 /-] [Invalid=1408 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q6A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	112	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%
2	UNEMPLOYMENT, JOBS	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
3	INTEREST RATES, MORTGAGE RATES	33	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
4	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%

v2021: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-1ST MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL)	119	8.8%
6	THE DEFICIT, PAYING OFF THE DEBT (POS=PAYING OFF DEBT)	8	0.6%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	4	0.3%
8	MORTGAGE TAX CREDIT, DEDUCTIBILITY	9	0.7%
9	TAXES (OTHER THAN GASOLINE) (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	11	0.8%
10	CONTROLS, WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS, PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.1%
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF, STABILIZING	4	0.3%
12	THE BUDGET/CONSERVATIVE BUDGET/CROSBIE'S BUDGET (GENERAL)	217	16.0%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS (POS=RAISING)	9	0.7%
16	FAMILY ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS	0	
17	HOUSING, PUBLIC HOUSING	0	
18	MEDICARE	1	0.1%
19	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.1%
20	NATIONAL UNITY/ CANADIAN UNITY/ UNITY	27	2.0%
21	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE/ SEPARATION	13	1.0%
22	THE REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	9	0.7%
23	CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, DIVISION OF POWERS CHANGES, PATRIATIO	1	0.1%
24	BILINGUALISM	3	0.2%
25	FED.-PROV. RELATIONS, REGIONAL DIVISIONS	7	0.5%
29	FOREIGN INVESTMENT, FOREIGN CONTROL	3	0.2%
30	FOREIGN AFFAIRS	9	0.7%
31	DEFENCE, ARMED FORCES, VETERANS' AFFAIRS	2	0.1%
37	WHO WAS GOING TO WIN	7	0.5%
38	CHANGE THE GOVERNMENT/ GET PC OUT/ PUT LIBERALS IN	42	3.1%
39	GOVERNMENT (PC) SHOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN A CHANCE, KEPT	19	1.4%
40	THE ELECTION WAS NOT JUSTIFIED, NOT NECESSARY	26	1.9%
41	ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	8	0.6%
42	CONSERVATIVES' BROKEN PROMISES	5	0.4%
43	GOOD GOVERNMENT, HONEST GOVERNMENT	15	1.1%
50	ENERGY (GENERAL)	81	6.0%
51	THE PRICE OF GASOLINE/ TAX ON GASOLINE	126	9.3%
52	THE 18 CENT INCREASE/ THE EXCISE TAX	58	4.3%
53	OIL, PRICE OF OIL, SUPPLY OF OIL/GAS, PRICE OF ENERGY	100	7.4%
54	PETRO-CANADA (POS.=KEEP; NEG.=SELL)	35	2.6%
55	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF, EXPLORATION	4	0.3%
56	ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	1	0.1%
57	OFF-SHORE OIL DEVELOPMENT	6	0.4%
58	ALBERTA, REFERENCES TO	8	0.6%
59	SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN ENERGY	9	0.7%
60	EFFECTS OF ENERGY (PRICING) ON SPECIFIC GROUPS	3	0.2%

# v2021: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-1ST MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
61	PRICE OF ELECTRICITY OR POWER	1	0.1%
62	THE AUTO INDUSTRY (AID TO CHRYSLER, AUTO-PACT)	2	0.1%
63	IMMIGRATION, FOREIGNERS	0	
70	LEADERSHIP	61	4.5%
71	TRUDEAU	24	1.8%
72	CLARK	47	3.5%
73	COMPARE OR MENTION BOTH CLARK AND TRUDEAU	13	1.0%
74	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
75	ED. BROADBENT	0	
76	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	12	0.9%
77	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
78	WOMEN'S ISSUES, WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.1%
79	AGRICULTURAL ISSUES (OTHER THAN ENERGY RELATED), FARMERS	1	0.1%
80	FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/ GOVERNMENT SECRECY	0	
81	FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL	2	0.1%
82	POLLS	0	
87	OTHER	3	0.2%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
88	D.K.	260	
99	NO IMPORTANT ISSUE	135	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2022: CONCERN ON ISSUE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1169 /-] [Invalid=1592 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q6B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE? (STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q6A, Q6B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY CONCERNED	543	46.4%
2	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	573	49.0%
3	NOT VERY CONCERNED	53	4.5%
0	N.A.	2	
8	CAN'T DEFINE	182	
9	INAP. CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q6A	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2023: ACTION ON ISSUE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=640 /-] [Invalid=2121 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v2023: ACTION ON ISSUE 1			
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION? ; Q6B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?		
Literal question	Q6B.2 (R'S FEELINGS ABOUT MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (PRESCRIPTION/ACTION CALLED FOR ON ISSUE CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q6A, Q6B.1, Q6B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SOMETHING SHOULD BE DONE	207	<div></div> 32.3%
2	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (GENERAL)	31	<div></div> 4.8%
3	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (SPECIFIC POLICY)	37	<div></div> 5.8%
4	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT (OR STOP WHAT IT IS NOW DOING)	8	<div></div> 1.2%
5	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT ACTED	139	<div></div> 21.7%
6	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT DID NOT ACT	12	<div></div> 1.9%
7	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE ACTED	18	<div></div> 2.8%
8	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT HAVE ACTED	131	<div></div> 20.5%
10	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	57	<div></div> 8.9%
0	N.A.	17	
88	CAN'T DEFINE	696	
99	INAP. CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q6A	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2024: FOR/AGAINST ISSUE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1347 /-] [Invalid=1414 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION? ; Q6B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE?		
Literal question	Q6B.3 (R'S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q6A, Q6B.1, Q6B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITIVE - FOR	411	<div></div> 30.5%
2	NEUTRAL	81	<div></div> 6.0%
3	NEGATIVE - AGAINST	590	<div></div> 43.8%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	265	<div></div> 19.7%
0	N.A.	6	
9	INAP. CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q6A	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2025: PARTY CLOSE-ISSUE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1170 /-] [Invalid=1591 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q6C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		

# v2025: PARTY CLOSE-ISSUE 1			
Notes		Q6A, Q6C in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	503	<div></div> 43.0%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	449	<div></div> 38.4%
3	N.D.P.	204	<div></div> 17.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	6	<div></div> 0.5%
5	OTHER	4	<div></div> 0.3%
6	COMBINATIONS	4	<div></div> 0.3%
0	NO PARTY	91	
8	D.K., N.A.	92	
9	INAP., 00, 88 OR 99 IN Q6A	1408	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2026: IMPACT ON VOTE-ISSUE 1			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1308 /-] [Invalid=1453 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION? ;Q6C. WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?	
Literal question		Q6D. HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?	
Notes		Q6A, Q6C, Q6D in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	648	<div></div> 49.5%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	422	<div></div> 32.3%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	238	<div></div> 18.2%
8	D.K.	37	
9	INAP., CODED 00, 88 OR 99 IN Q6A., N.A.	1416	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2027: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-2ND MENTION			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=1664 /-] [Invalid=1097 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION?	
Literal question		Q7A. WERE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU THINK WERE IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?	
Notes		Q6A, Q7A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	54	<div></div> 3.2%
2	UNEMPLOYMENT, JOBS	40	<div></div> 2.4%
3	INTEREST RATES, MORTGAGE RATES	44	<div></div> 2.6%
4	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	2	<div></div> 0.1%
5	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL)	32	<div></div> 1.9%
6	THE DEFICIT, PAYING OFF THE DEBT (POS=PAYING OFF DEBT)	7	<div></div> 0.4%

v2027: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-2ND MENTION

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	5	0.3%
8	MORTGAGE TAX CREDIT, DEDUCTIBILITY	20	1.2%
9	TAXES (OTHER THAN GASOLINE) (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	12	0.7%
10	CONTROLS, WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS, PRICE CONTROLS	2	0.1%
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF, STABILIZING	2	0.1%
12	THE BUDGET/CONSERVATIVE BUDGET/CROSBIE'S BUDGET (GENERAL)	66	4.0%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS (POS=RAISING)	12	0.7%
16	FAMILY ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS	2	0.1%
17	HOUSING, PUBLIC HOUSING	5	0.3%
18	MEDICARE	1	0.1%
19	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
20	NATIONAL UNITY/ CANADIAN UNITY/ UNITY	41	2.5%
21	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE/ SEPARATION	49	2.9%
22	THE REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	26	1.6%
23	CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, DIVISION OF POWERS CHANGES, PATRIATIO	6	0.4%
24	BILINGUALISM	6	0.4%
25	FED.-PROV. RELATIONS, REGIONAL DIVISIONS	14	0.8%
29	FOREIGN INVESTMENT, FOREIGN CONTROL	5	0.3%
30	FOREIGN AFFAIRS	34	2.0%
31	DEFENCE, ARMED FORCES, VETERANS' AFFAIRS	4	0.2%
37	WHO WAS GOING TO WIN	1	0.1%
38	CHANGE THE GOVERNMENT/ GET PC OUT/ PUT LIBERALS IN	18	1.1%
39	GOVERNMENT (PC) SHOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN A CHANCE, KEPT	26	1.6%
40	THE ELECTION WAS NOT JUSTIFIED, NOT NECESSARY	12	0.7%
41	ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	7	0.4%
42	CONSERVATIVES' BROKEN PROMISES	10	0.6%
43	GOOD GOVERNMENT, HONEST GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
50	ENERGY (GENERAL)	37	2.2%
51	THE PRICE OF GASOLINE/ TAX ON GASOLINE	40	2.4%
52	THE 18 CENT INCREASE/ THE EXCISE TAX	13	0.8%
53	OIL, PRICE OF OIL, SUPPLY OF OIL/GAS, PRICE OF ENERGY	35	2.1%
54	PETRO-CANADA (POS.=KEEP; NEG.=SELL)	25	1.5%
55	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF, EXPLORATION	5	0.3%
56	ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	1	0.1%
57	OFF-SHORE OIL DEVELOPMENT	4	0.2%
58	ALBERTA, REFERENCES TO	8	0.5%
59	SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN ENERGY	6	0.4%
60	EFFECTS OF ENERGY (PRICING) ON SPECIFIC GROUPS	3	0.2%
61	PRICE OF ELECTRICITY OR POWER	1	0.1%
62	THE AUTO INDUSTRY (AID TO CHRYSLER, AUTO-PACT)	0	

# v2027: MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE-2ND MENTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	IMMIGRATION, FOREIGNERS	2	0.1%
70	LEADERSHIP	29	1.7%
71	TRUDEAU	29	1.7%
72	CLARK	36	2.2%
73	COMPARE OR MENTION BOTH CLARK AND TRUDEAU	18	1.1%
74	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.2%
75	ED. BROADBENT	1	0.1%
76	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
77	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	2	0.1%
78	WOMEN'S ISSUES, WOMEN'S RIGHTS	2	0.1%
79	AGRICULTURAL ISSUES (OTHER THAN ENERGY RELATED), FARMERS	3	0.2%
80	FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/ GOVERNMENT SECRECY	2	0.1%
81	FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL	0	
82	POLLS	1	0.1%
87	OTHER	9	0.5%
99	NO OTHER ISSUES	780	46.9%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, INAP., CODED 88 OR 99 IN Q6A.	1013	
88	D.K.	84	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2028: CONCERN ON ISSUE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=881 -] [Invalid=1880 -]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION? ; Q7A. WERE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU THINK WERE IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q7B.1 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS (ISSUE MENTIONED IN Q7A.)? (STRENGTH OF CONCERN CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q6A, Q7A, Q7B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY CONCERNED	327	37.1%
2	MODERATELY/SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	417	47.3%
3	NOT VERY CONCERNED	20	2.3%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	117	13.3%
0	N.A.	3	
9	INAP. CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q7A	1877	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2029: ACTION ON ISSUE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=875 -] [Invalid=1886 -]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	Q7B.2 (R'S FEELINGS ABOUT MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (PRESCRIPTION/ACTION CALLED FOR ON ISSUE CODED HERE)		
Notes	Q7B.2 in the documentation.		

v2029: ACTION ON ISSUE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SOMETHING SHOULD BE DONE	156	17.8%
2	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (GENERAL)	24	2.7%
3	GOVERNMENT SHOULD ACT (SPECIFIC POLICY)	30	3.4%
4	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT (OR STOP WHAT IT IS NOW DOING)	11	1.3%
5	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT ACTED	62	7.1%
6	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT DID NOT ACT	13	1.5%
7	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE ACTED	8	0.9%
8	PAST (PC) GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT HAVE ACTED	65	7.4%
10	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	23	2.6%
88	CAN'T DEFINE	483	55.2%
0	N.A.	93	
99	INAP. CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q7A	1793	















Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2030: FOR/AGAINST ISSUE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=881 /-] [Invalid=1880 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	(R'S FEELING ABOUT IMPORTANT ISSUE.) (DIRECTION OF OPINION ON ISSUE CODED HERE)
Notes	Q7B.3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITIVE - FOR	252	28.6%
2	NEUTRAL	30	3.4%
3	NEGATIVE - AGAINST	434	49.3%
8	CAN'T DEFINE	165	18.7%
0	N.A.	87	
9	INAP. CODED 0, 88 OR 99 IN Q7A	1793	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2031: PARTY CLOSE ISSUE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=809 /-] [Invalid=1952 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?		
Notes	Q7C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO PARTY	73	 9.0%
1	LIBERALS	333	 41.2%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	267	 33.0%
3	N.D.P.	126	 15.6%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	1	 0.1%
5	OTHER	0	
6	COMBINATIONS	9	 1.1%
8	D.K., N.A.	159	
9	INAP., 00, 88 OR 99 IN Q7A	1793	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2032: IMPACT ON VOTE-ISSUE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=857 /-] [Invalid=1904 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	HOW IMPORTANT WAS THAT ISSUE TO YOU IN DECIDING HOW TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION?		
Notes	Q7D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY IMPORTANT	388	 45.3%
2	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	324	 37.8%
3	NOT VERY IMPORTANT	145	 16.9%
8	DON'T KNOW, N.A.	111	
9	INAP., CODED 00, 88 OR 99 IN Q7A.	1793	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2033: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=839 /-] [Invalid=1922 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION, THAT IS THE ISSUE OF ENERGY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q8A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	FORMS OF ENERGY, GENERALLY OR SEVERAL MENTIONS	96	 11.4%
2	HEATING OIL	43	 5.1%
3	GAS	66	 7.9%
4	ELECTRICITY, HYDRO	35	 4.2%
5	NUCLEAR POWER	16	 1.9%

v2033: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	SOLAR ENERGY	2	0.2%
10	IT'S LIMITED; IT'S RUNNING OUT, GENERAL SUPPLY	53	6.3%
11	MUST CONSERVE	75	8.9%
12	TOO MUCH WASTE	28	3.3%
13	NEED MORE SOURCES; BETTER SEARCHES FOR SOURCES, EXPLORATION	9	1.1%
14	NEED ALTERNATIVES TO CONVENTIONAL SOURCES	7	0.8%
15	EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENT	1	0.1%
20	COST, GENERALLY - GOING UP	92	11.0%
21	COST OF GAS	42	5.0%
22	COST - OF HEATING HOMES, OF OIL, ELECTRICITY COSTS	34	4.1%
23	COSTS - DUE TO OPEC	0	
24	COSTS - DUE TO PROVINCIAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
25	COSTS - BECAUSE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMMES, IMPORT SUBSIDIES	1	0.1%
26	COSTS - DUE TO CORPORATIONS' ACTIONS	5	0.6%
29	MAJOR CAUSE OF INFLATION	5	0.6%
30	PRICES INEVITABLY HIGH	3	0.4%
31	PRICES ARTIFICIALLY HIGH	5	0.6%
32	PRICES SHOULD BE FIXED, LIMITED	3	0.4%
33	SHOULD/MUST PAY WORLD PRICES	6	0.7%
34	SHOULD NOT PAY WORLD PRICE IN CANADA	0	
35	REFERENCE TO THE BUDGET	1	0.1%
40	CANADA HAS LOTS OF ENERGY	11	1.3%
41	SHOULD NOT EXPORT CANADA'S SUPPLY	8	1.0%
42	NEED CANADIAN SELF-SUFFICIENCY	12	1.4%
43	CANADA WOULD HAVE ENOUGH IF THINGS WERE BETTER ORGANIZED	9	1.1%
44	REFERENCE TO U.S. AND CANADA'S ENERGY	1	0.1%
45	REFERENCE TO PETRO CANADA	3	0.4%
46	REFERENCE TO ALBERTA, LOUGHEED, ETC.	13	1.5%
47	REFERENCE TO QUEBEC	5	0.6%
49	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	1	0.1%
50	SOMETHING MUST BE DONE (MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED)	9	1.1%
51	GOVERNMENT MUST DO SOMETHING; NOT DOING ENOUGH	12	1.4%
52	PROBLEM FOR FEDERALISM; FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS; INEQUI	8	1.0%
53	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT, INTERVENE	2	0.2%
60	ENERGY CRISIS	10	1.2%
61	CRISIS/ PROBLEMS BECAUSE OF OPEC; EXPORTING COUNTRIES	5	0.6%
62	COMPANIES' PROFITS TOO HIGH	6	0.7%
63	COMPANIES GAIN; CONSUMERS LOSE	2	0.2%
64	COMPANIES TOO INFLUENTIAL	4	0.5%
65	REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT, FOREIGN CONTROL	0	

# v2033: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 1				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
70	AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM	29	<div></div>	3.5%
71	FRIGHTENING	11	<div></div>	1.3%
72	NOT REALLY A PROBLEM; OR POLITICIANS CONFUSE THE ISSUE	30	<div></div>	3.6%
73	NEED TO PAY MORE ATTENTION TO THE PROBLEM	4	<div></div>	0.5%
80	IT'S THE BASIS OF THE MODERN LIFE-STYLE	7	<div></div>	0.8%
81	NECESSARY FOR INDUSTRY; INDUSTRIALIZATION, EMPLOYMENT	3	<div></div>	0.4%
82	EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC GROUPS/OCCUPATIONS	2	<div></div>	0.2%
87	OTHER	3	<div></div>	0.4%
0	NO ANSWER, NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1878		
88	D.K.	44		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2034: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 2				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=876 /-] [Invalid=1885 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.			
Pre-question	Q8A.1 I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION, THAT IS THE ISSUE OF ENERGY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED?			
Literal question	Q8A.2 WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED? (SECOND MENTION)			
Notes	Q8A.1, Q8A.2 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	FORMS OF ENERGY, GENERALLY OR SEVERAL MENTIONS	13	<div></div>	1.5%
2	HEATING OIL	26	<div></div>	3.0%
3	GAS	32	<div></div>	3.7%
4	ELECTRICITY, HYDRO	26	<div></div>	3.0%
5	NUCLEAR POWER	13	<div></div>	1.5%
6	SOLAR ENERGY	4	<div></div>	0.5%
10	IT'S LIMITED; IT'S RUNNING OUT, GENERAL SUPPLY	45	<div></div>	5.1%
11	MUST CONSERVE	71	<div></div>	8.1%
12	TOO MUCH WASTE	27	<div></div>	3.1%
13	NEED MORE SOURCES; BETTER SEARCHES FOR SOURCES, EXPLORATION	31	<div></div>	3.5%
14	NEED ALTERNATIVES TO CONVENTIONAL SOURCES	39	<div></div>	4.5%
15	EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENT	2	<div></div>	0.2%
20	COST, GENERALLY - GOING UP	50	<div></div>	5.7%
21	COST OF GAS	15	<div></div>	1.7%
22	COST - OF HEATING HOMES, OF OIL, ELECTRICITY COSTS	26	<div></div>	3.0%
23	COSTS - DUE TO OPEC	0		
24	COSTS - DUE TO PROVINCIAL POLICIES	0		
25	COSTS - BECAUSE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMMES, IMPORT SUBSIDIES	2	<div></div>	0.2%
26	COSTS - DUE TO CORPORATIONS' ACTIONS	1	<div></div>	0.1%
29	MAJOR CAUSE OF INFLATION	7	<div></div>	0.8%

v2034: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	PRICES INEVITABLY HIGH	7	0.8%
31	PRICES ARTIFICIALLY HIGH	8	0.9%
32	PRICES SHOULD BE FIXED, LIMITED	10	1.1%
33	SHOULD/MUST PAY WORLD PRICES	7	0.8%
34	SHOULD NOT PAY WORLD PRICE IN CANADA	8	0.9%
35	REFERENCE TO THE BUDGET	7	0.8%
40	CANADA HAS LOTS OF ENERGY	22	2.5%
41	SHOULD NOT EXPORT CANADA'S SUPPLY	15	1.7%
42	NEED CANADIAN SELF-SUFFICIENCY	13	1.5%
43	CANADA WOULD HAVE ENOUGH IF THINGS WERE BETTER ORGANIZED	6	0.7%
44	REFERENCE TO U.S. AND CANADA'S ENERGY	4	0.5%
45	REFERENCE TO PETRO CANADA	6	0.7%
46	REFERENCE TO ALBERTA, LOUGHEED, ETC.	10	1.1%
47	REFERENCE TO QUEBEC	5	0.6%
49	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	2	0.2%
50	SOMETHING MUST BE DONE (MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED)	8	0.9%
51	GOVERNMENT MUST DO SOMETHING; NOT DOING ENOUGH	22	2.5%
52	PROBLEM FOR FEDERALISM; FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS; INEQUI	11	1.3%
53	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT, INTERVENE	2	0.2%
60	ENERGY CRISIS	3	0.3%
61	CRISIS/ PROBLEMS BECAUSE OF OPEC; EXPORTING COUNTRIES	6	0.7%
62	COMPANIES' PROFITS TOO HIGH	7	0.8%
63	COMPANIES GAIN; CONSUMERS LOSE	4	0.5%
64	COMPANIES TOO INFLUENTIAL	4	0.5%
65	REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT, FOREIGN CONTROL	4	0.5%
70	AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM	24	2.7%
71	FRIGHTENING	8	0.9%
72	NOT REALLY A PROBLEM; OR POLITICIANS CONFUSE THE ISSUE	25	2.9%
73	NEED TO PAY MORE ATTENTION TO THE PROBLEM	12	1.4%
80	IT'S THE BASIS OF THE MODERN LIFE-STYLE	7	0.8%
81	NECESSARY FOR INDUSTRY; INDUSTRIALIZATION, EMPLOYMENT	6	0.7%
82	EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC GROUPS/OCCUPATIONS	6	0.7%
87	OTHER	2	0.2%
99	NO SECOND MENTION	155	17.7%
0	NO ANSWER, NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1878	
88	D.K.	7	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2035: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 3

Information [Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88]

# v2035: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 3				
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=878 /-] [Invalid=1883 /-]		
Universe		Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question		Q8A.1 I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT FOR SOME TIME NOW IN CANADIAN POLITICS, NOT JUST IN THIS ELECTION, THAT IS THE ISSUE OF ENERGY. WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED?		
Literal question		Q8A.3 WHAT DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF WHEN THE ISSUE OF ENERGY IS MENTIONED? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes		Q8A.1, Q8A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	FORMS OF ENERGY, GENERALLY OR SEVERAL MENTIONS	7	<div></div>	0.8%
2	HEATING OIL	2	<div></div>	0.2%
3	GAS	4	<div></div>	0.5%
4	ELECTRICITY, HYDRO	8	<div></div>	0.9%
5	NUCLEAR POWER	10	<div></div>	1.1%
6	SOLAR ENERGY	2	<div></div>	0.2%
10	IT'S LIMITED; IT'S RUNNING OUT, GENERAL SUPPLY	12	<div></div>	1.4%
11	MUST CONSERVE	44	<div></div>	5.0%
12	TOO MUCH WASTE	15	<div></div>	1.7%
13	NEED MORE SOURCES; BETTER SEARCHES FOR SOURCES, EXPLORATION	20	<div></div>	2.3%
14	NEED ALTERNATIVES TO CONVENTIONAL SOURCES	18	<div></div>	2.1%
15	EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENT	0	<div></div>	
20	COST, GENERALLY - GOING UP	21	<div></div>	2.4%
21	COST OF GAS	8	<div></div>	0.9%
22	COST - OF HEATING HOMES, OF OIL, ELECTRICITY COSTS	4	<div></div>	0.5%
23	COSTS - DUE TO OPEC	0	<div></div>	
24	COSTS - DUE TO PROVINCIAL POLICIES	1	<div></div>	0.1%
25	COSTS - BECAUSE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMMES, IMPORT SUBSIDIES	0	<div></div>	
26	COSTS - DUE TO CORPORATIONS' ACTIONS	0	<div></div>	
29	MAJOR CAUSE OF INFLATION	5	<div></div>	0.6%
30	PRICES INEVITABLY HIGH	4	<div></div>	0.5%
31	PRICES ARTIFICIALLY HIGH	10	<div></div>	1.1%
32	PRICES SHOULD BE FIXED, LIMITED	5	<div></div>	0.6%
33	SHOULD/MUST PAY WORLD PRICES	10	<div></div>	1.1%
34	SHOULD NOT PAY WORLD PRICE IN CANADA	4	<div></div>	0.5%
35	REFERENCE TO THE BUDGET	9	<div></div>	1.0%
40	CANADA HAS LOTS OF ENERGY	12	<div></div>	1.4%
41	SHOULD NOT EXPORT CANADA'S SUPPLY	13	<div></div>	1.5%
42	NEED CANADIAN SELF-SUFFICIENCY	19	<div></div>	2.2%
43	CANADA WOULD HAVE ENOUGH IF THINGS WERE BETTER ORGANIZED	8	<div></div>	0.9%
44	REFERENCE TO U.S. AND CANADA'S ENERGY	1	<div></div>	0.1%
45	REFERENCE TO PETRO CANADA	5	<div></div>	0.6%
46	REFERENCE TO ALBERTA, LOUGHEED, ETC.	10	<div></div>	1.1%
47	REFERENCE TO QUEBEC	4	<div></div>	0.5%
49	NOTHING CAN BE DONE	4	<div></div>	0.5%

v2035: ENERGY ISSUE-MEANING 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	SOMETHING MUST BE DONE (MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED)	19	2.2%
51	GOVERNMENT MUST DO SOMETHING; NOT DOING ENOUGH	20	2.3%
52	PROBLEM FOR FEDERALISM; FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS; INEQUI	10	1.1%
53	GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT ACT, INTERVENE	3	0.3%
60	ENERGY CRISIS	3	0.3%
61	CRISIS/ PROBLEMS BECAUSE OF OPEC; EXPORTING COUNTRIES	1	0.1%
62	COMPANIES' PROFITS TOO HIGH	4	0.5%
63	COMPANIES GAIN; CONSUMERS LOSE	2	0.2%
64	COMPANIES TOO INFLUENTIAL	6	0.7%
65	REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT, FOREIGN CONTROL	1	0.1%
70	AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM	44	5.0%
71	FRIGHTENING	8	0.9%
72	NOT REALLY A PROBLEM; OR POLITICIANS CONFUSE THE ISSUE	15	1.7%
73	NEED TO PAY MORE ATTENTION TO THE PROBLEM	8	0.9%
80	IT'S THE BASIS OF THE MODERN LIFE-STYLE	10	1.1%
81	NECESSARY FOR INDUSTRY; INDUSTRIALIZATION, EMPLOYMENT	1	0.1%
82	EFFECTS ON SPECIFIC GROUPS/OCCUPATIONS	10	1.1%
87	OTHER	0	
99	NO THIRD MENTION	414	47.2%
0	NO ANSWER, NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1878	
88	D.K.	5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2036: PARTY CLOSEST-ENERGY

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=655 /-] [Invalid=2106 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION? ; Q7A. WERE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU THINK WERE IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?
Literal question	Q8C. (IF "ENERGY" MENTIONED IN Q6A OR Q7A, RECORD ANSWER FROM Q6C OR Q7C AUTOMATICALLY) WHICH PARTY IS CLOSEST TO YOU ON THIS ISSUE?
Notes	Q6A, Q7A, Q8C in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NONE	92	14.0%
1	LIBERALS	239	36.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES	204	31.1%
3	NDP	98	15.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	8	1.2%
5	OTHER	5	0.8%
6	COMBINATIONS	9	1.4%

# v2036: PARTY CLOSEST-ENERGY			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	248	
9	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2037: FOR/AGAINST-PC BUDGET			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=802 /-] [Invalid=1959 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Literal question	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ON THE BUDGET WHICH WAS INTRODUCED IN PARLIAMENT LAST DECEMBER BY THE FORMER CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT. WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE ...		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q9A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1	0.1%
1	STRONGLY IN FAVOUR OF THAT BUDGET	103	12.8%
2	SOMEWHAT IN FAVOUR	318	39.7%
3	SOMEWHAT AGAINST IT	199	24.8%
4	STRONGLY AGAINST THE BUDGET	181	22.6%
8	D.K.	101	
9	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2038: PC BUDGET-FEELINGS 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=845 /-] [Invalid=1916 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q6A. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION. WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IN THAT ELECTION? ; Q7A. WERE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU THINK WERE IMPORTANT IN THE ELECTION?		
Literal question	Q9B. (IF "CONSERVATIVE BUDGET" MENTIONED IN Q6A OR Q7A, RECORD ANSWERS FROM Q6B OR Q7B TO Q9B AUTOMATICALLY) WHY DID YOU FEEL THIS WAY? ANY OTHER REASON?		
Notes	Q6A, Q7A, Q9B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO ANSWER	146	17.3%
1	GENERALLY A GOOD BUDGET; NECESSARY	208	24.6%
2	GENERALLY GOOD - BUT TOO MUCH TOO FAST; TOO DRAMATIC	40	4.7%
3	GENERALLY GOOD BUT BADLY PRESENTED	6	0.7%
4	NOT REALLY AN ISSUE; EXAGGERATED	2	0.2%
5	DISAPPROVE OF BUDGET - GENERALLY NEGATIVE	143	16.9%
6	CROSBIE, FINANCE MINISTER, REFERENCE TO	1	0.1%
10	PRICES WOULD GO UP - GENERALLY	22	2.6%
11	PRICES OF CIGARETTES, LIQUOR, ETC.	1	0.1%
12	PRICE OF GAS, ENERGY GENERALLY	54	6.4%
13	SHOULD NOT MOVE TO WORLD PRICE FOR OIL	1	0.1%

v2038: PC BUDGET-FEELINGS 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	MUST MOVE TO WORLD PRICE FOR OIL	2	0.2%
15	18 CENTS - APPROVE, NECESSARY	4	0.5%
16	18 CENTS - DISAPPROVE	30	3.6%
17	RAISED TAXES TOO MUCH	16	1.9%
18	RAISED TAXES TOO LITTLE, OR NOT ENOUGH	1	0.1%
20	THE DEFICIT; NATIONAL DEBT - APPROVE BUDGET EFFORTS	49	5.8%
21	THE DEFICIT; NATIONAL DEBT - DISAPPROVE BUDGET EFFORTS	4	0.5%
22	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY - APPROVE	8	0.9%
23	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY - DISAPPROVE	7	0.8%
24	INTEREST RATES - GENERAL	6	0.7%
25	SPENDING CONTROL	7	0.8%
27	REFERENCE TO REBATE FOR FARMES	0	
28	FAVOURS BUSINESS	6	0.7%
29	AGAINST BUSINESS	1	0.1%
30	TOO HARD ON LOW INCOME PEOPLE	34	4.0%
31	LIBERALS WOULD HAVE DONE THE SAME; ANYONE WOULD HAVE DONE TH	20	2.4%
32	P.C. DIDN'T KEEP THEIR PROMISES	4	0.5%
33	P.C. WEREN'T GIVEN A CHANCE	13	1.5%
34	EFFECTS ON QUEBEC POSITIVE	0	
35	EFFECTS ON QUEBEC NEUTRAL	0	
36	EFFECTS ON QUEBEC NEGATIVE	1	0.1%
87	OTHER	8	0.9%
88	D.K.	58	
99	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2039: PC BUDGET-FEELINGS 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Literal question	FEELING ABOUT BUDGET (SECOND MENTION).
Notes	Q9B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	705	78.2%
1	GENERALLY A GOOD BUDGET; NECESSARY	6	0.7%
2	GENERALLY GOOD - BUT TOO MUCH TOO FAST; TOO DRAMATIC	6	0.7%
3	GENERALLY GOOD BUT BADLY PRESENTED	3	0.3%
4	NOT REALLY AN ISSUE; EXAGGERATED	2	0.2%
5	DISAPPROVE OF BUDGET - GENERALLY NEGATIVE	15	1.7%
6	CROSBIE, FINANCE MINISTER, REFERENCE TO	1	0.1%
10	PRICES WOULD GO UP - GENERALLY	10	1.1%
11	PRICES OF CIGARETTES, LIQUOR, ETC.	1	0.1%

v2039: PC BUDGET-FEELINGS 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	PRICE OF GAS, ENERGY GENERALLY	21	2.3%
13	SHOULD NOT MOVE TO WORLD PRICE FOR OIL	2	0.2%
14	MUST MOVE TO WORLD PRICE FOR OIL	1	0.1%
15	18 CENTS - APPROVE, NECESSARY	11	1.2%
16	18 CENTS - DISAPPROVE	13	1.4%
17	RAISED TAXES TOO MUCH	10	1.1%
18	RAISED TAXES TOO LITTLE, OR NOT ENOUGH	2	0.2%
20	THE DEFICIT; NATIONAL DEBT - APPROVE BUDGET EFFORTS	6	0.7%
21	THE DEFICIT; NATIONAL DEBT - DISAPPROVE BUDGET EFFORTS	3	0.3%
22	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY - APPROVE	3	0.3%
23	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY - DISAPPROVE	8	0.9%
24	INTEREST RATES - GENERAL	8	0.9%
25	SPENDING CONTROL	8	0.9%
27	REFERENCE TO REBATE FOR FARMES	2	0.2%
28	FAVOURS BUSINESS	5	0.6%
29	AGAINST BUSINESS	1	0.1%
30	TOO HARD ON LOW INCOME PEOPLE	22	2.4%
31	LIBERALS WOULD HAVE DONE THE SAME; ANYONE WOULD HAVE DONE TH	8	0.9%
32	P.C. DIDN'T KEEP THEIR PROMISES	2	0.2%
33	P.C. WEREN'T GIVEN A CHANCE	11	1.2%
34	EFFECTS ON QUEBEC POSITIVE	0	
35	EFFECTS ON QUEBEC NEUTRAL	0	
36	EFFECTS ON QUEBEC NEGATIVE	0	
87	OTHER	6	0.7%
88	D.K.	1	
99	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2	1858	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2040: MAJORITY VS MINORITY GOVERNMENT

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/8]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=817 /-] [Invalid=1944 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Pre-question	BEFORE WE LEAVE THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL QUESTION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT.
Literal question	SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT IT IS BETTER WHEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS A MAJORITY OF SEATS IN PARLIAMENT, WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT MINORITY GOVERNMENTS CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE. WHICH DO YOU FEEL IS BETTER?
Notes	Q10A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MAJORITY	509	62.3%
2	MINORITY	212	25.9%
3	IT DEPENDS	84	10.3%
9	NO OPINION	12	1.5%
0	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	

# v2040: MAJORITY VS MINORITY GOVERNMENT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	28	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2041: MAJORITY GOVERNMENT -WOULD SWITCH?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=798 /-] [Invalid=1963 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	Q10B. IF YOU BELIEVED THAT ONE PARTY WAS MORE LIKELY TO BE ABLE TO FORM A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, BUT YOU DID NOT ORDINARILY VOTE FOR THAT PARTY, HOW LIKELY WOULD YOU BE TO VOTE FOR IT IN ORDER TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, VERY LIKELY, SOMEWHAT LIKELY, OR NOT VERY LIKELY?		
Notes	Q10B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY LIKELY	117	<div><div></div></div> 14.7%
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	222	<div><div></div></div> 27.8%
3	NOT VERY LIKELY	459	<div><div></div></div> 57.5%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	47	
9	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	903	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2042: IMPORT OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=804 /-] [Invalid=1957 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q10A. BEFORE WE LEAVE THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES, THERE IS ONE ADDITIONAL QUESTION THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT. SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT IT IS BETTER WHEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS A MAJORITY OF SEATS IN PARLIAMENT, WHILE OTHERS FEEL THAT MINORITY GOVERNMENTS CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE. WHICH DO YOU FEEL IS BETTER?		
Literal question	Q10C. DID THIS QUESTION OF MAJORITY GOVERNMENT HAVE A GREAT DEAL, SOMETHING, OR VERY LITTLE TO DO WITH THE WAY YOU VOTED IN THIS LAST ELECTION?		
Notes	Q10A, Q10C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A GREAT DEAL	129	<div><div></div></div> 16.0%
2	SOMETHING	138	<div><div></div></div> 17.2%
3	VERY LITTLE	537	<div><div></div></div> 66.8%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	41	
9	INAP., HALF SAMPLE 1	903	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2043: FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1452 /-] [Invalid=1309 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?		

# v2043: FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Notes		Q11A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	734	<div><div></div></div> 50.6%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	455	<div><div></div></div> 31.3%
3	N.D.P.	228	<div><div></div></div> 15.7%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	19	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
5	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	LIBERAL AND N.D.P.	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
7	OTHER	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
0	INDEPENDENT, NONE	192	
8	REFUSED	50	
9	D.K., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1067	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2044: FEDERAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=296 /-] [Invalid=2465 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Pre-question		Q11A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?	
Literal question		Q11B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q11A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?	
Notes		Q11A, Q11B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 8 OR 9 IN Q11A	296	<div><div></div></div> 100.0%
0		1013	
1	VERY STRONGLY	534	
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	713	
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	198	
8	D.K.	7	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2045: FEEL CLOSE TO FEDERAL PARTY?			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=279 /-] [Invalid=2482 /-]	
Universe		Q12A asked only to respondents who answered "independent or none", "don't know", or refused to answer Q11A.	
Pre-question		Q11A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT?	
Literal question		Q12A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?	
Notes		Q11A, Q12A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	104	<div><div></div></div> 37.3%
2	NO	162	<div><div></div></div> 58.1%
7	REFUSED	13	<div><div></div></div> 4.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	

# v2045: FEEL CLOSE TO FEDERAL PARTY?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	17	
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 7 OR 8 IN Q11A	1452	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2046: FEDERAL PARTY LEANING			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=103 /-] [Invalid=2658 /-]		
Universe	Q12B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q12B.		
Pre-question	Q11A. THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? ; Q12A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS BEING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q12B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q11A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	39	<div></div> 37.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	27	<div></div> 26.2%
3	N.D.P.	18	<div></div> 17.5%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	3	<div></div> 2.9%
5	PC AND LIB	1	<div></div> 1.0%
6	LIB AND N.D.P.	0	
7	REFUSED	15	<div></div> 14.6%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	1	
9	INAP., CODED 0 OR 2 TO 9 IN Q12A	1644	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2047: ANY PAST FEDERAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1704 /-] [Invalid=1057 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?		
Notes	Q13A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	649	<div></div> 38.1%
2	NO	1055	<div></div> 61.9%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	24	
9	REFUSED	20	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2048: PAST FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=637 /-] [Invalid=2124 /-]		
Universe	Q13B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q13A.		

# v2048: PAST FEDERAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION				
Pre-question	Q13A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY?			
Literal question	Q13B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?			
Notes	Q13A, Q13B in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LIBERAL	267	<div><div></div></div>	41.9%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	207	<div><div></div></div>	32.5%
3	N.D.P./C.C.F.	120	<div><div></div></div>	18.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	35	<div><div></div></div>	5.5%
5	LIBERAL AND PC	3	<div><div></div></div>	0.5%
6	PC AND NDP	2	<div><div></div></div>	0.3%
7	OTHER	3	<div><div></div></div>	0.5%
0	INAP., CODED 0,2 OR 8 IN Q13A, NO 1980 INTERVIEW	2117		
8	REFUSED	7		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2049: WHEN CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	Q13C asked only to respondents who named a party for Q13B.			
Pre-question	Q13A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY? ; Q13B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?			
Literal question	Q13C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?			
Notes	Q13A, Q13B, Q13C in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED, NOT PERMANENT CHANGE NO 1980 INTERV	2191	<div><div></div></div>	79.4%
1	LAST ELECTION (FEB. 18, 1980); 1980: OR AFTER MAY 22, 1979 E	124	<div><div></div></div>	4.5%
2	MAY 22, 1979 ELECTION, OR 1979 BEFORE MAY 22 ELECTION	67	<div><div></div></div>	2.4%
3	1979 UNSPECIFIED	7	<div><div></div></div>	0.3%
4	1977-1978, 2 OR 3 YEARS AGO	40	<div><div></div></div>	1.4%
5	1975-1976, 4 OR 5 YEARS AGO	43	<div><div></div></div>	1.6%
6	1973-1974, 6 OR 7 YEARS AGO	32	<div><div></div></div>	1.2%
7	1972 OR EARLIER, 8 OR MORE YEARS AGO	167	<div><div></div></div>	6.0%
8	DON'T KNOW, NO ANSWER, NOT SPECIFIED	45	<div><div></div></div>	1.6%
9	OTHER ANSWERS, TIME NOT SPECIFIED, UNABLE TO DETERMINE FROM	45	<div><div></div></div>	1.6%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2050: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 1				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=612 /-] [Invalid=2149 /-]			
Universe	Q13D.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" in Q13A, or refused to answer Q13B.			
Pre-question	Q13A. STILL THINKING OF FEDERAL POLITICS, WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU FELT CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY? ; Q13B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?			
Literal question	Q13D.1 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (FIRST MENTION)			

v2050: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 1

Notes

Q13A, Q13B, Q13D.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	17	2.8%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	21	3.4%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	65	10.6%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	17	2.8%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	31	5.1%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	9	1.5%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	3	0.5%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	1	0.2%
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	1	0.2%
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	10	1.6%
11	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	5	0.8%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	4	0.7%
13	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	7	1.1%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	2	0.3%
15	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	6	1.0%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	1	0.2%
18	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	5	0.8%
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	3	0.5%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	6	1.0%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	11	1.8%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	21	3.4%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	19	3.1%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	13	2.1%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	5	0.8%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	7	1.1%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	5	0.8%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	12	2.0%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	14	2.3%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	0.3%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	26	4.2%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	12	2.0%
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	0.2%
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	2	0.3%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	9	1.5%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	40	6.5%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	9	1.5%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	24	3.9%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	8	1.3%

v2050: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	8	1.3%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	0.2%
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	6	1.0%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	1	0.2%
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	4	0.7%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	1	0.2%
50	RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	3	0.5%
51	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	28	4.6%
52	"THE MAN"	14	2.3%
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL"	26	4.2%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	2	0.3%
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH/NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	13	2.1%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH /NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	7	1.1%
58	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	1	0.2%
59	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	3	0.5%
60	RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
61	WANTED MINORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
62	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED/NO ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY/ DEPENDS O	36	5.9%
63	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. & LIBERAL	3	0.5%
0	INAP., CODED 0,2, OR 8 IN Q13A	2112	
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	37	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2051: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/88]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	Q13D.2 REASON FOR CHANGING PARTISANSHIP. (SECOND MENTION)
Notes	Q13D.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO SECOND MENTION	2704	97.9%
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	0	
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	1	0.0%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	2	0.1%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	1	0.0%

v2051: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	3	0.1%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	0	
11	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
12	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
13	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
14	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
15	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	1	0.0%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	0	
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	2	0.1%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	7	0.3%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	1	0.0%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	1	0.0%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	1	0.0%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	0	
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	4	0.1%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	0	
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	4	0.1%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	3	0.1%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	1	0.0%
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	2	0.1%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	0	
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	0	
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	6	0.2%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	0	
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	5	0.2%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	

# v2051: WHY CHANGED FEDERAL PARTY ID RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	0	
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR	0	
50	RESPONSE TO A PROVINCIAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
51	PERSONAL REASONS/FACTORS	1	0.0%
52	"THE MAN"	0	
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL"	3	0.1%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH/NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	2	0.1%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH /NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	1	0.0%
58	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	0	
59	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR	0	
60	RESPONSE TO A REGIONAL/LOCAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
61	WANTED MINORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
62	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED/NO ALLEGIANCE TO ANY PARTY/ DEPENDS O	2	0.1%
63	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. & LIBERAL	3	0.1%
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2052: PERSONAL CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=840 /-] [Invalid=1921 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS		
Notes	Q14A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	282	<div><div></div></div> 33.6%
2	NO	558	<div><div></div></div> 66.4%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	
8	D.K.	5	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2053: WHO CONTACTED			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.545 /-] [StdDev=3.128 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
# v2054: CONTACT BY WHICH PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		

# v2054: CONTACT BY WHICH PARTY			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=127 /-] [Invalid=2634 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Q14C asked only to respondents who mentioned candidates in Q14B.		
Pre-question	Q14A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING? ; Q14B. WHICH ONES? (PROBE) ANY OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q14C. WHICH PARTY WAS HE/SHE (WERE THEY)?		
Notes	Q14A, Q14B, Q14C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL ONLY	33	<div></div> 26.0%
2	P.C. ONLY	29	<div></div> 22.8%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	14	<div></div> 11.0%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	0	
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	26	<div></div> 20.5%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	3	<div></div> 2.4%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
8	LIBERAL & P.C. & N.D.P.	14	<div></div> 11.0%
9	LIBERAL & P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
10	LIBERAL & N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	2	<div></div> 1.6%
12	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
13	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	0	
14	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
15	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
16	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
17	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	0	
18	LIB. & OTHER	0	
19	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
20	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
21	P.C. & N.D.P.	4	<div></div> 3.1%
22	P.C. & S.C.	0	
23	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
24	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	0	
25	N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
26	COMMUNIST ONLY	1	<div></div> 0.8%
27	OTHER ONLY (LIST) - INDEPENDENT, RHINOCEROS, LIBERTARIAN, MA	0	
28	P.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
29	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
30	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
31	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & RHINOCEROS	1	<div></div> 0.8%
0	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 9 IN Q14A, NO 1980 INTERVIEW, CONTACTE	2632	
88	D.K.	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2055: PHONE CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=833 /-] [Invalid=1928 /-]		

# v2055: PHONE CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q14A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		
Literal question	Q15A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Notes	Q14A, Q15A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	660	<div><div></div></div> 79.2%
2	NO	173	<div><div></div></div> 20.8%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW OR HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	
8	D.K.	12	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2056: WHO CONTACTED BY PHONE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=638 /-] [Invalid=2123 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q14A. DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WERE YOU PERSONALLY CONTACTED BY ANY OF THE LOCAL CANDIDATES OR PARTY WORKERS HERE IN THIS RIDING?		
Literal question	Q15A. WERE YOU CONTACTED IN ANY OTHER WAYS BY THE PARTIES DURING THE CAMPAIGN, FOR EXAMPLE, BY TELEPHONE OR BY HAVING A PAMPHLET LEFT IN YOUR MAILBOX?		
Notes	Q14A, Q15A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL ONLY	69	<div><div></div></div> 10.8%
2	P.C. ONLY	45	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
3	N.D.P. ONLY	24	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT ONLY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
5	LIBERAL & P.C.	117	<div><div></div></div> 18.3%
6	LIBERAL & N.D.P.	17	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
7	LIBERAL & SOCIAL CREDIT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
8	LIBERAL & P.C. & N.D.P.	290	<div><div></div></div> 45.5%
9	LIBERAL & P.C. & SOCIAL CREDIT	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
10	LIBERAL & N.D.P. & SOCIAL CREDIT	0	
11	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	33	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
12	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
13	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
14	LIB. & P.C. & COMMUNIST	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	LIB. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
16	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
17	LIB. & P.C. & OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
18	LIB. & OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
19	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C. & OTHER	0	
20	LIB. & S.C. & OTHER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
21	P.C. & N.D.P.	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
22	P.C. & S.C.	0	
23	P.C. & N.D.P. & S.C.	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

# v2056: WHO CONTACTED BY PHONE			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	P.C. & N.D.P. & OTHER	1	0.2%
25	N.D.P. & S.C.	0	
26	COMMUNIST ONLY	2	0.3%
27	OTHER ONLY (LIST) - INDEPENDENT, RHINOCEROS, LIBERTARIAN, MA	1	0.2%
28	P.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
29	LIB. & P.C. & N.D.P. & COMMUNIST & OTHER	0	
30	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & COMMUNIST	0	
31	LIB. & P.C. & S.C. & RHINOCEROS	0	
0	INAP., CODED 2, 8 OR 0 IN Q15A OR HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 1980 INT	2101	
88	D.K.	22	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2057: FORM OF CAMPAIGN CONTACT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2101	76.1%
1		529	19.2%
2		12	0.4%
3		113	4.1%
8		6	0.2%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2058: FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: NEWSPAPER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=843 /-] [Invalid=1918 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU READ QUITE A BIT, SOMETHING, OR NOT MUCH AT ALL ABOUT THE PARTIES, CANDIDATES, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWSPAPERS?		
Notes	Q16 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A BIT	381	45.2%
2	SOMETHING	249	29.5%
3	NOT MUCH	213	25.3%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	
8	D.K.	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2059: FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: TELEVISION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=843 /-] [Invalid=1918 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		

# v2059: FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: TELEVISION			
Literal question	HOW ABOUT TELEVISION? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, DID YOU WATCH PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU SAW QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?		
Notes	Q17 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A FEW	397	47.1%
2	SOME	295	35.0%
3	ALMOST NONE	151	17.9%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	
8	D.K.	2	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2060: FOLLOW CAMPAIGN: RADIO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=839 /-] [Invalid=1922 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	HOW ABOUT RADIO? DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, DID YOU HEAR PROGRAMS OR ADVERTISEMENTS ABOUT THE PARTIES OR CANDIDATES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN? WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU HEARD QUITE A FEW, SOME, OR ALMOST NONE?		
Notes	Q18 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	QUITE A FEW	202	24.1%
2	SOME	312	37.2%
3	ALMOST NONE	325	38.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	
8	D.K.	6	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2061: VOTED IN 80 FEDERAL ELECTION?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1747 /-] [Invalid=1014 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Notes	Q19A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VOTED	1531	87.6%
2	DID NOT VOTE	216	12.4%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	1	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2062: VOTE IN 80 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1440 /-] [Invalid=1321 /-]		
Universe	Q19B asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q19A.		

# v2062: VOTE IN 80 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Pre-question	Q19A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q19B. FOR WHICH PARTY DID YOU VOTE?		
Notes	Q19A, Q19B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	668	<div></div> 46.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	494	<div></div> 34.3%
3	N.D.P.	242	<div></div> 16.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	12	<div></div> 0.8%
5	OTHER	18	<div></div> 1.2%
6	VOTED AS BEFORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
7	SPOILED BALLOT	5	<div></div> 0.3%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K., INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN 19A	219	
9	REFUSED	89	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2063: WHY NOT VOTE 80 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/99]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=216 /-] [Invalid=2545 /-]		
Universe	Q19C asked only to respondents who did not vote, as in Q19A.		
Pre-question	Q19A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q19C. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE IN THE FEBRUARY ELECTION?		
Notes	Q19A, Q19C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	OUT OF TOWN	14	<div></div> 6.5%
2	ON VACATION, HOLIDAYS	22	<div></div> 10.2%
3	IN HOSPITAL, SICK, BLIND	27	<div></div> 12.5%
4	FORGOT ABOUT IT, DIDN'T KNOW WHEN, WHERE VOTING WAS	2	<div></div> 0.9%
5	BUSY	7	<div></div> 3.2%
6	COULDN'T DECIDE, DIDN'T KNOW CANDIDATES, PARTIES	12	<div></div> 5.6%
7	NOT INTERESTED, JUST DIDN'T BOTHER	26	<div></div> 12.0%
8	RELIGIOUS REASONS	3	<div></div> 1.4%
9	DID NOT WANT TO VOTE	18	<div></div> 8.3%
10	FELT OWN PARTY WOULD WIN WITHOUT MY VOTE	1	<div></div> 0.5%
11	PROTEST, SPOILED BALLOT	1	<div></div> 0.5%
12	WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE	10	<div></div> 4.6%
13	NEVER VOTE	1	<div></div> 0.5%
14	OUT OF TOWN ON BUSINESS, AT SCHOOL, AND OTHER SPECIFIC REASO	38	<div></div> 17.6%
15	INELIGIBLE, NOT ENUMERATED	15	<div></div> 6.9%
16	NOT ELIGIBLE, LANDED IMMIGRANT	6	<div></div> 2.8%

# v2063: WHY NOT VOTE 80 FEDERAL ELECTION			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	DIDN'T LIKE CANDIDATE(S)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
18	DIDN'T LIKE CANDIDATE'S PARTY, ANY OF THE PARTIES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
19	DIDN'T LIKE MR. TRUDEAU OR MR. CLARK	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
88	CAN'T REMEMBER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
89	NO PARTICULAR REASON	8	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
99	INAP, CODED 1 OR 8 IN Q19A	1532	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2064: PARTY WOULD HAVE VOTED IN 80			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=175 /-] [Invalid=2586 /-]		
Universe	Q19D asked only to respondents who did not vote, as in Q19A.		
Pre-question	Q19A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q19D. IF YOU HAD VOTED, WHO WOULD YOU HAVE VOTED FOR?		
Notes	Q19A, Q19D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERALS	74	<div><div></div></div> 42.3%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	56	<div><div></div></div> 32.0%
3	N.D.P.	27	<div><div></div></div> 15.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	7	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
5	OTHER	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
7	REFUSED	6	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	41	
9	INAP., CODED 1 OR 8 IN Q19A	1532	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2065: MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1653 /-] [Invalid=1108 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q20A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	605	<div><div></div></div> 36.6%
2	CANDIDATES	344	<div><div></div></div> 20.8%
3	THE PARTIES	704	<div><div></div></div> 42.6%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	47	
9	INAP., CODED 7 OR 8 IN Q19D OR 8 IN Q19A	48	

# v2065: MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2066: 2ND MOST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1577 /-] [Invalid=1184 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q20B. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE NEXT MOST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?		
Notes	Q20A, Q20B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	605	<div></div> 38.4%
2	CANDIDATES	526	<div></div> 33.4%
3	THE PARTIES	446	<div></div> 28.3%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	123	
9	INAP., CODED 7 OR 8 IN Q19D OR 8 IN Q19A	48	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2067: LEAST IMPORTANT: LEADER, CANDIDATE, PARTY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1539 /-] [Invalid=1222 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q20C. WHICH WOULD YOU SAY WAS LEAST IMPORTANT (REASON FOR VOTING)?		
Notes	Q20A, Q20C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	PARTY LEADERS	385	<div></div> 25.0%
2	CANDIDATES	719	<div></div> 46.7%
3	THE PARTIES	435	<div></div> 28.3%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	161	
9	INAP., CODED 7 OR 8 IN Q19D OR 8 IN Q19A	48	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2068: ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=899 /-] [Invalid=1862 /-]		
Universe	Q20D asked only to respondents who mentioned "party leader" or "candidate" as most important in Q20A.		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q20D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q20A, Q20D in the documentation.		

# v2068: ISSUES OR PERSONAL QUALITIES?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STAND ON ISSUES	422	<div><div></div></div> 46.9%
2	PERSONAL QUALITIES	477	<div><div></div></div> 53.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	50	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 OR 2 IN Q20A	799	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2069: CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=376 /-] [Invalid=2385 /-]		
Universe	Q20E.1 asked only to respondents who answered "stand on issues" for Q20D.		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q20D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q20E.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q20A, Q20D, Q20E.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	11	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
3	INTEREST RATES	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	26	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODE 62)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, GASOLINE, ETC.)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	0	
12	THE BUDGET	32	<div><div></div></div> 8.5%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT (ALSO SEE CODE 64)	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS (ALSO SEE CODE 65)	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL) (ALSO SEE CODES 67 + 68)	59	<div><div></div></div> 15.7%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	13	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
23	TRANSPORTATION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

v2069: CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	EDUCATION	0	
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODES 71 + 72)	7	<div></div> 1.9%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT (ALSO SEE COD	1	<div></div> 0.3%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY (ALSO SEE CODE 78)	12	<div></div> 3.2%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	3	<div></div> 0.8%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	5	<div></div> 1.3%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	1	<div></div> 0.3%
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	0	
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	13	<div></div> 3.5%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	1	<div></div> 0.3%
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	5	<div></div> 1.3%
35	REFERENDUM	4	<div></div> 1.1%
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	0	
37	GOVERNMENT, RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT PAST	0	
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKEN PROMISES	0	
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	0	
40	THE FISHERIES	3	<div></div> 0.8%
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	1	<div></div> 0.3%
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	2	<div></div> 0.5%
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE, WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
46	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	9	<div></div> 2.4%
47	ALL ISSUES UNSPECIFIED, EVERYTHING	11	<div></div> 2.9%
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZA	0	
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	6	<div></div> 1.6%
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	0	
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	0	
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	2	<div></div> 0.5%
54	BOYCOTT OF OLYMPICS	2	<div></div> 0.5%
55	IRANIAN CRISIS	2	<div></div> 0.5%
56	VERERAN'S AFFAIRS, DVA TO CHARLOTTETOWN	1	<div></div> 0.3%
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	3	<div></div> 0.8%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	0	
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	0	
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	0	
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	

# v2069: CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	0	
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	14	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	0	
71	TRUDEAU	22	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
72	CLARK	8	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	28	<div><div></div></div> 7.4%
74	THE PARTY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
77	QUEBEC ISSUES, WAR MEASURES ACT	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	0	
86	GUN CONTROL	0	
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
0	INAP, NOT CODED 1 IN Q20D	2339	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	43	
98	REFUSED	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2070: CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88/89]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=422 /-] [Invalid=2339 /-]		
Universe	Q20E.2 asked only to respondents who answered "stand on issues" for Q20D.		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q20D. WHEN YOU SAY THAT (PARTY LEADER OR CANDIDATE) WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THIS PERSON'S PERSONAL QUALITIES OR THIS PERSON'S STAND ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q20E.2 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q20A, Q20D, Q20E.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
3	INTEREST RATES	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	0	
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODE 62)	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%

v2070: CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	1	0.2%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, GASOLINE, ETC.)	0	
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	1	0.2%
12	THE BUDGET	13	3.1%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT (ALSO SEE CODE 64)	4	0.9%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	0	
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	2	0.5%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	4	0.9%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS (ALSO SEE CODE 65)	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	2	0.5%
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	2	0.5%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL) (ALSO SEE CODES 67 + 68)	18	4.3%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	10	2.4%
23	TRANSPORTATION	0	
24	EDUCATION	0	
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODES 71 + 72)	1	0.2%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT (ALSO SEE COD	1	0.2%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY (ALSO SEE CODE 78)	8	1.9%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	2	0.5%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	0	
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	2	0.5%
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	6	1.4%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	0	
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	5	1.2%
35	REFERENDUM	1	0.2%
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	0	
37	GOVERNMENT, RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT PAST	2	0.5%
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKEN PROMISES	1	0.2%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	0	
40	THE FISHERIES	0	
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	0	
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	0	
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE, WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
46	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	4	0.9%

v2070: CANDIDATE: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
47	ALL ISSUES UNSPECIFIED, EVERYTHING	0	
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZA	0	
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	1	0.2%
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	0	
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	0	
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	0	
54	BOYCOTT OF OLYMPICS	2	0.5%
55	IRANIAN CRISIS	1	0.2%
56	VERERAN'S AFFAIRS, DVA TO CHARLOTTETOWN	0	
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.2%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	2	0.5%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	0	
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	1	0.2%
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	2	0.5%
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	8	1.9%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	1	0.2%
71	TRUDEAU	5	1.2%
72	CLARK	2	0.5%
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	1	0.2%
74	THE PARTY	2	0.5%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	0	
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
77	QUEBEC ISSUES, WAR MEASURES ACT	2	0.5%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	2	0.5%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	1	0.2%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	0	
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.2%
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	2	0.5%
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	1	0.2%
86	GUN CONTROL	0	
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.2%
98	REFUSED	0	
99	NO SECOND MENTION	269	63.7%
0	INAP, NOT CODED 1 IN Q20D	2339	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2071: PARTY: ISSUE OR GENERAL APPROACH			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=674 /-] [Invalid=2087 /-]		
Universe	Q20F asked only to respondents who mentioned "party" as most important in Q20A.		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Literal question	Q20F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Notes	Q20A, Q20F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	POSITION ON ISSUES	304	<div></div> 45.1%
2	GENERAL APPROACH	370	<div></div> 54.9%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 3 IN Q20A	2057	
8	D.K.	30	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2072: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=278 /-] [Invalid=2483 /-]		
Universe	Q20G.1 asked only to respondents who answered "position on issues" for Q20F.		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q20F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q20G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q20A, Q20F, Q20G.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	13	<div></div> 4.7%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	0	
3	INTEREST RATES	2	<div></div> 0.7%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	35	<div></div> 12.6%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	1	<div></div> 0.4%
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	5	<div></div> 1.8%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODE 62)	3	<div></div> 1.1%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	1	<div></div> 0.4%
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	2	<div></div> 0.7%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, GASOLINE, ETC.)	0	
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	0	
12	THE BUDGET	43	<div></div> 15.5%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT (ALSO SEE CODE 64)	5	<div></div> 1.8%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	3	<div></div> 1.1%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	2	<div></div> 0.7%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	2	<div></div> 0.7%

v2072: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS (ALSO SEE CODE 65)	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	0	
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	2	0.7%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL) (ALSO SEE CODES 67 + 68)	52	18.7%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	5	1.8%
23	TRANSPORTATION	0	
24	EDUCATION	0	
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODES 71 + 72)	1	0.4%
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT (ALSO SEE COD	2	0.7%
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY (ALSO SEE CODE 78)	6	2.2%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	3	1.1%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	1	0.4%
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	0	
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	10	3.6%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	0	
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	1	0.4%
35	REFERENDUM	2	0.7%
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	0	
37	GOVERNMENT, RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT PAST	3	1.1%
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKEN PROMISES	1	0.4%
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	2	0.7%
40	THE FISHERIES	0	
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	1	0.4%
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	1	0.4%
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE, WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
46	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	9	3.2%
47	ALL ISSUES UNSPECIFIED, EVERYTHING	1	0.4%
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZA	0	
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	0	
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	2	0.7%
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	0	
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	0	
54	BOYCOTT OF OLYMPICS	0	
55	IRANIAN CRISIS	0	
56	VERERAN'S AFFAIRS, DVA TO CHARLOTTETOWN	1	0.4%

# v2072: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	5	1.8%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	4	1.4%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	0	
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	2	0.7%
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	0	
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	2	0.7%
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	10	3.6%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	1	0.4%
71	TRUDEAU	2	0.7%
72	CLARK	3	1.1%
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	0	
74	THE PARTY	8	2.9%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	4	1.4%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	3	1.1%
77	QUEBEC ISSUES, WAR MEASURES ACT	0	
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	3	1.1%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	2	0.7%
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	2	0.7%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	1	0.4%
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	1	0.4%
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	1	0.4%
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	0	
86	GUN CONTROL	0	
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.4%
0	INAP, NOT CODED 1 IN Q20F	2457	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	26	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2073: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/88/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1743 /-] [Invalid=1018 /-]		
Universe	Q20G.2 asked only to respondents who answered "position on issues" for Q20F.		
Pre-question	Q20A. IN DECIDING HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: THE PARTY LEADERS, THE CANDIDATES HERE IN THIS CONSTITUENCY, OR THE PARTIES TAKEN AS A WHOLE? ; Q20F. WHEN YOU SAY THAT PARTY WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU, ARE YOU THINKING OF THE PARTY'S GENERAL APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT OR ITS POSITION ON CERTAIN ISSUES?		
Literal question	Q20G.1 WHICH ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING OF SPECIFICALLY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q20A, Q20F, Q20G.2 in the documentation.		








v2073: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, PRICES (GENERAL OR SPECIFIC)	8	0.5%
2	COST OF HOUSING, HOUSING	1	0.1%
3	INTEREST RATES	3	0.2%
4	THE ECONOMY (GENERAL), FINANCIAL SITUATION	15	0.9%
5	THE ECONOMY (SPECIFIC REGIONAL ISSUES)	0	
6	DEFICIT, COUNTRY'S DEBT EACH YEAR	1	0.1%
7	GOVERNMENT SPENDING (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODE 62)	3	0.2%
8	ELECTION EXPENSES	0	
9	TAXES, INCOME TAXES	6	0.3%
10	OTHER SPECIFIC TAXES (SALES, UTILITY, GASOLINE, ETC.)	0	
11	THE DOLLAR, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	1	0.1%
12	THE BUDGET	12	0.7%
13	UNEMPLOYMENT / JOBS / EMPLOYMENT (ALSO SEE CODE 64)	5	0.3%
14	HEALTH PROGRAMMES, HOSPITALIZATION	2	0.1%
15	OLD AGE PENSIONS	2	0.1%
16	PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY, CARE / HELP FOR AGED / OLD	3	0.2%
17	DEFENSE ISSUES / COSTS (ALSO SEE CODE 65)	0	
18	FARM/ AGRICULTURAL ISSUES	0	
19	NATURAL RESOURCES, DEVELOPMENT OF	2	0.1%
20	OIL/ENERGY CRISIS/POLICY (GENERAL) (ALSO SEE CODES 67 + 68)	22	1.3%
21	ECOLOGY/POLLUTION	0	
22	CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH REST OF WORLD/FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE	5	0.3%
23	TRANSPORTATION	0	
24	EDUCATION	0	
25	LEADERSHIP (UNSPECIFIED) (ALSO SEE CODES 71 + 72)	0	
26	TIME FOR CHANGE, GENERAL DISLIKE OF GOVERNMENT (ALSO SEE COD	0	
27	NATIONAL UNITY, UNITY (ALSO SEE CODE 78)	6	0.3%
28	FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS, FEDERALISM, DECENTRALIZATION	4	0.2%
29	THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, ELECTION PROMISES	0	
30	TO EXERCISE VOTE	0	
31	RIGHTS OF MINORITY GROUPS (INDIAN, METIS)	0	
32	RIGHTS OF WORKING PEOPLE/CONCERN FOR PEOPLE	3	0.2%
33	CONTROL OF UNIONS/STRIKES, LABOUR PROBLEMS	0	
34	SPECIFIC LOCAL, REGIONAL ISSUES	1	0.1%
35	REFERENDUM	0	
36	QUEBEC DOMINANCE OF GOVERNMENT, PAMPERING OF QUEBEC, FRENCH	0	
37	GOVERNMENT, RUNNING OF GOVERNMENT, LACK OF GOVERNMENT PAST	0	

v2073: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
38	LACK OF TRUST/HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, BROKEN PROMISES	0	
39	KEEP THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT	0	
40	THE FISHERIES	0	
41	YOUTH PROBLEMS, KEEP YOUNG OCCUPIED	1	0.1%
42	HERITAGE TRUST (ALBERTA BANK AND OIL ROYALTIES)	0	
43	LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA	0	
44	OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, HOMOSEXUALITY)	2	0.1%
45	EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE, WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
46	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	4	0.2%
47	ALL ISSUES UNSPECIFIED, EVERYTHING	0	
48	MORE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, FREE ENTERPRISE, TOO MUCH SOCIALIZA	0	
49	MONARCHY	0	
50	BROADBENT'S VIEWS	0	
51	ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS	2	0.1%
52	ARTS AND CULTURAL POLICIES	1	0.1%
53	INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT	0	
54	BOYCOTT OF OLYMPICS	3	0.2%
55	IRANIAN CRISIS	0	
56	VERERAN'S AFFAIRS, DVA TO CHARLOTTETOWN	0	
60	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	3	0.2%
61	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY ON TAXES	1	0.1%
62	CUT DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE	0	
63	FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROL	0	
64	CUTBACK ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
65	UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES	0	
66	BAN THE SEAL HUNT, THE SEAL HUNT	1	0.1%
67	OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL IN NFLD	0	
68	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN/CROWN CORPORATIONS	5	0.3%
70	CUT BACK ON IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION	0	
71	TRUDEAU	1	0.1%
72	CLARK	1	0.1%
73	THE CANDIDATE(S)	0	
74	THE PARTY	1	0.1%
75	THE PARTY PLATFORM	1	0.1%
76	NEED FOR A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
77	QUEBEC ISSUES, WAR MEASURES ACT	1	0.1%
78	QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE, SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
79	LANGUAGE ISSUES, BILINGUALISM	0	
80	CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION, CONSTITUTION, BILL C60	1	0.1%
81	SOCIAL WELFARE	0	
82	FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
83	MOVE CANADA'S EMBASSY IN ISRAEL	0	

# v2073: PARTY: WHICH ISSUE IMPORTANT 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
84	THE RCMP INVESTIGATION	0	
85	METRIC SYSTEM	0	
86	GUN CONTROL	0	
87	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.1%
99	NO SECOND MENTION	1607	92.2%
0	INAP, NOT CODED 1 IN Q20F	1018	
88	DON'T KNOW, CAN'T REMEMBER	0	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2074: WHEN DECIDE 80 VOTE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=752 /-] [Invalid=2009 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q19A.		
Literal question	AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON FEBRUARY 18, 1980. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?		
Notes	Q21A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	KNEW ALL ALONG, ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE SAME PARTY	155	20.6%
2	QUITE AWHILE BEFORE THE ELECTION WAS CALLED	71	9.4%
3	WHEN THE ELECTION WAS CALLED	202	26.9%
4	6 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	8	1.1%
5	5 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	2	0.3%
6	4 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	50	6.6%
7	3 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	20	2.7%
8	2 WEEKS BEFORE ELECTION DAY	52	6.9%
9	1 WEEK BEFORE ELECTION DAY	71	9.4%
10	AT POLL ON ELECTION DAY	53	7.0%
11	REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC EVENT (UNDATED)	2	0.3%
12	OTHER	0	
13	SEVERAL OR A FEW WEEKS BEFORE	5	0.7%
14	WHEN THE BUDGET WAS INTRODUCED	16	2.1%
15	WHEN THEY BROUGHT DOWN THE GOVERNMENT, DEC. 13, 1979	39	5.2%
16	ALWAYS SPOIL BALLOT IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS	1	0.1%
17	WHEN TRUDEAU SAID HE WOULD LEAD THE LIBERALS AGAIN	5	0.7%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q19A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1980 INTERVI	1980	
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER	29	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2075: SURE ABOUT VOTE ALL ALONG			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=747 /-] [Invalid=2014 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Q21B asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q21A.		

# v2075: SURE ABOUT VOTE ALL ALONG			
Pre-question	Q21A. AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON FEBRUARY 18, 1980. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE?		
Literal question	Q21B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?		
Notes	Q21A, Q21B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SURE ALL ALONG	588	 78.7%
2	CONSIDERED OTHER	159	 21.3%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q19A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1980 INTERVI	1980	
8	D.K.	34	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2076: OTHER PARTY CONSIDERED			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=146 /-] [Invalid=2615 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Q21C asked only to respondents who voted and considered another party, as in Q21B.		
Pre-question	Q21A. AS YOU KNOW, THE FEDERAL ELECTION WAS HELD ON FEBRUARY 18, 1980. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE? ; Q21B. WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG WHICH PARTY YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR A DIFFERENT PARTY?		
Literal question	Q21C. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q21A, Q21B, Q21C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	43	 29.5%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	48	 32.9%
3	N.D.P.	40	 27.4%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT/CREDITISTE	8	 5.5%
5	LIBERALS AND PC	3	 2.1%
6	PC AND NDP	1	 0.7%
7	OTHER	3	 2.1%
0	INAP., 1, 8 OR 9 IN Q21B, NO 1980 INTERVIEW	2602	
8	D.K.	5	
9	REFUSED	8	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2077: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-90] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=734 /-] [Invalid=2027 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Q22.1 asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q19A.		
Pre-question	Q19A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q22.1 SOMETIMES, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE THE WAY YOU DID IN THE RECENT FEDERAL ELECTION, AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q19A, Q22.1 in the documentation.		

v2077: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
3	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - PRO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - CON	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - PRO	0	
6	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CON	0	
7	SELL PETROCAN - PRO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
8	DON'T SELL PETROCAN - CON	15	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
9	EDUCATION	0	
10	LIBERALS - PRO	36	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
11	LIBERALS - CON	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	26	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
15	N.D.P. - CON	0	
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	0	
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
19	WANTED A CHANGE, TIME FOR A CHANGE	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	58	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	24	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
23	CLARK - PRO	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
24	CLARK - CON	28	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
25	BROADBENT - PRO	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
26	BROADBENT - CON	0	
27	WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
28	LANGUAGE RIGHTS, NOT JUST FRENCH/ENGLISH	0	
29	PRO P.C. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	38	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	0	
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
33	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - PRO	0	
34	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - CON	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
35	GUN LEGISLATION	0	
36	USE/CONTROL OWN NATIONAL RESOURCES - PRO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
37	MORE FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
38	STAND ON BUSINESS	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
39	METRIC SYSTEM - CON	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	16	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
44	STRIKES - CON	0	

v2077: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
45	TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT RATES	3	0.4%
46	FISHERIES PROGRAM	1	0.1%
47	YOUTH PROGRAMS	2	0.3%
48	SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, MARIJUANA)	1	0.1%
49	BILINGUALISM	0	
50	SEPARTISM, REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	16	2.2%
51	CANADIAN UNITY	13	1.8%
52	THE CONSTITUTION	0	
53	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	7	1.0%
54	DEFENCE DEPARTMENT, ARMED FORCES	1	0.1%
55	FAVOUR MORE IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES - PRO IMMIGRATION	0	
56	FAVOUR LESS IMMIGRATION - CON IMMIGRATION	0	
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	2	0.3%
58	AGRICULTURE	3	0.4%
59	HEALTH CARE	2	0.3%
60	THE ECONOMY, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	42	5.7%
61	TAXES	3	0.4%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	7	1.0%
63	WELFARE	1	0.1%
64	HOUSING	1	0.1%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
66	ENERGY POLICY	71	9.7%
67	PENSIONS	6	0.8%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	0	
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	13	1.8%
70	PROTEST VOTE	0	
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	11	1.5%
72	GIVE US OUR RIGHTS	2	0.3%
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	4	0.5%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	0	
77	PARTY REPRESENTS THE LOCAL INTERESTS	0	
78	DON'T WANT LIBERALS TO HAVE MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
79	PRO LIBERAL FOR SPECIFIC HELP PERSONALLY	0	
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	1	0.1%
81	CIVIC DUTY	25	3.4%
82	P.C. BUDGET- PRO	27	3.7%
83	P.C. BUDGET- CON	33	4.5%
84	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	23	3.1%
85	ALWAYS SPOIL BALLOT IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS	1	0.1%
86	TO GIVE P.C.'S ANOTHER CHANCE	25	3.4%
87	IRANIAN CRISIS	1	0.1%
88	BOYCOTT OLYMPICS	1	0.1%

# v2077: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q19A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1980 INTERVI	1980	
89	REFUSED	44	
90	D.K.	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2078: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/89/90]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=781 /-] [Invalid=1980 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Q22.2 asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q19A.		
Pre-question	Q19A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?		
Literal question	Q22.2 (MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID) (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q19A, Q22.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE	11	1.4%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	3	0.4%
3	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - PRO	0	
4	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - CON	1	0.1%
5	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - PRO	1	0.1%
6	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CON	0	
7	SELL PETROCAN - PRO	1	0.1%
8	DON'T SELL PETROCAN - CON	10	1.3%
9	EDUCATION	0	
10	LIBERALS - PRO	11	1.4%
11	LIBERALS - CON	5	0.6%
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	6	0.8%
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	7	0.9%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	5	0.6%
15	N.D.P. - CON	0	
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	0	
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	1	0.1%
19	WANTED A CHANGE, TIME FOR A CHANGE	4	0.5%
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	5	0.6%
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	23	2.9%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	7	0.9%
23	CLARK - PRO	3	0.4%
24	CLARK - CON	8	1.0%
25	BROADBENT - PRO	3	0.4%
26	BROADBENT - CON	0	
27	WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
28	LANGUAGE RIGHTS, NOT JUST FRENCH/ENGLISH	0	

v2078: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	PRO P.C. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	14	1.8%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	1	0.1%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	1	0.1%
33	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - PRO	0	
34	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - CON	3	0.4%
35	GUN LEGISLATION	1	0.1%
36	USE/CONTROL OWN NATIONAL RESOURCES - PRO	2	0.3%
37	MORE FREE ENTERPRISE	2	0.3%
38	STAND ON BUSINESS	0	
39	METRIC SYSTEM - CON	3	0.4%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	3	0.4%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	18	2.3%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	13	1.7%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
44	STRIKES - CON	0	
45	TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT RATES	0	
46	FISHERIES PROGRAM	1	0.1%
47	YOUTH PROGRAMS	0	
48	SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, MARIJUANA)	0	
49	BILINGUALISM	3	0.4%
50	SEPARTISM, REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	12	1.5%
51	CANADIAN UNITY	8	1.0%
52	THE CONSTITUTION	2	0.3%
53	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	0.3%
54	DEFENCE DEPARTMENT, ARMED FORCES	1	0.1%
55	FAVOUR MORE IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES - PRO IMMIGRATION	0	
56	FAVOUR LESS IMMIGRATION - CON IMMIGRATION	1	0.1%
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	11	1.4%
58	AGRICULTURE	2	0.3%
59	HEALTH CARE	2	0.3%
60	THE ECONOMY, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	27	3.5%
61	TAXES	8	1.0%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	8	1.0%
63	WELFARE	2	0.3%
64	HOUSING	1	0.1%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
66	ENERGY POLICY	47	6.0%
67	PENSIONS	5	0.6%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	0	
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	12	1.5%
70	PROTEST VOTE	0	
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	2	0.3%
72	GIVE US OUR RIGHTS	1	0.1%

v2078: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	5	0.6%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	0	
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	0	
77	PARTY REPRESENTS THE LOCAL INTERESTS	1	0.1%
78	DON'T WANT LIBERALS TO HAVE MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
79	PRO LIBERAL FOR SPECIFIC HELP PERSONALLY	1	0.1%
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	0	
81	CIVIC DUTY	1	0.1%
82	P.C. BUDGET- PRO	22	2.8%
83	P.C. BUDGET- CON	22	2.8%
84	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	18	2.3%
85	ALWAYS SPOIL BALLOT IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS	1	0.1%
86	TO GIVE P.C.'S ANOTHER CHANCE	18	2.3%
87	IRANIAN CRISIS	2	0.3%
88	BOYCOTT OLYMPICS	1	0.1%
99	NO SECOND MENTION	355	45.5%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q19A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1980 INTERVI	1980	
89	REFUSED	0	
90	D.K.	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2079: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 3

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/89/90]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=781 /-] [Invalid=1980 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Q22.3 asked only to respondents who voted, as in Q19A.
Pre-question	Q19A. NOW, THINKING ABOUT THIS YEAR'S FEBRUARY FEDERAL ELECTION, WE FIND THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE WEREN'T ABLE TO VOTE BECAUSE THEY WERE SICK, OR DIDN'T HAVE TIME, OR HAD SOME OTHER REASONS FOR NOT VOTING. HOW ABOUT YOU? DID YOU VOTE THIS TIME, OR DID SOMETHING HAPPEN TO KEEP YOU FROM VOTING?
Literal question	Q22.3 (MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT MADE YOU VOTE THE WAY YOU DID) (THIRD MENTION)
Notes	Q19A, Q22.3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENT, FOR GOOD OF THE PEOPLE	6	0.8%
2	TRADITIONAL VOTE	1	0.1%
3	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - PRO	1	0.1%
4	MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY - CON	2	0.3%
5	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - PRO	1	0.1%
6	CAPITAL PUNISHMENT - CON	0	
7	SELL PETROCAN - PRO	0	
8	DON'T SELL PETROCAN - CON	6	0.8%
9	EDUCATION	0	
10	LIBERALS - PRO	2	0.3%
11	LIBERALS - CON	0	
12	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - PRO	3	0.4%

v2079: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES - CON	3	0.4%
14	N.D.P. - PRO	1	0.1%
15	N.D.P. - CON	0	
16	SOCIAL CREDIT - PRO	0	
17	SOCIAL CREDIT - CON	0	
18	PARTY	1	0.1%
19	WANTED A CHANGE, TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
20	LEADERSHIP (GENERAL REFERENCE), THE LEADERS	0	
21	TRUDEAU - PRO	6	0.8%
22	TRUDEAU - CON	4	0.5%
23	CLARK - PRO	4	0.5%
24	CLARK - CON	9	1.2%
25	BROADBENT - PRO	2	0.3%
26	BROADBENT - CON	0	
27	WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
28	LANGUAGE RIGHTS, NOT JUST FRENCH/ENGLISH	0	
29	PRO P.C. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	
30	LOCAL CANDIDATE - PRO	4	0.5%
31	LOCAL CANDIDATE - CON	1	0.1%
32	LOCAL CANDIDATE (CANNOT DETERMINE DIRECTION)	1	0.1%
33	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - PRO	0	
34	MOVE THE EMBASSY IN ISRAEL - CON	0	
35	GUN LEGISLATION	0	
36	USE/CONTROL OWN NATIONAL RESOURCES - PRO	0	
37	MORE FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
38	STAND ON BUSINESS	1	0.1%
39	METRIC SYSTEM - CON	2	0.3%
40	ISSUES (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
41	INFLATION (GENERAL)	4	0.5%
42	INFLATION (SPECIFIC)	5	0.6%
43	WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
44	STRIKES - CON	0	
45	TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT RATES	1	0.1%
46	FISHERIES PROGRAM	1	0.1%
47	YOUTH PROGRAMS	0	
48	SOCIAL ISSUES (ABORTION, MARIJUANA)	1	0.1%
49	BILINGUALISM	1	0.1%
50	SEPARTISM, REFERENDUM, SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION	8	1.0%
51	CANADIAN UNITY	1	0.1%
52	THE CONSTITUTION	0	
53	FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	7	0.9%
54	DEFENCE DEPARTMENT, ARMED FORCES	1	0.1%
55	FAVOUR MORE IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES - PRO IMMIGRATION	1	0.1%
56	FAVOUR LESS IMMIGRATION - CON IMMIGRATION	0	

v2079: REAL REASON VOTE RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN POLICY	3	0.4%
58	AGRICULTURE	1	0.1%
59	HEALTH CARE	1	0.1%
60	THE ECONOMY, VALUE OF THE DOLLAR	5	0.6%
61	TAXES	7	0.9%
62	GOVERNMENT SPENDING	1	0.1%
63	WELFARE	1	0.1%
64	HOUSING	2	0.3%
65	FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
66	ENERGY POLICY	15	1.9%
67	PENSIONS	5	0.6%
68	FAMILY ALLOWANCES	0	
69	UNEMPLOYMENT/JOBS	6	0.8%
70	PROTEST VOTE	0	
71	MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
72	GIVE US OUR RIGHTS	0	
73	PARTY REPRESENTS THE WORKING CLASS	6	0.8%
74	PARTY REPRESENTS THE MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
75	PARTY REPRESENTS REGIONAL INTERESTS	0	
77	PARTY REPRESENTS THE LOCAL INTERESTS	0	
78	DON'T WANT LIBERALS TO HAVE MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
79	PRO LIBERAL FOR SPECIFIC HELP PERSONALLY	0	
80	PERSONAL OR FAMILY JOBS AFFECTED	0	
81	CIVIC DUTY	0	
82	P.C. BUDGET- PRO	3	0.4%
83	P.C. BUDGET- CON	7	0.9%
84	PRICE OF GAS/ OIL/ ENERGY	4	0.5%
85	ALWAYS SPOIL BALLOT IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS	1	0.1%
86	TO GIVE P.C.'S ANOTHER CHANCE	4	0.5%
87	IRANIAN CRISIS	2	0.3%
88	BOYCOTT OLYMPICS	0	
99	NO THIRD MENTION	611	78.2%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q19A: HALF SAMPLE 2 OR NO 1980 INTERVI	1980	
89	REFUSED	0	
90	D.K.	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2080: TRUDEAU FEELING THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1719 /-] [Invalid=1042 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE











v2080: TRUDEAU FEELING THERMOMETER

SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

Literal question LET'S START WITH THE LIBERALS, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. TRUDEAU? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?

Notes Q23A in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	188	 10.9%
2	2 SCORE	1	 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	1	 0.1%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	6	 0.3%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	94	 5.5%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	67	 3.9%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	14	 0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	79	 4.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	6	 0.3%









v2080: TRUDEAU FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	77	4.5%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	0.1%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	225	13.1%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.1%
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	11	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	149	8.7%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	17	1.0%
66	66 SCORE	1	0.1%
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	202	11.8%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	72	4.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	213	12.4%

v2080: TRUDEAU FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	20	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	138	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	16	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	111	<div><div></div></div> 6.5%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1042	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2081: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1559 /-] [Invalid=1202 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23B. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23B in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	106	 6.8%
2	2 SCORE	1	 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	1	 0.1%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	77	 4.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	70	 4.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	14	 0.9%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	

v2081: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	30 SCORE	76	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	77	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	422	<div><div></div></div> 27.1%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	151	<div><div></div></div> 9.7%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	144	<div><div></div></div> 9.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	

# v2081: LOCAL LIBERAL CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
75	75 SCORE	58	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	159	<div><div></div></div> 10.2%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	95	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
95	95 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	48	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1202	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2082: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1702 /-] [Invalid=1059 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23C. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE LIBERAL PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23C in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		

v2082: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	73	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	38	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	63	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	13	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	104	<div><div></div></div> 6.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	11	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	137	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

v2082: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	1	0.1%
50	NEUTRAL	333	19.6%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	10	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	219	12.9%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	25	1.5%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	208	12.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	88	5.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	193	11.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	12	0.7%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	87	5.1%

v2082: LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	0.4%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	64	3.8%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1059	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2083: CLARK FEELING THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1694 /-] [Invalid=1067 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>
Literal question	Q23D. NOW, THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. CLARK? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?
Notes	Q23A, Q23D in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	154	9.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	1	0.1%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	8	0.5%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	1	0.1%
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	100	5.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	1	0.1%
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.1%










v2083: CLARK FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	1	0.1%
20	20 SCORE	96	5.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	1	0.1%
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	31	1.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	138	8.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	10	0.6%
36	36 SCORE	1	0.1%
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	201	11.9%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	1	0.1%
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	14	0.8%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	1	0.1%
50	NEUTRAL	365	21.5%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.1%
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	16	0.9%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	196	11.6%

# v2083: CLARK FEELING THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	21	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	133	<div><div></div></div> 7.9%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	99	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	9	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	27	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1067	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2084: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1559 /-] [Invalid=1202 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

v2084: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>
Literal question	Q23E. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?
Notes	Q23A, Q23E in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	112	 7.2%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	1	 0.1%
4	4 SCORE	1	 0.1%
5	5 SCORE	2	 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	71	 4.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	94	 6.0%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	16	 1.0%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	90	 5.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	

v2084: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	5	0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	132	8.5%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	7	0.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	379	24.3%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.1%
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	11	0.7%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	166	10.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	21	1.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	137	8.8%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	60	3.8%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	

# v2084: LOCAL PC CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
78	78 SCORE	1	0.1%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	113	7.2%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	9	0.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	66	4.2%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	58	3.7%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1202	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2085: PC PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1697 /-] [Invalid=1064 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23F. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23F in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	75	4.4%
2	2 SCORE	1	0.1%

v2085: PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	3 SCORE	1	0.1%
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	4	0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	63	3.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	73	4.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	16	0.9%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	116	6.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	14	0.8%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	189	11.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	14	0.8%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	

v2085: PC PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	401	23.6%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	1	0.1%
55	55 SCORE	15	0.9%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	210	12.4%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	26	1.5%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	175	10.3%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	62	3.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	142	8.4%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	10	0.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	54	3.2%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	

# v2085: PC PARTY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	5	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	27	1.6%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1064	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2086: BROADBENT THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1669 /-] [Invalid=1092 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23G. HOW ABOUT THE N.D.P.? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. BROADBENT? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23G in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	100	6.0%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	0.1%
6	6 SCORE	1	0.1%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	50	3.0%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	

v2086: BROADBENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	64	3.8%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	13	0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	102	6.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	8	0.5%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	131	7.8%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	8	0.5%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	1	0.1%
48	48 SCORE	1	0.1%
49	49 SCORE	1	0.1%
50	NEUTRAL	340	20.4%
51	51 SCORE	1	0.1%
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	16	1.0%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	244	14.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	

# v2086: BROADBENT THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	38	2.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	207	12.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	1	0.1%
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	53	3.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	1	0.1%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	149	8.9%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	8	0.5%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	91	5.5%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	33	2.0%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1092	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2087: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1368 /-] [Invalid=1393 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00		










v2087: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

Literal question Q23H. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YOUR LOCAL N.D.P. CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?

Notes Q23A, Q23H in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	161	 11.8%
2	2 SCORE	1	 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	 0.2%
6	6 SCORE	1	 0.1%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	64	 4.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	4	 0.3%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	80	 5.8%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	19	 1.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	105	 7.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	

v2087: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
35	35 SCORE	7	0.5%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	107	7.8%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	10	0.7%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	1	0.1%
50	NEUTRAL	434	31.7%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	9	0.7%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	1	0.1%
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	131	9.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	14	1.0%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	85	6.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	22	1.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	

# v2087: LOCAL NDP CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
80	80 SCORE	56	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	33	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1393	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2088: NDO THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1635 /-] [Invalid=1126 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23I. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE N.D.P. PARTY TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23I in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	128	<div><div></div></div> 7.8%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
4	4 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
5	5 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v2088: NDO THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	6 SCORE	1	0.1%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	73	4.5%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	8	0.5%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	86	5.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	24	1.5%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	1	0.1%
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	143	8.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	13	0.8%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	176	10.8%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	15	0.9%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	394	24.1%

v2088: NDO THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	2	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	1	0.1%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	21	1.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	1	0.1%
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	206	12.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	32	2.0%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	117	7.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	26	1.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	76	4.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	3	0.2%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	51	3.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	2	0.1%

# v2088: NDO THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	30	<div></div> 1.8%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1126	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2089: FAB ROY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=408 /-] [Invalid=2353 /-]		
Universe	Q23J asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23J. HOW ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT? HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. ROY? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23J in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	113	<div></div> 27.7%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	4	<div></div> 1.0%
6	6 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.2%
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	25	<div></div> 6.1%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.5%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	26	<div></div> 6.4%

v2089: FAB ROY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	8	2.0%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	39	9.6%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	31	7.6%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	0	
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	83	20.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	1	0.2%
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.5%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	35	8.6%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	2	0.5%

# v2089: FAB ROY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	19	<div><div></div></div> 4.7%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	7	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	0	
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	2353	
999	INAP., NON-QUEBEC INTERVIEW, NO 1980 INTERVIEW	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2090: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=221 /-] [Invalid=2540 /-]		
Universe	Q23K asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec, and if Social Credit had a local candadite in this riding.		
Pre-question	Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR		

v2090: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

Literal question Q23K. HOW MUCH DID YOU LIKE YO UR LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE IN THE RECENT ELECTION?

Notes Q23A, Q23K in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	57	25.8%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	0.5%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	15	6.8%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.9%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	15	6.8%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	3	1.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	17	7.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.5%

v2090: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	21	<div><div></div></div> 9.5%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	61	<div><div></div></div> 27.6%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	0	
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	9	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%

# v2090: LOCAL SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	0	
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	3	1.4%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	0	
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	0	
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	2383	
999	INAP., NON-QUEBEC INTERVIEW, NO 1980 INTERVIEW NO LOCAL SOC	157	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2091: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/999]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=413 /-] [Invalid=2348 /-]		
Universe	Q23L asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q23L. AND, FINALLY, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY, TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q23A, Q23L in the documentation. THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS WAS ALTERNATED.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	117	28.3%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	

v2091: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	5 SCORE	3	0.7%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	44	10.7%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	0.5%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	32	7.7%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	9	2.2%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	51	12.3%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	0.5%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	26	6.3%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.5%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	

v2091: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	NEUTRAL	84	20.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	0	
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	21	5.1%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	1	0.2%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	10	2.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	3	0.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	2	0.5%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	0	
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	2	0.5%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	

# v2091: SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
95	95 SCORE	0	0.5%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	2	
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NO 1980 INTERVIEW	2348	
999	INAP., NON-QUEBEC INTERVIEW, NO 1980 INTERVIEW	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2092: PROVINCE GENERAL-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1726 /-] [Invalid=1035 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE. THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.		
Literal question	Q24A. NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS. FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q23A, Q24 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	1	0.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	0.2%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	4	
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	

v2092: PROVINCE GENERAL-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	3	0.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	3	0.2%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	9	0.5%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	21	1.2%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	99	5.7%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.1%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	84	4.9%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	

v2092: PROVINCE GENERAL-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	15	0.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	1	0.1%
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	174	10.1%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	91	5.3%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	328	19.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	37	2.1%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	311	18.0%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	1	0.1%
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	35	2.0%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	1	0.1%
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	503	29.1%
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	1035	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2093: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1709 /-] [Invalid=1052 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR










v2093: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

Notes

Q23A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	56	 3.3%
2	2 SCORE	1	 0.1%
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	3	 0.2%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	37	 2.2%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	30	 1.8%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	13	 0.8%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	53	 3.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	6	 0.4%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	

v2093: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	110	6.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	1	0.1%
45	45 SCORE	9	0.5%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	278	16.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	1	0.1%
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	10	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	1	0.1%
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	225	13.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	1	0.1%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	30	1.8%
66	66 SCORE	1	0.1%
67	67 SCORE	1	0.1%
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	252	14.7%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	89	5.2%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	250	14.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	

# v2093: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	22	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	138	<div><div></div></div> 8.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
98	98 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	82	<div><div></div></div> 4.8%
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	1052	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2094: CANADA GENERAL-THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1728 /-] [Invalid=1033 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOU FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q24C. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?		
Notes	Q23A, Q24C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	

v2094: CANADA GENERAL-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	6	0.3%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	8	0.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.1%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	12	0.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	0	
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	21	1.2%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.1%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	1	0.1%
50	NEUTRAL	101	5.8%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	

v2094: CANADA GENERAL-THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	5	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	92	5.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	11	0.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	1	0.1%
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	155	9.0%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	75	4.3%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	256	14.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	27	1.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	266	15.4%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	38	2.2%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	1	0.1%
98	98 SCORE	0	

# v2094: CANADA GENERAL-THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	648	<div></div> 37.5%
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	1033	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2095: CANADA GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1693 /-] [Invalid=1068 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q24D. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?		
Notes	Q23A, Q24D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	38	<div></div> 2.2%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	25	<div></div> 1.5%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	3	<div></div> 0.2%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	35	<div></div> 2.1%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	

v2095: CANADA GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	25 SCORE	9	0.5%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	69	4.1%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	5	0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	102	6.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	0.1%
49	49 SCORE	2	0.1%
50	NEUTRAL	336	19.8%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	4	0.2%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	226	13.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	1	0.1%
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	35	2.1%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	1	0.1%
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	

v2095: CANADA GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
70	70 SCORE	236	<div></div> 13.9%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	78	<div></div> 4.6%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	225	<div></div> 13.3%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	17	<div></div> 1.0%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	126	<div></div> 7.4%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	8	<div></div> 0.5%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	104	<div></div> 6.1%
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	1068	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2096: USA THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1630 /-] [Invalid=1131 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	<p>Q23A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 00 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100, THE WARMER YOUR FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEMS MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>THERE ARE MANY ASPECTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES WHICH STRIKE CANADIANS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. WE WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD SOME OF THESE ASPECTS OF OUR PARTIES. WE ARE INTERESTED TO SEE HOW YOU LIKED THE LEADERS, THE PARTY'S CANDIDATE IN YOUR RIDING IN THE</p>

v2096: USA THERMOMETER

	LAST ELECTION, AND THE PARTY AS A WHOLE. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q24E. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE UNITED STATES?
Notes	Q23A, Q24E in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	23	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	14	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	44	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	67	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	

v2096: USA THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	0.2%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	1	0.1%
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	400	24.5%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	15	0.9%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	1	0.1%
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	268	16.4%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	22	1.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	237	14.5%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	93	5.7%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	225	13.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	16	1.0%
86	86 SCORE	0	

# v2096: USA THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	94	<div><div></div></div> 5.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	61	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
0	NO OPINION, NO ANSWER, REFUSED	1131	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2097: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=842 /-] [Invalid=1919 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q25A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	136	<div><div></div></div> 16.2%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, INTEGRITY	25	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	35	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	42	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	19	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	83	<div><div></div></div> 9.9%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HAS SETTLED DOWN, GOOD FATHER T	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
12	BILINGUAL	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS, MAN OF ACTION	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%

v2097: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	8	1.0%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES' MAN	0	
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESS ONWARD, TRYING TO CHANGE THINGS	0	
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	8	1.0%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	1	0.1%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	10	1.2%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	1	0.1%
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING, FRIENDLY	3	0.4%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	8	1.0%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	24	2.9%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	4	0.5%
29	AGGRESSIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	11	1.3%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	12	1.4%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q./LA PORTE AFFAIR	0	
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING Q	4	0.5%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE/FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	1	0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS D	1	0.1%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	4	0.5%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	4	0.5%
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION, H	0	
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE/EVERYONE	1	0.1%
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	0	
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	8	1.0%
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNETI	8	1.0%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND', HIS ARROGA	1	0.1%
44	NOT PATRONIZING, MORE HUMBLE	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	2	0.2%
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS/CRISES WELL	3	0.4%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	5	0.6%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	0	
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING A	4	0.5%
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	0	
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	1	0.1%

v2097: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT OF	2	0.2%
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKE COMPROMISES	1	0.1%
55	LIKE THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT	5	0.6%
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	0	
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	0	
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING	1	0.1%
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR DI	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	16	1.9%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT/STATESMAN	6	0.7%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	1	0.1%
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, PICKS BEST PEOPLE FOR JOBS	0	
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	2	0.2%
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS/MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	0	
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT/WHEN HE HAD A LOT	0	
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	0	
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.1%
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	0	
72	GOOD IMAGE	0	
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	3	0.4%
74	HE TRAVELS	0	
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	0	
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING, SENSITIVE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.1%
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	2	0.2%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	0	
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	0	
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS OR	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	0	
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	2	0.2%
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS/ENERGY CRISIS	0	
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	2	0.2%
87	MORE EXPERIENCED	32	3.8%
89	HANDLES FAMILY PROBLEMS WITH CLASS	5	0.6%

# v2097: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	3	0.4%
91	HE IS A FEDERALIST	0	
92	HE IS CATHOLIC	0	
93	HE IS GOOD FOR CERTAIN AREAS OF CANADA	0	
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	25	3.0%
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	131	15.6%
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	69	8.2%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	2	0.2%
99	SEE 1979 STUDY, FEEL SAME AS BEFORE	1	0.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	1916	
98	REFUSED	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2098: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=416 /-] [Invalid=2345 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q25A.1 NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25A.2 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU?		
Notes	Q25A.1, Q25A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	57	13.7%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, INTEGRITY	14	3.4%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	17	4.1%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	20	4.8%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	3	0.7%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	15	3.6%
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	51	12.3%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	3	0.7%
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HAS SETTLED DOWN, GOOD FATHER T	2	0.5%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	6	1.4%
12	BILINGUAL	7	1.7%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	3	0.7%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS, MAN OF ACTION	6	1.4%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	0	
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	9	2.2%

v2098: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	2	0.5%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES' MAN	1	0.2%
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESS ONWARD, TRYING TO CHANGE THINGS	0	
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	5	1.2%
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	2	0.5%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	8	1.9%
23	INTERESTING	1	0.2%
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	1	0.2%
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING, FRIENDLY	1	0.2%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	2	0.5%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	22	5.3%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	1	0.2%
29	AGGRESSIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	9	2.2%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	19	4.6%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q./LA PORTE AFFAIR	2	0.5%
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING Q	5	1.2%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE/FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	2	0.5%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS D	6	1.4%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	4	1.0%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	0	
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION, H	1	0.2%
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE/EVERYONE	0	
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	3	0.7%
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	5	1.2%
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNETI	11	2.6%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND', HIS ARROGA	1	0.2%
44	NOT PATRONIZING, MORE HUMBLE	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	0	
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS/CRISES WELL	2	0.5%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	5	1.2%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	0	
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING A	1	0.2%
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	1	0.2%
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	0	

v2098: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	HIS AMBITION	0	
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT OF	2	0.5%
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKE COMPROMISES	1	0.2%
55	LIKE THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT	5	1.2%
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	1	0.2%
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	0	
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING	0	
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR DI	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	6	1.4%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT/STATESMAN	11	2.6%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	1	0.2%
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, PICKS BEST PEOPLE FOR JOBS	0	
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	1	0.2%
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	3	0.7%
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS/MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	1	0.2%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT/WHEN HE HAD A LOT	2	0.5%
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	0	
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	0	
72	GOOD IMAGE	2	0.5%
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	4	1.0%
74	HE TRAVELS	0	
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	0	
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING, SENSITIVE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.2%
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	1	0.2%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	2	0.5%
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	1	0.2%
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	0	
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS OR	1	0.2%
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	1	0.2%
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	1	0.2%
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS/ENERGY CRISIS	1	0.2%
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	1	0.2%
87	MORE EXPERIENCED	22	5.3%
89	HANDLES FAMILY PROBLEMS WITH CLASS	3	0.7%

# v2098: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
91	HE IS A FEDERALIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
92	HE IS CATHOLIC	0	
93	HE IS GOOD FOR CERTAIN AREAS OF CANADA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY, FEEL SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	2345	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2099: LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=170 /-] [Invalid=2591 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q25A.1 NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS LEADERS OF THE FEDERAL POLITICAL PARTIES. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25A.3 WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q25A.1, Q25A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART, CAPABLE, BRIGHT, CLEVER, KNOWS WHAT HE	21	<div><div></div></div> 12.4%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, FRANK, DIRECT, INTEGRITY	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
3	PERSONALITY, NICE PERSONALITY, NICE PERSON, I LIKE HIM, LIKE	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, SPEAKING ABILITY OR MANNER	9	<div><div></div></div> 5.3%
5	GOOD MAN, FINE MAN	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
6	WORKS HARD, DOING A GOOD JOB, TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	8	<div><div></div></div> 4.7%
7	GOOD LEADER, LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, HIS LEADERSHIP, BEST LEA	17	<div><div></div></div> 10.0%
8	CALM, COOL, EASY MANNER, UNRUFFLED	0	
9	GOOD FAMILY MAN, HIS FAMILY, HAS SETTLED DOWN, GOOD FATHER T	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	
11	GOOD LOOKING, HANDSOME, HIS APPEARANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
12	BILINGUAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
14	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC, FORCEFUL, VIGOROUS, MAN OF ACTION	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
15	HE IS YOUNG, YOUTHFUL, LOOKS YOUNG FOR HIS AGE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
16	INTELLECTUAL, SCHOLAR, WELL-EDUCATED	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%



v2099: LIKE ABOUTTRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS, BLUNT, MIND OF HIS OWN	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
18	CHARMING, A LADIES' MAN	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
19	MODERN, UP TO DATE, PROGRESS ONWARD, TRYING TO CHANGE THINGS	0	
20	COLOURFUL, FLAMBOYANT, FLAIR, HIS STYLE, CLASSY	0	
21	BROAD MINDED, OPEN-MINDED, TOLERANT	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
23	INTERESTING	0	
24	SWINGER, SKIER, ATHLETE	0	
25	CHEERFUL, PLEASANT, ALWAYS SMILING, FRIENDLY	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS, SPUNK, BRAVERY	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS, DOESN'T EVADE THE ISSUE	6	<div><div></div></div> 3.5%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR	0	
29	AGGRESSIVE, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS	8	<div><div></div></div> 4.7%
30	GOOD INTERNATIONALLY, GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS	10	<div><div></div></div> 5.9%
31	THE WAY HE HANDLED F.L.Q./LA PORTE AFFAIR	0	
32	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING QUEBEC, AGAINST SEPARATISM, KEEPING Q	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
33	STANDS UP FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE/FRENCH PEOPLE, HE REPRESENTS	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, INTERESTED IN CANADA, HE HAS D	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, UNDERST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
36	HE HAS HELPED THE PEOPLE	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, HAS DONE A LOT FOR OLD PEOPLE, F	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
38	HE IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, DONE A LOT FOR YOUNGER GENERATION, H	0	
39	HE IS FOR ALL WALKS OF LIFE/EVERYONE	0	
40	SERIOUS, MATURE, CAREFUL, CONTROLS HIMSELF	0	
41	A GENTLEMAN, DIGNIFIED, DISTINGUISHED, I RESPECT HIM	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
42	HAS A WAY WITH PEOPLE, HAS CHARISMA, HIS POPULARITY, MAGNETI	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
43	REFRESHING, DIFFERENT, 'NICEST EGOMANIAC AROUND', HIS ARROGA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
44	NOT PATRONIZING, MORE HUMBLE	0	
45	GOOD UPBRINGING, COMES FROM A GOOD BACKGROUND, A GOOD LAWYER	0	
46	HANDLES PROBLEMS/CRISES WELL	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
47	CONFIDENT, VERY POSITIVE	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
48	NOT A BAD CHAP, HE IS O.K.	0	
49	HE IS OUTSTANDING, PERFECT, THE IDEAL MAN, LIKE EVERYTHING A	0	
50	HE ACTS QUICKLY	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.2%
51	HE HAS HIS OWN MONEY, IS A RICH MAN, NOT IN IT FOR THE MONEY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%

v2099: LIKE ABOUTTRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	HIS AMBITION	1	0.6%
53	HE KEEPS HIS PROMISES OR MOST OF HIS PROMISES, MADE A LOT OF	2	1.2%
54	WILLING TO ADMIT MISTAKES, MAKE COMPROMISES	1	0.6%
55	LIKE THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT	2	1.2%
56	TRYING TO KEEP PEACE	0	
57	WORK HE DID AS MINISTER OF JUSTICE, OVERHAULING OF CRIMINAL	0	
58	BECOMING MORE SOCIALISTIC	0	
59	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING	0	
60	RAISED FAMILY ALLOWANCE, WIDOWS' ALLOWANCE, ALLOWANCE FOR DI	0	
61	HE IS STRONG	1	0.6%
62	HE IS A DIPLOMAT/STATESMAN	3	1.8%
63	HE IS REALISTIC	0	
64	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, PICKS BEST PEOPLE FOR JOBS	1	0.6%
65	RAN A GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
66	DOESN'T MAKE TOO MANY PROMISES	1	0.6%
67	LIKE HIS IDEAS/MOST OF HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, YOUNG IDEAS	2	1.2%
68	HE DID A GOOD JOB IN MINORITY GOVERNMENT/WHEN HE HAD A LOT	0	
69	THE WAY HE HANDLED EMPLOYMENT, JOBS	1	0.6%
70	LIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
71	HANDLES PRESS WELL	0	
72	GOOD IMAGE	1	0.6%
73	HIS APPROACH, MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL LIKE (UNSPECI	4	2.4%
74	HE TRAVELS	0	
75	HE KEEPS PEOPLE OR THE COUNTRY INFORMED OF WHAT IS GOING ON	0	
76	SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING, SENSITIVE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
77	THE WAY HE HANDLES MEETINGS, KNOWS HOW TO DIRECT QUESTIONS	1	0.6%
78	HIS INDEPENDENCE	1	0.6%
79	HIS OUTLOOK ON LIFE	0	
80	COMES OVER ON T.V. VERY WELL	2	1.2%
81	DONE A FEW THINGS FOR THE FARMERS (ANY MENTION OF FARMERS OR	0	
82	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS BUSINESS	0	
83	MEDICARE, OTHER WELFARE	0	
84	ECONOMIC POLICIES (INCLUDING TAXES)	0	
85	THE WAY HE IS HANDLING THE OIL CRISIS/ENERGY CRISIS	0	
86	I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN HIM	1	0.6%
87	MORE EXPERIENCED	4	2.4%
89	HANDLES FAMILY PROBLEMS WITH CLASS	5	2.9%















v2099: LIKE ABOUTTRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	GOOD ADMINISTRATOR	1	 0.6%
91	HE IS A FEDERALIST	1	 0.6%
92	HE IS CATHOLIC	0	
93	HE IS GOOD FOR CERTAIN AREAS OF CANADA	0	
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	LIKED NOTHING, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY, FEEL SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1	2591	
98	REFUSED	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2100: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=841 /-] [Invalid=1920 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?
Notes	Q25B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	158	 18.8%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	1	 0.1%
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE/ANTICS	5	 0.6%
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO B	4	 0.5%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN'	5	 0.6%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE/WORKIN	1	 0.1%
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY/CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED IN C	6	 0.7%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT CO	5	 0.6%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	3	 0.4%
11	EVERYTHING	8	 1.0%
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	1	 0.1%
13	GIVES/LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AID	0	
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUNC	0	
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY ON (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	1	 0.1%
16	SPENDS/WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	6	 0.7%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC/FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH CANAD	7	 0.8%

v2100: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FRE	1	0.1%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO/OTTAWA	1	0.1%
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	12	1.4%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFORE	6	0.7%
22	HE IS FRENCH	3	0.4%
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	10	1.2%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	25	3.0%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, RUDE	6	0.7%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	3	0.4%
27	SARCASTIC, RIDICULES	3	0.4%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	14	1.7%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	17	2.0%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPECI	18	2.1%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	3	0.4%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	15	1.8%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	2	0.2%
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIST	20	2.4%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	3	0.4%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	4	0.5%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	1	0.1%
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	2	0.2%
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	10	1.2%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	2	0.2%
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIG	2	0.2%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	1	0.1%
45	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES	0	
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	7	0.8%
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC	10	1.2%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	2	0.2%
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL, MARGRET, HIS SEPARATION	2	0.2%
51	POOR CABINET, UNABLE TO KEEP GOOD MEMBERS, POOR CHOICE OF ME	1	0.1%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	1	0.1%
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	2	0.2%

v2100: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
54	HIS STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	2	0.2%
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS	0	
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.1%
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	0	
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	2	0.2%
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	1	0.1%
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM, CANADIAN UNITY	6	0.7%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	0	
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	0	
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	0	
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE/FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FARMER	0	
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUAL	1	0.1%
67	HANDLING OF OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES	3	0.4%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.1%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	2	0.2%
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL/SMART, TALKS DOWN TO PEOPLE	5	0.6%
71		5	0.6%
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	4	0.5%
73	POOR SPEAKER	1	0.1%
74	HIS TEMPER	3	0.4%
75	NOT KEEPING CANADIAN GOVERNMENT INFORMED	0	
76	CAMPAIGN CRITICIZING OTHER PARTY	2	0.2%
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	10	1.2%
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO T	3	0.4%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY, HIS PERSONAL LIFE	0	
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	2	0.2%
83	TOO STUBBORN, NOT FLEXIBLE	7	0.8%
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	2	0.2%
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	4	0.5%
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0	
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	0	
90	HE WAS IN TOO LONG, SHOULDN'T HAVE RUN AGAIN	14	1.7%
91	HE/HIS PARTY LOST TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE	5	0.6%
93	MADE A MESS OF THINGS, LEFT A MESS FOR CLARK TO CLEAN UP	0	
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	43	5.1%
95	NO NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	227	27.0%

# v2100: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	64	<div><div></div></div> 7.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY - FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1916	
98	REFUSED	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2101: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=199 /-] [Invalid=2562 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q25B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B.2 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q25B.1, Q25B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	23	<div><div></div></div> 11.6%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	0	
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE/ANTICS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO B	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN'	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE/WORKIN	6	<div><div></div></div> 3.0%
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY/CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED IN C	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT CO	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	0	
13	GIVES/LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AID	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUNC	0	
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY ON (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
16	SPENDS/WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC/FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH CANAD	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FRE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO/OTTAWA	0	
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%

v2101: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFORE	0	
22	HE IS FRENCH	0	
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	4	2.0%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	9	4.5%
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, RUDE	2	1.0%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.5%
27	SARCASTIC, RIDICULES	5	2.5%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	9	4.5%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	4	2.0%
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPECI	11	5.5%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	2	1.0%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	5	2.5%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	1	0.5%
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIST	13	6.5%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	1	0.5%
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	2	1.0%
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	2	1.0%
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	0	
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	2	1.0%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	1	0.5%
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIG	3	1.5%
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	1	0.5%
45	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES	1	0.5%
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	1	0.5%
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC	5	2.5%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	0	
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL, MARGRET, HIS SEPARATION	3	1.5%
51	POOR CABINET, UNABLE TO KEEP GOOD MEMBERS, POOR CHOICE OF ME	2	1.0%
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	0	
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	0	
54	HIS STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.5%
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS	1	0.5%
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	1	0.5%

v2101: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	0	
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	1	0.5%
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	1	0.5%
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM, CANADIAN UNITY	4	2.0%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	0	
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	0	
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	0	
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE/FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FARMER	0	
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUAL	1	0.5%
67	HANDLING OF OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES	5	2.5%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	2	1.0%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	4	2.0%
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL/SMART, TALKS DOWN TO PEOPLE	1	0.5%
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	4	2.0%
73	POOR SPEAKER	0	
74	HIS TEMPER	1	0.5%
75	NOT KEEPING CANADIAN GOVERNMENT INFORMED	1	0.5%
76	CAMPAIGN CRITICIZING OTHER PARTY	1	0.5%
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	8	4.0%
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO T	2	1.0%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY, HIS PERSONAL LIFE	0	
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	3	1.5%
83	TOO STUBBORN, NOT FLEXIBLE	2	1.0%
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	4	2.0%
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.5%
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0	
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0	
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	0	
90	HE WAS IN TOO LONG, SHOULDN'T HAVE RUN AGAIN	1	0.5%
91	HE/HIS PARTY LOST TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE	3	1.5%
93	MADE A MESS OF THINGS, LEFT A MESS FOR CLARK TO CLEAN UP	1	0.5%
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NO NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY - FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2562	

# v2101: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2102: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=55 /-] [Invalid=2706 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Pre-question	Q25B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. TRUDEAU? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q25B.3 WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q25B.1, Q25B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	TOO ARROGANT, ARROGANT AT TIMES, OVERBEARING	1	<div></div> 1.8%
2	TRAVELS TOO MUCH, TAKES TOO MANY HOLIDAYS	0	
3	PLAYBOY, PLAYBOY IMAGE/ANTICS	0	
4	DOESN'T GET MUCH DONE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, DOESN'T ATTEND TO B	0	
5	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE, DOESN'	3	<div></div> 5.5%
6	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN WORKING PEOPLE/WORKIN	0	
7	NOT CONCERNED ABOUT, NOT INTERESTED IN THE POOR	0	
8	LACK OF CONCERN FOR THE COUNTRY/CANADA, ONLY INTERESTED IN C	1	<div></div> 1.8%
9	LACK OF CONCERN ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN GOVERNMENT, NOT CO	1	<div></div> 1.8%
10	LACK OF CONCERN, INTEREST, OR UNDERSTANDING (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
11	EVERYTHING	1	<div></div> 1.8%
12	SPENDS TOO MUCH OF OUR MONEY (TAXPAYERS' MONEY) ON HIMSELF	1	<div></div> 1.8%
13	GIVES/LOANS TOO MUCH MONEY TO OTHER COUNTRIES, FOREIGN AID	0	
14	TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT ON GRANTS (O.F.Y., L.I.P., CANADA COUNC	0	
15	SPENDS TOO MUCH MONEY ON (OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS)	0	
16	SPENDS/WASTES TOO MUCH MONEY (UNSPECIFIED)	1	<div></div> 1.8%
17	GIVES TOO MUCH TO QUEBEC/FRENCH CANADA, FAVOURS FRENCH CANAD	1	<div></div> 1.8%
18	FRENCH LANGUAGE ISSUE, CATERING TO BILINGUALISM, SHOVING FRE	0	
19	TOO MUCH FOR ONTARIO/OTTAWA	0	
20	TOO MUCH FOR THE EAST, FORGETS THE WEST	4	<div></div> 7.3%
21	NOT ENOUGH DONE FOR QUEBEC, THINKS OF OTHER PROVINCES BEFORE	0	
22	HE IS FRENCH	0	
23	HE DOESN'T KEEP HIS PROMISES, TOO MANY PROMISES	1	<div></div> 1.8%
24	HE IS DISHONEST, NOT SINCERE	3	<div></div> 5.5%

v2102: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	HIS LANGUAGE, USES BAD WORDS, SWEARS, RUDE	0	
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	2	3.6%
27	SARCASTIC, RIDICULES	1	1.8%
28	CONCEITED, INFLATED EGO, SNOB	3	5.5%
29	PERSONALITY, NOT A LIKEABLE MAN, JUST DON'T LIKE HIM	0	
30	MANNER, ATTITUDE, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL APPROACH (UNSPECI	3	5.5%
31	HIS INFORMALITY, NOT DIGNIFIED, TOO FLAMBOYANT	1	1.8%
32	DOESN'T ANSWER QUESTIONS DIRECTLY, AVOIDS TAKING A STAND ON	2	3.6%
33	'SHRUG OF SHOULDER ATTITUDE', 'SO WHAT ATTITUDE'	0	
34	TOO DICTATORIAL, TOO INDEPENDENT, DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINIST	6	10.9%
35	IMAGE HE PRESENTS AS LEADER OF CANADA, NOT AN ADMIRABLE LEAD	0	
36	HE IS JUST A FIGUREHEAD, A FRONT MAN	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, SPECIFIC MANNERISMS, VOICE	0	
38	TOO AMBITIOUS, POWER HUNGRY, DO ANYTHING FOR VOTES	0	
39	COOL, ALOOF, NOT FRIENDLY	0	
40	TRUDEAUMANIA STYLE, THE WAY HE WON VOTES WITH WOMEN	0	
41	THE WAY HE RAN THE COUNTRY OR GOVERNMENT	2	3.6%
42	COULD DO A LOT BETTER, COULD DO MORE	0	
43	NOT DO ANYTHING OR MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, HIG	0	
44	NOT A GOOD LEADER	0	
45	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATLANTIC AND PRAIRIES	0	
46	HIS PARTY, HE IS A LIBERAL, HIS POLITICS	0	
47	TOO EXTREME IN HIS THINKING, TOO SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC	1	1.8%
48	HE IS TOO RICH, NEVER HAD TO SUFFER OR WORK	1	1.8%
49	HIS MARRYING SUCH A YOUNG GIRL, MARGRET, HIS SEPARATION	0	
51	POOR CABINET, UNABLE TO KEEP GOOD MEMBERS, POOR CHOICE OF ME	0	
52	RELIES TOO MUCH ON SOME OF HIS MINISTERS OR CAREER CIVIL SER	1	1.8%
53	HE IS IMPATIENT	0	
54	HIS STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
55	OIL POLICY, FUEL CRISIS	0	
56	HANDLING OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
57	HANDLING OF OLD AGE SECURITY, NOT ENOUGH FOR AGED	0	
58	HANDLING OF WELFARE, ABUSE OF WELFARE	0	
59	HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	0	
60	HANDLING OF IMMIGRATION	1	1.8%

# v2102: DISLIKE ABOUT TRUDEAU-RESPONSE 3				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
61	HANDLING OF QUEBEC QUESTION, SEPARATISM, CANADIAN UNITY	1	<div></div>	1.8%
62	HANDLING OF LARGE CORPORATIONS, TOO MUCH FOR LARGE CORPORATI	0		
63	HANDLING OF AMERICAN CONTROL	1	<div></div>	1.8%
64	HANDLING OF TAXES, TAXES TOO HIGH	0		
65	HANDLING OF AGRICULTURE/FARM PROBLEMS, NOT ENOUGH FOR FARMER	0		
66	HANDLING OF LEGISLATION ON MORAL ISSUES, VIEWS ON HOMOSEXUAL	2	<div></div>	3.6%
67	HANDLING OF OTHER SPECIFIC ISSUES	1	<div></div>	1.8%
68	DISLIKE HIS POLICIES (UNSPECIFIED)	2	<div></div>	3.6%
69	HIS BEHAVIOUR WITH THE PRESS, BELITTLES THE PRESS	0		
70	TOO INTELLECTUAL/SMART, TALKS DOWN TO PEOPLE	0		
72	TOO OUTSPOKEN	0		
73	POOR SPEAKER	0		
74	HIS TEMPER	0		
75	NOT KEEPING CANADIAN GOVERNMENT INFORMED	0		
76	CAMPAIGN CRITICIZING OTHER PARTY	0		
78	I DON'T TRUST HIM	1	<div></div>	1.8%
79	HE USES HIS WIFE TO GAIN POPULARITY, WORRIED HIS WIFE INTO T	1	<div></div>	1.8%
80	SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME WITH HIS FAMILY, HIS PERSONAL LIFE	0		
81	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	<div></div>	1.8%
83	TOO STUBBORN, NOT FLEXIBLE	0		
84	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	0		
85	HIS IDEAS (UNSPECIFIED)	0		
86	DOESN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT UNIONS, DOESN'T PREVENT STRIKES	0		
87	HE IS A NON-VETERAN	0		
89	HIS EMOTIONS SHOW THROUGH	0		
90	HE WAS IN TOO LONG, SHOULDN'T HAVE RUN AGAIN	0		
91	HE/HIS PARTY LOST TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE	2	<div></div>	3.6%
93	MADE A MESS OF THINGS, LEFT A MESS FOR CLARK TO CLEAN UP	1	<div></div>	1.8%
94	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0		
95	NO NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0		
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0		
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0		
99	SEE 1979 STUDY - FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0		
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2706		
98	REFUSED	0		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2103: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=842 /-] [Invalid=1919 /-]			

# v2103: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q26A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT, SMART, KNOWS WHAT H	19	<div></div> 2.3%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIOUS	130	<div></div> 15.4%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	20	<div></div> 2.4%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	9	<div></div> 1.1%
5	GOOD MAN	14	<div></div> 1.7%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST (SEE ALSO CODES 29 AND	39	<div></div> 4.6%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	5	<div></div> 0.6%
8	CALM, COOL	1	<div></div> 0.1%
9	HE IS A FAMILY MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY (SEE ALSO 13)	4	<div></div> 0.5%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	<div></div> 0.1%
11	NICE/GOOD LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	8	<div></div> 1.0%
12	BILINGUAL	4	<div></div> 0.5%
13	LIKE HIS WIFE, GOOD LOOKING WIFE, SHE SUPPORTS HIM (ALSO SEE	2	<div></div> 0.2%
14	ENERGETIC, HAS VITALITY, ENTHUSIASTIC	6	<div></div> 0.7%
15	HE IS YOUNG	27	<div></div> 3.2%
16	HE IS CONFIDENT, ASSERTIVE	0	
17	HE IS HUMBLE, SIMPLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF	6	<div></div> 0.7%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	10	<div></div> 1.2%
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	2	<div></div> 0.2%
20	HE IS A GOOD BUSINESS MAN, MORE FAVOURABLE TO BUSINESS	1	<div></div> 0.1%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	3	<div></div> 0.4%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	5	<div></div> 0.6%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	4	<div></div> 0.5%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	0	
25	FRIENDLY, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	4	<div></div> 0.5%
26	HIS COURAGE	15	<div></div> 1.8%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	2	<div></div> 0.2%
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSISTE	16	<div></div> 1.9%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH, CAN MAKE MISTAKES	7	<div></div> 0.8%
31	WELL THOUGHT INTERNATIONALLY, DID WELL ON HIS TRIP TO AFRICA	2	<div></div> 0.2%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/ HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND T	5	<div></div> 0.6%
33	WILL CLEAN UP THE MESS, PUT CANADA ON FEET AGAIN, EVERYTHING	1	<div></div> 0.1%

v2103: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	3	0.4%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/ CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WITH	3	0.4%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE/DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOPL	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHA	29	3.4%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, WILLING TO TRY (ALSO SEE 06 + 29)	5	0.6%
41	HIS PROMISES, GOOD PROMISES	2	0.2%
42	HE IS RESPECTED/ADMIRE, I RESPECT/ADMIRE HIM, PROUD OF HIM	1	0.1%
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER,	7	0.8%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, NEW IDEAS	14	1.7%
45	A NICE CHANGE, FRESH APPROACH, NEW BLOOD, IT WAS TIME TO GIV	3	0.4%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (NOT SPECIFIED)	0	
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD PLATFORM	3	0.4%
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSUE	1	0.1%
50	UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY, TAKES HIS TIME	1	0.1%
52	HIS AMBITION	3	0.4%
53	HIS MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY PLAN	1	0.1%
54	LOYAL TO THE PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	0	
55	HIS PARTY, HE IS P.C.	3	0.4%
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	0	
57	HE IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR/ORGANIZER	2	0.2%
58	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, SELECTED GOOD PEOPLE	3	0.4%
59	NOT A ONE MAN SHOW, A TEAM MAN, CONSULTS WITH MINISTERS, ACC	7	0.8%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY, RESTRAINT ON SPENDING	0	
61	HE IS A WESTERNER, ALBERTAN	8	1.0%
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST, KNOWS PROBLEMS OF THE WEST, WILL DO	2	0.2%
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN, DEMOCRATIC, DOES NOT FAVOUR ONE	2	0.2%
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY/STYLE (UNSPECIFIED)	2	0.2%
65	REMINDS ME OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
66	HE IS A CATHOLIC	0	
67	HANDLING QUEBEC PROBLEM WELL	2	0.2%
68	HANDLES PROVINCES BETTER, READY TO DISCUSS WITH THEM	0	
69	HIS DISREGARD OF THE MEDIA	0	
70	HIS VIEW ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	

# v2103: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
71	HIS VIEW ON PETRO-CAN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	HIS VIEW ON EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM	1	0.1%
74	HIS LAUGH, BELLY LAUGH	0	
75	EVERYTHING	0	
76	STRONG BUDGET/ GOOD BUDGET/ GAS TAX	6	0.7%
77	BELIEVES IN CANADA/ APPROACHES TO GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
78	ROLE IN FREEING IRAN HOSTAGES	0	
79	ADMITS MISTAKES/ WILLINGNESS TO TACKLE UNPLEASANT THINGS	1	0.1%
80	GOOD LOSER	4	0.5%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	46	5.5%
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	214	25.4%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	81	9.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	8	1.0%
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	1	0.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1916	
98	REFUSED	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2104: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=223 /-] [Invalid=2538 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q26A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT, SMART, KNOWS WHAT H	7	3.1%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIOUS	22	9.9%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	8	3.6%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	2	0.9%
5	GOOD MAN	5	2.2%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST (SEE ALSO CODES 29 AND	30	13.5%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	3	1.3%
8	CALM, COOL	1	0.4%
9	HE IS A FAMILY MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY (SEE ALSO 13)	2	0.9%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	0.4%
11	NICE/GOOD LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	2	0.9%
12	BILINGUAL	1	0.4%
13	LIKE HIS WIFE, GOOD LOOKING WIFE, SHE SUPPORTS HIM (ALSO SEE	1	0.4%

v2104: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	ENERGETIC, HAS VITALITY, ENTHUSIASTIC	5	2.2%
15	HE IS YOUNG	14	6.3%
16	HE IS CONFIDENT, ASSERTIVE	0	
17	HE IS HUMBLE, SIMPLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF	2	0.9%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	4	1.8%
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	0	
20	HE IS A GOOD BUSINESS MAN, MORE FAVOURABLE TO BUSINESS	1	0.4%
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	1	0.4%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	2	0.9%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	1	0.4%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	1	0.4%
25	FRIENDLY, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	1	0.4%
26	HIS COURAGE	5	2.2%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	1	0.4%
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSISTE	9	4.0%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH, CAN MAKE MISTAKES	4	1.8%
31	WELL THOUGHT INTERNATIONALLY, DID WELL ON HIS TRIP TO AFRICA	0	
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/ HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND T	1	0.4%
33	WILL CLEAN UP THE MESS, PUT CANADA ON FEET AGAIN, EVERYTHING	3	1.3%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	4	1.8%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/ CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WITH	4	1.8%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE/DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOPL	1	0.4%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHA	21	9.4%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, WILLING TO TRY (ALSO SEE 06 + 29)	2	0.9%
41	HIS PROMISES, GOOD PROMISES	0	
42	HE IS RESPECTED/ADMIRE, I RESPECT/ADMIRE HIM, PROUD OF HIM	0	
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER,	3	1.3%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, NEW IDEAS	3	1.3%
45	A NICE CHANGE, FRESH APPROACH, NEW BLOOD, IT WAS TIME TO GIV	8	3.6%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (NOT SPECIFIED)	0	
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD PLATFORM	2	0.9%

v2104: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSUE	1	0.4%
50	UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY, TAKES HIS TIME	0	
52	HIS AMBITION	1	0.4%
53	HIS MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY PLAN	2	0.9%
54	LOYAL TO THE PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	1	0.4%
55	HIS PARTY, HE IS P.C.	2	0.9%
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	2	0.9%
57	HE IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR/ORGANIZER	4	1.8%
58	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, SELECTED GOOD PEOPLE	2	0.9%
59	NOT A ONE MAN SHOW, A TEAM MAN, CONSULTS WITH MINISTERS, ACC	4	1.8%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY, RESTRAINT ON SPENDING	1	0.4%
61	HE IS A WESTERNER, ALBERTAN	0	
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST, KNOWS PROBLEMS OF THE WEST, WILL DO	1	0.4%
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN, DEMOCRATIC, DOES NOT FAVOUR ONE	0	
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY/STYLE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.4%
65	REMINDS ME OF DIEFENBAKER	1	0.4%
66	HE IS A CATHOLIC	0	
67	HANDLING QUEBEC PROBLEM WELL	1	0.4%
68	HANDLES PROVINCES BETTER, READY TO DISCUSS WITH THEM	1	0.4%
69	HIS DISREGARD OF THE MEDIA	0	
70	HIS VIEW ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
71	HIS VIEW ON PETRO-CAN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	HIS VIEW ON EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM	0	
74	HIS LAUGH, BELLY LAUGH	0	
75	EVERYTHING	1	0.4%
76	STRONG BUDGET/ GOOD BUDGET/ GAS TAX	4	1.8%
77	BELIEVES IN CANADA/ APPROACHES TO GOVERNMENT	1	0.4%
78	ROLE IN FREEING IRAN HOSTAGES	1	0.4%
79	ADMITS MISTAKES/ WILLINGNESS TO TACKLE UNPLEASANT THINGS	1	0.4%
80	GOOD LOSER	2	0.9%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2538	
98	REFUSED	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2105: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=71 /-] [Invalid=2690 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q26A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, CAPABLE, CLEVER, BRILLIANT, SMART, KNOWS WHAT H	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, INTEGRITY, STRAIGHTFORWARD, CONSCIENTIOUS	5	<div><div></div></div> 7.0%
3	NICE PERSON, LIKE HIM, GOOD PERSONALITY	0	
4	GOOD SPEAKER, IMPROVED SPEAKER	3	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
5	GOOD MAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
6	WORKS HARD, TRIES HARD, DOES HIS BEST (SEE ALSO CODES 29 AND	9	<div><div></div></div> 12.7%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
8	CALM, COOL	0	
9	HE IS A FAMILY MAN, HAS A NICE FAMILY (SEE ALSO 13)	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	
11	NICE/GOOD LOOKING, LOOKS HONEST OR SINCERE, HIS APPEARANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
12	BILINGUAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
13	LIKE HIS WIFE, GOOD LOOKING WIFE, SHE SUPPORTS HIM (ALSO SEE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
14	ENERGETIC, HAS VITALITY, ENTHUSIASTIC	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
15	HE IS YOUNG	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
16	HE IS CONFIDENT, ASSERTIVE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
17	HE IS HUMBLE, SIMPLE, MODEST, NOT A SHOW-OFF	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
18	HE IS O.K., NOT BAD, JUST A MAN	0	
19	CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE	0	
20	HE IS A GOOD BUSINESS MAN, MORE FAVOURABLE TO BUSINESS	0	
21	BETTER THAN TRUDEAU, AS GOOD AS TRUDEAU (ANY MENTION)	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN, HAS POLITICAL STYLE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
23	HE IS KIND, GENEROUS, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
24	HIGH MORAL STANDARDS, DOESN'T SWEAR, DECENT	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
25	FRIENDLY, PLEASANT PERSON, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE	3	<div><div></div></div> 4.2%
27	STEADY, RELIABLE	0	
28	EARNEST, SERIOUS	0	
29	DETERMINATION, KEEPS TRYING, HAS STAMINA, TENACITY, PERSISTE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
30	MORE HUMAN, DOWN TO EARTH, CAN MAKE MISTAKES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
31	WELL THOUGHT INTERNATIONALLY, DID WELL ON HIS TRIP TO AFRICA	0	
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/ HIGH PRICES/ COST OF LIVING AND T	0	

v2105: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	WILL CLEAN UP THE MESS, PUT CANADA ON FEET AGAIN, EVERYTHING	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/ CANADIAN PEOPLE, IN TOUCH WITH	4	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
36	HE HAS HELPED PEOPLE/DONE A LOT FOR PEOPLE, WOULD HELP PEOPL	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE	0	
38	LIKED HIM ON T.V., GOOD IMPRESSION ON T.V.	0	
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHA	8	<div><div></div></div> 11.3%
40	HAS GOOD INTENTIONS, WILLING TO TRY (ALSO SEE 06 + 29)	0	
41	HIS PROMISES, GOOD PROMISES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
42	HE IS RESPECTED/ADMIRE, I RESPECT/ADMIRE HIM, PROUD OF HIM	0	
43	HE IS A GO-GETTER, STANDS BEHIND HIS CONVICTIONS, A FIGHTER,	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
44	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, NEW IDEAS	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
45	A NICE CHANGE, FRESH APPROACH, NEW BLOOD, IT WAS TIME TO GIV	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
46	HIS QUALITIES, SOME THINGS (NOT SPECIFIED)	0	
47	HE IS DIFFERENT	0	
48	LIKE HIS POLICIES, GOOD PLATFORM	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
49	HE PERFORMED WELL IN HIS CAMPAIGN, WANTED TO DEAL WITH ISSUE	0	
50	UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE	0	
51	PLANS CAREFULLY, TAKES HIS TIME	0	
52	HIS AMBITION	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
53	HIS MORTGAGE DEDUCTABILITY PLAN	0	
54	LOYAL TO THE PARTY, REPRESENTS THE PARTY	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
55	HIS PARTY, HE IS P.C.	0	
56	HE IS EXPERIENCED, HAS THE POTENTIAL	0	
57	HE IS A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR/ORGANIZER	0	
58	HE HAS A GOOD TEAM, SELECTED GOOD PEOPLE	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
59	NOT A ONE MAN SHOW, A TEAM MAN, CONSULTS WITH MINISTERS, ACC	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
60	WOULD SAVE US MONEY, RESTRAINT ON SPENDING	2	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
61	HE IS A WESTERNER, ALBERTAN	0	
62	INTERESTED IN THE WEST, KNOWS PROBLEMS OF THE WEST, WILL DO	0	
63	WANTS TO BE FAIR, FAIR MAN, DEMOCRATIC, DOES NOT FAVOUR ONE	0	
64	HIS MANNER, HIS WAY/STYLE (UNSPECIFIED)	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
65	REMINDS ME OF DIEFENBAKER	0	
66	HE IS A CATHOLIC	0	
67	HANDLING QUEBEC PROBLEM WELL	0	
68	HANDLES PROVINCES BETTER, READY TO DISCUSS WITH THEM	0	

# v2105: LIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
69	HIS DISREGARD OF THE MEDIA	0	
70	HIS VIEW ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	<div></div> 1.4%
71	HIS VIEW ON PETRO-CAN	0	
72	HE CARES ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
73	HIS VIEW ON EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM	0	
74	HIS LAUGH, BELLY LAUGH	0	
75	EVERYTHING	2	<div></div> 2.8%
76	STRONG BUDGET/ GOOD BUDGET/ GAS TAX	2	<div></div> 2.8%
77	BELIEVES IN CANADA/ APPROACHES TO GOVERNMENT	0	
78	ROLE IN FREEING IRAN HOSTAGES	0	
79	ADMITS MISTAKES/ WILLINGNESS TO TACKLE UNPLEASANT THINGS	1	<div></div> 1.4%
80	GOOD LOSER	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2690	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2106: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=842 /-] [Invalid=1919 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. CLARK? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q26B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW	6	<div></div> 0.7%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	42	<div></div> 5.0%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	20	<div></div> 2.4%
4	POOR SPEAKER, LACK OF SPEAKING ABILITY, MANNER OF SPEAKING	29	<div></div> 3.4%
5	DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH	6	<div></div> 0.7%
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	2	<div></div> 0.2%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, LACKS LEADERSHIP	62	<div></div> 7.4%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM	6	<div></div> 0.7%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	19	<div></div> 2.3%
10	TOO YOUNG, NOT MATURE ENOUGH	22	<div></div> 2.6%
11	NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	77	<div></div> 9.1%

v2106: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
12	HASTY DECISIONS, SPEAKS AND THINKS LATER, CHANGES HIS MIND T	24	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM (UNSPECIFIED)	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
16	LACKS "SAVOIR-FAIRE", LACKS FINISHING TOUCHES, CLUMSY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
17	BUNGLES, MAKES MISTAKES	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
18	HIS IMPATIENCE, NOT CONSERVATIVE ENOUGH	0	
19	HELPING QUEBEC TO SEPARATE	0	
20	ANTI-FRENCH	0	
21	HIS ATTITUDES TOWARDS HANDLING OF QUEBEC (GENERAL)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, IRISH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
23	TOO MANY PROMISES, UNREALISTIC PROMISES, WON'T BE ABLE TO KE	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
24	NOT SINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM, DISHONEST	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
25	HE IS RUDE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL, POMPOUS, CONCEITED	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
29	TOO STUBBORN	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, STYLE, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	18	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE IN HIM/HIS ABILITY, DOESN'T IMPRE	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	23	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL, NOT WELL KNOWN	20	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, LEAVES YOU FLAT, WISHY-WASHY	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, WALK	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T.V.	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
39	HIS NERVOUS LAUGH	0	
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
41	HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE NOT USING HIS NAME, HIS WIFE IS TOO DOMIN	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
42	NOT A CANADIAN	0	
43	EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM (ANY MENTION)	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
44	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN, ANY MENTION OF PETRO-CAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
45	CUTTING DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE, LAY-OFFS	0	
46	TOO MANY REFUGEES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, HASN'T TAKEN OVER	0	
48	HE DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS, TOO INDEPENDENT	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%

# v2106: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
49	TRAVELS TOO MUCH	0	
50	HE IS OUT FOR HIMSELF, IN POLITICS FOR EASY INCOME	0	
51	NO BETTER THAN TRUDEAU	0	
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY/BIG BUSINESS	0	
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
56	HASN'T DONE ANYTHING/MUCH ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
57	VIEWS ON MEDICARE, WELFARE, OLD AGE PENSION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
58	TOO AMBITIOUS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
59	OIL/GAS POLICIES, PRICES	5	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WHA	22	<div><div></div></div> 2.6%
61	SHOULD HAVE OPENED PARLIAMENT SOONER	0	
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
63	SELECTION OF CABINET -- FLORA	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
64	BUDGET, RAISING TAXES	15	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
65	LACK OF CONCERN FOR PEOPLE/WORKING CLASS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
66	RULED AS MAJORITY GOVERNMENT/ SHOULD HAVE TAKEN IT EASIER AS	11	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
67	DOES NOT HAVE CONTROL OF PARTY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	44	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	182	<div><div></div></div> 21.6%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	36	<div><div></div></div> 4.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1916	
98	REFUSED	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2107: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sampple 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q26B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2510	<div><div></div></div> 90.9%
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	22	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%

v2107: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	POOR SPEAKER, LACK OF SPEAKING ABILITY, MANNER OF SPEAKING	5	0.2%
5	DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH	0	
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, LACKS LEADERSHIP	29	1.1%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM	5	0.2%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	6	0.2%
10	TOO YOUNG, NOT MATURE ENOUGH	11	0.4%
11	NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	18	0.7%
12	HASTY DECISIONS, SPEAKS AND THINKS LATER, CHANGES HIS MIND T	24	0.9%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM (UNSPECIFIED)	1	0.0%
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	3	0.1%
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES	3	0.1%
16	LACKS "SAVOIR-FAIRE", LACKS FINISHING TOUCHES, CLUMSY	1	0.0%
17	BUNGLES, MAKES MISTAKES	5	0.2%
18	HIS IMPATIENCE, NOT CONSERVATIVE ENOUGH	0	
19	HELPING QUEBEC TO SEPARATE	0	
20	ANTI-FRENCH	0	
21	HIS ATTITUDES TOWARDS HANDLING OF QUEBEC (GENERAL)	1	0.0%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, IRISH	0	
23	TOO MANY PROMISES, UNREALISTIC PROMISES, WON'T BE ABLE TO KE	5	0.2%
24	NOT SINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM, DISHONEST	1	0.0%
25	HE IS RUDE	0	
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	0	
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL, POMPOUS, CONCEITED	4	0.1%
29	TOO STUBBORN	3	0.1%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, STYLE, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	6	0.2%
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE IN HIM/HIS ABILITY, DOESN'T IMPRE	7	0.3%
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER	0	
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	15	0.5%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	4	0.1%
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL, NOT WELL KNOWN	1	0.0%
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, LEAVES YOU FLAT, WISHY-WASHY	4	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, WALK	6	0.2%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T.V.	3	0.1%
39	HIS NERVOUS LAUGH	1	0.0%
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	3	0.1%

# v2107: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE NOT USING HIS NAME, HIS WIFE IS TOO DOMIN	3	0.1%
42	NOT A CANADIAN	1	0.0%
43	EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM (ANY MENTION)	6	0.2%
44	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN, ANY MENTION OF PETRO-CAN	3	0.1%
45	CUTTING DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE, LAY-OFFS	0	
46	TOO MANY REFUGEES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, HASN'T TAKEN OVER	2	0.1%
48	HE DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS, TOO INDEPENDENT	4	0.1%
49	TRAVELS TOO MUCH	0	
50	HE IS OUT FOR HIMSELF, IN POLITICS FOR EASY INCOME	0	
51	NO BETTER THAN TRUDEAU	0	
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY/BIG BUSINESS	1	0.0%
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING	2	0.1%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	0	
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	1	0.0%
56	HASN'T DONE ANYTHING/MUCH ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
57	VIEWS ON MEDICARE, WELFARE, OLD AGE PENSION	0	
58	TOO AMBITIOUS	0	
59	OIL/GAS POLICIES, PRICES	4	0.1%
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WHA	3	0.1%
61	SHOULD HAVE OPENED PARLIAMENT SOONER	1	0.0%
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	5	0.2%
63	SELECTION OF CABINET -- FLORA	1	0.0%
64	BUDGET, RAISING TAXES	3	0.1%
65	LACK OF CONCERN FOR PEOPLE/WORKING CLASS	2	0.1%
66	RULED AS MAJORITY GOVERNMENT/ SHOULD HAVE TAKEN IT EASIER AS	7	0.3%
67	DOES NOT HAVE CONTROL OF PARTY	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2108: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sampple 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q26B.3 in the documentation.		

v2108: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2685	97.2%
1	NOT DYNAMIC ENOUGH, TOO SLOW	1	0.0%
2	NOT DECISIVE ENOUGH, TOO HESITANT, NOT SURE OF HIMSELF, NOT	6	0.2%
3	PERSONALITY, POOR PERSONALITY, LACKS PERSONALITY	1	0.0%
4	POOR SPEAKER, LACK OF SPEAKING ABILITY, MANNER OF SPEAKING	3	0.1%
5	DOESN'T SPEAK ENOUGH FRENCH	0	
6	BORING, NOT COLOURFUL ENOUGH, DULL	1	0.0%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, LACKS LEADERSHIP	8	0.3%
8	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH, NOT ENOUGH FIGHT IN HIM	0	
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH, WE NEED A STRONGER MAN	1	0.0%
10	TOO YOUNG, NOT MATURE ENOUGH	3	0.1%
11	NOT EXPERIENCED ENOUGH	10	0.4%
12	HASTY DECISIONS, SPEAKS AND THINKS LATER, CHANGES HIS MIND T	2	0.1%
13	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
14	HIS IDEAS, MOST OF HIS IDEAS	1	0.0%
15	UNDECIDED ON ISSUES	0	
16	LACKS "SAVOIR-FAIRE", LACKS FINISHING TOUCHES, CLUMSY	1	0.0%
17	BUNGLES, MAKES MISTAKES	1	0.0%
18	HIS IMPATIENCE, NOT CONSERVATIVE ENOUGH	0	
19	HELPING QUEBEC TO SEPARATE	0	
20	ANTI-FRENCH	0	
21	HIS ATTITUDES TOWARDS HANDLING OF QUEBEC (GENERAL)	2	0.1%
22	HE IS ENGLISH, IRISH	0	
23	TOO MANY PROMISES, UNREALISTIC PROMISES, WON'T BE ABLE TO KE	3	0.1%
24	NOT SINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM, DISHONEST	1	0.0%
25	HE IS RUDE	0	
26	HE TALKS TOO MUCH	1	0.0%
27	TOO CRITICAL, NOT CONSTRUCTIVE IN HIS CRITICISM, PERSONAL AT	2	0.1%
28	TOO ARROGANT, BOASTFUL, POMPOUS, CONCEITED	1	0.0%
29	TOO STUBBORN	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, STYLE, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
31	DOESN'T INSPIRE CONFIDENCE IN HIM/HIS ABILITY, DOESN'T IMPRE	0	
32	POOR CAMPAIGNER	0	
33	NOT INTELLIGENT ENOUGH, NOT CAPABLE, NOT A GOOD THINKER, INE	4	0.1%
34	NOT A POLITICIAN	1	0.0%
35	POOR IMAGE, NO PUBLIC APPEAL, NOT WELL KNOWN	0	

v2108: DISLIKE ABOUT CLARK-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
36	NOT MUCH CHARISMA, LEAVES YOU FLAT, WISHY-WASHY	2	0.1%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS, WALK	1	0.0%
38	HIS APPEARANCE ON T.V., DOESN'T COME ACROSS ON T.V.	1	0.0%
39	HIS NERVOUS LAUGH	0	
40	TOO QUIET, DOESN'T SAY MUCH	0	
41	HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE NOT USING HIS NAME, HIS WIFE IS TOO DOMIN	0	
42	NOT A CANADIAN	0	
43	EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM (ANY MENTION)	4	0.1%
44	SELLING OF PETRO-CAN, ANY MENTION OF PETRO-CAN	3	0.1%
45	CUTTING DOWN ON CIVIL SERVICE, LAY-OFFS	0	
46	TOO MANY REFUGEES	0	
47	HE HASN'T DONE MUCH, HASN'T TAKEN OVER	1	0.0%
48	HE DOESN'T CONSULT HIS MINISTERS, TOO INDEPENDENT	1	0.0%
49	TRAVELS TOO MUCH	0	
50	HE IS OUT FOR HIMSELF, IN POLITICS FOR EASY INCOME	1	0.0%
51	NO BETTER THAN TRUDEAU	0	
52	TOO MUCH FOR INDUSTRY/BIG BUSINESS	0	
53	NOT DOING MUCH ABOUT INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, COST OF LIVING	1	0.0%
54	HE IS NOT A REALIST	0	
55	HE IS A CONSERVATIVE, HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	2	0.1%
56	HASN'T DONE ANYTHING/MUCH ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
57	VIEWS ON MEDICARE, WELFARE, OLD AGE PENSION	0	
58	TOO AMBITIOUS	0	
59	OIL/GAS POLICIES, PRICES	1	0.0%
60	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SHOW WHA	0	
61	SHOULD HAVE OPENED PARLIAMENT SOONER	0	
62	DOESN'T HAVE INTERNATIONAL RESPECT, NOT GOOD IN FOREIGN AFFA	2	0.1%
63	SELECTION OF CABINET -- FLORA	0	
64	BUDGET, RAISING TAXES	0	
65	LACK OF CONCERN FOR PEOPLE/WORKING CLASS	0	
66	RULED AS MAJORITY GOVERNMENT/ SHOULD HAVE TAKEN IT EASIER AS	1	0.0%
67	DOES NOT HAVE CONTROL OF PARTY	1	0.0%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NO, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
98	REFUSED	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2109: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=840 /-] [Invalid=1921 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q27A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, CAPABLE, SMART	42	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, INTEGRITY	85	<div><div></div></div> 10.1%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM	41	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF SPEAKING, ENJOY LISTENIN	74	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
5	GOOD MAN	17	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	12	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	26	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
8	CALM, COOL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
9	HIS WIFE, GOOD FAMILY MAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
11	HIS APPEARANCE, ANY MENTION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
12	EFFORTS MADE TO IMPROVE HIS FRENCH/SPEAKING FRENCH	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
13	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROBLEMS, HANDLES PROBLEMS WELL	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
14	A LONER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
16	THE WAY HE CONDUCTS HIMSELF, CONTROLS HIMSELF	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
18	CHARMING, GENTLEMAN	0	
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, FRESH IDEAS	23	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
23	EVERYTHING	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
24	DOWN-TO-EARTH TYPE, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SENSE	9	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, PLEASANT	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE, DEMOCRATIC	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS C	27	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, TALKS TO BOTH PARTIES	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
31	STEADY, CONSTANT, STABLE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING AND TRY	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

v2109: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
33	MEDICARE, HEALTH CARE ISSUES	1	0.1%
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	2	0.2%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON/ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN	14	1.7%
36	HE IS YOUNG	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, POLICIES FOR AGED	0	
38	HE IS FOR WORKING PEOPLE (SEE CODES 40 + 41)	3	0.4%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	40	4.8%
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR (SEE CODE 38)	2	0.2%
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS (SEE CODE 38)	6	0.7%
42	OPINION ON UNIONS	0	
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	3	0.4%
44	TRYING TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR NATURAL RESOURCES	1	0.1%
45	WORKS FOR POOR/UNDERPRIVILEGED	1	0.1%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES/BIG CORPORATIONS	0	
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	0	
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	4	0.5%
49	NOT TOO RADICAL	2	0.2%
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES, KEEPS PEOPLE INFORMED	2	0.2%
51	HE WANTS CLARK OUT	1	0.1%
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM	2	0.2%
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING, AMBITIOUS	8	1.0%
54	WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISES	0	
55	I WOULD LIKE HIM TO RUN FOR OTHER PARTY	2	0.2%
56	WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS, DO MORE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	1	0.1%
57	ATTITUDE TOWARD PETRO-CAN	0	
58	LIKE TRUDEAU	0	
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG, IMPRESSIVE	6	0.7%
62	NATIVE/WOMEN'S RIGHTS/ SOCIAL ISSUES	2	0.2%
63	STAND ON ECONOMIC NATIONALISM	0	
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	2	0.2%
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST, HELPED THE WEST	1	0.1%
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW	2	0.2%
72	GOOD CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
74	HIS STYLE	0	
75	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC	12	1.4%
76	EXPERIENCED, MATURE, A PROFESSIONAL	0	
77	CONFIDENT	2	0.2%

# v2109: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	60	<div></div> 7.1%
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	165	<div></div> 19.6%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	38	<div></div> 4.5%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	19	<div></div> 2.3%
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	1	<div></div> 0.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1916	
98	REFUSED	5	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2110: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=301 /-] [Invalid=2460 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q27A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, CAPABLE, SMART	24	<div></div> 8.0%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, INTEGRITY	30	<div></div> 10.0%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM	9	<div></div> 3.0%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF SPEAKING, ENJOY LISTENIN	24	<div></div> 8.0%
5	GOOD MAN	11	<div></div> 3.7%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	13	<div></div> 4.3%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	23	<div></div> 7.6%
8	CALM, COOL	0	
9	HIS WIFE, GOOD FAMILY MAN	0	
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	3	<div></div> 1.0%
11	HIS APPEARANCE, ANY MENTION	2	<div></div> 0.7%
12	EFFORTS MADE TO IMPROVE HIS FRENCH/SPEAKING FRENCH	3	<div></div> 1.0%
13	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROBLEMS, HANDLES PROBLEMS WELL	3	<div></div> 1.0%
14	A LONER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	4	<div></div> 1.3%
16	THE WAY HE CONDUCTS HIMSELF, CONTROLS HIMSELF	2	<div></div> 0.7%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	2	<div></div> 0.7%
18	CHARMING, GENTLEMAN	0	
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, FRESH IDEAS	18	<div></div> 6.0%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	3	<div></div> 1.0%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	9	<div></div> 3.0%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	6	<div></div> 2.0%
23	EVERYTHING	0	

v2110: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
24	DOWN-TO-EARTH TYPE, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SENSE	8	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, PLEASANT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE, DEMOCRATIC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS C	12	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, TALKS TO BOTH PARTIES	0	
31	STEADY, CONSTANT, STABLE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING AND TRY	0	
33	MEDICARE, HEALTH CARE ISSUES	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON/ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.3%
36	HE IS YOUNG	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, POLICIES FOR AGED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
38	HE IS FOR WORKING PEOPLE (SEE CODES 40 + 41)	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR (SEE CODE 38)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS (SEE CODE 38)	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
42	OPINION ON UNIONS	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
44	TRYING TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR NATURAL RESOURCES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
45	WORKS FOR POOR/UNDERPRIVILEGED	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES/BIG CORPORATIONS	0	
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
49	NOT TOO RADICAL	0	
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES, KEEPS PEOPLE INFORMED	11	<div><div></div></div> 3.7%
51	HE WANTS CLARK OUT	0	
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING, AMBITIOUS	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
54	WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISES	0	
55	I WOULD LIKE HIM TO RUN FOR OTHER PARTY	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
56	WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS, DO MORE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
57	ATTITUDE TOWARD PETRO-CAN	0	
58	LIKE TRUDEAU	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
59		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG, IMPRESSIVE	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%

# v2110: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
62	NATIVE/WOMEN'S RIGHTS/ SOCIAL ISSUES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
63	STAND ON ECONOMIC NATIONALISM	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	0	
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST, HELPED THE WEST	0	
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
72	GOOD CAMPAIGN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
74	HIS STYLE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
75	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
76	EXPERIENCED, MATURE, A PROFESSIONAL	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
77	CONFIDENT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2460	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2111: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=111 /-] [Invalid=2650 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q27A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, KNOWS WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT, CAPABLE, SMART	8	<div><div></div></div> 7.2%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, STRAIGHTFORWARD, INTEGRITY	12	<div><div></div></div> 10.8%
3	NICE PERSON, PERSONALITY, NICE MAN, I LIKE HIM	5	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, ARTICULATE, MANNER OF SPEAKING, ENJOY LISTENIN	5	<div><div></div></div> 4.5%
5	GOOD MAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
6	GOOD WORKER, WORKS HARD, HE TRIES HARD, GETS THINGS DONE	4	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
7	GOOD LEADER, HAS LEADERSHIP QUALITIES	10	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
8	CALM, COOL	0	
9	HIS WIFE, GOOD FAMILY MAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
10	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
11	HIS APPEARANCE, ANY MENTION	0	
12	EFFORTS MADE TO IMPROVE HIS FRENCH/SPEAKING FRENCH	0	

v2111: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
13	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROBLEMS, HANDLES PROBLEMS WELL	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
14	A LONER	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS PARTY, WORKS HARD FOR THE N.D.P.	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
16	THE WAY HE CONDUCTS HIMSELF, CONTROLS HIMSELF	0	
17	OUTSPOKEN, SPEAKS HIS MIND	3	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
18	CHARMING, GENTLEMAN	0	
19	I LIKE HIS IDEAS, GOOD IDEAS, FRESH IDEAS	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
20	HE IS HUMANE, SYMPATHETIC, UNDERSTANDING	4	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
21	HIS POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, PLATFORM	4	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	4	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
23	EVERYTHING	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
24	DOWN-TO-EARTH TYPE, PRACTICAL, REALISTIC, COMMON SENSE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO TALK TO, WARM, PLEASANT	4	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
26	HIS COURAGE, GUTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
27	DECISIVE, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
28	HE IS JUST, FAIR, REASONABLE, DEMOCRATIC	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
29	AGGRESSIVE, FIGHTS FOR WHAT HE BELIEVES, STANDS BEHIND HIS C	3	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
30	DID A GOOD JOB IN OPPOSITION, TALKS TO BOTH PARTIES	4	<div><div></div></div> 3.6%
31	STEADY, CONSTANT, STABLE	0	
32	CONCERNED ABOUT INFLATION/HIGH PRICES/COST OF LIVING AND TRY	0	
33	MEDICARE, HEALTH CARE ISSUES	0	
34	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT CANADA, DONE A LOT FOR CANADA	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT COMMON/ORDINARY PEOPLE, INTERESTED IN	6	<div><div></div></div> 5.4%
36	HE IS YOUNG	0	
37	HE CARES ABOUT OLD PEOPLE, POLICIES FOR AGED	0	
38	HE IS FOR WORKING PEOPLE (SEE CODES 40 + 41)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
39	I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
40	HE IS FOR LABOUR (SEE CODE 38)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
41	HE IS FOR THE WORKING CLASS (SEE CODE 38)	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
42	OPINION ON UNIONS	0	
43	GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT PROBLEMS, HE UNDERSTANDS, HE CARES	3	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
44	TRYING TO DO SOMETHING WITH OUR NATURAL RESOURCES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
45	WORKS FOR POOR/UNDERPRIVILEGED	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
46	LIKE HIS IDEAS ON CORPORATE TAXES/BIG CORPORATIONS	0	
47	REALLY BELIEVES IN SOCIALISM, LIVES UP TO HIS IDEALS	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
48	HE IS O.K., HAS GOOD POINTS	0	
49	NOT TOO RADICAL	0	

# v2111: LIKE ABOUT BROADBENT-RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
50	ABILITY TO CLARIFY ISSUES, KEEPS PEOPLE INFORMED	0	
51	HE WANTS CLARK OUT	0	
52	DON'T LIKE MUCH ABOUT HIM	0	
53	DETERMINED, HE KEEPS TRYING, AMBITIOUS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
54	WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISES	0	
55	I WOULD LIKE HIM TO RUN FOR OTHER PARTY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
56	WOULD CREATE MORE JOBS, DO MORE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT	0	
57	ATTITUDE TOWARD PETRO-CAN	0	
58	LIKE TRUDEAU	0	
59		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
60	BETTER IMMIGRATION POLICY	0	
61	HE IS STRONG, IMPRESSIVE	3	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
62	NATIVE/WOMEN'S RIGHTS/ SOCIAL ISSUES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
63	STAND ON ECONOMIC NATIONALISM	0	
64	POLICY ON TAXES	0	
67	HIS PARTY, IT IS A GOOD PARTY	0	
68	OTHER SPECIFIC WELFARE POLICIES	0	
70	TRIED TO HELP WEST, HELPED THE WEST	0	
71	HIS T.V. APPEARANCES, STEALS THE SHOW	0	
72	GOOD CAMPAIGN	0	
74	HIS STYLE	0	
75	DYNAMIC, ENERGETIC	0	
76	EXPERIENCED, MATURE, A PROFESSIONAL	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
77	CONFIDENT	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL THE SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2650	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2112: DISLIKE ABOUTBROADBT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=841 /-] [Invalid=1920 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. BROADBENT? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q27B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	69	<div><div></div></div> 8.2%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES	16	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	13	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%

v2112: DISLIKE ABOUTBROADBT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	RADICAL CHANGES/IDEAS	4	0.5%
5	HE HASN'T DONE/DOESN'T DO MUCH	0	
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	7	0.8%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	5	0.6%
8	LACKS POISE	1	0.1%
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	2	0.2%
10	UNABLE TO CARRY OUT POLICIES BECAUSE PARTY TOO WEAK	4	0.5%
11	EVERYTHING	4	0.5%
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	24	2.9%
13	TOO EASILY PERSUADED, NOT PERSISTENT ENOUGH	1	0.1%
14	SUPPORTS THE LIBERALS TOO MUCH, MORE LIBERAL THAN N.D.P.	3	0.4%
15	NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH	0	
16	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
17	CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	1	0.1%
18	HIS TEMPER, IMPATIENCE	0	
19	AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS ARGUING/FIGHTING	4	0.5%
20	TOO ENGLISH	4	0.5%
21	NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY ANY CREDIT	5	0.6%
22	TOO SERIOUS	1	0.1%
23	DOESN'T SUPPORT INDUSTRY	2	0.2%
24	INSINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM	8	1.0%
25	NOT INFORMED ENOUGH, IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS	9	1.1%
26	POOR SPEAKER, HIS VOICE	5	0.6%
27	SENSATIONALIST, EXCITEABLE	3	0.4%
28	TOO ARROGANT, EGOTISTICAL	1	0.1%
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	12	1.4%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS STYLE/WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIE	3	0.4%
31	ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE	1	0.1%
32	FEARS HIS OWN PARTY	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, LACK OF POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	3	0.4%
34	OVER ESTIMATES THE IMPRORTANCE OF HIS PARTY	1	0.1%
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND TOO EASY	15	1.8%
36	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	2	0.2%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	2	0.2%
38	AGAINST LEGALIZING MARIJUANA	0	
39	HASN'T ENOUGH GOOD PEOPLE WORKING FOR HIM	3	0.4%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	30	3.6%
41	DOESN'T ACT ON UNPOPULAR ISSUES	2	0.2%
42	INTERFERES TOO MUCH, GIVE CLARK A CHANCE	2	0.2%
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	3	0.4%

# v2112: DISLIKE ABOUTBROADBT-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	HE SUPPORTS THE SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	0	
45	POOR RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC	0	
46	TOO OUTSPOKEN	6	0.7%
47	HE IS BORING	1	0.1%
48		3	0.4%
49		2	0.2%
50		2	0.2%
51	MORE FOR WEST, NOTHING FOR EAST	6	0.7%
52	EASTERN ATTITUDE	1	0.1%
53	TOO CRITICAL	3	0.4%
54	TOO PARTY ORIENTED	2	0.2%
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	1	0.1%
57	HE LOST THE ELECTION	2	0.2%
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V., IN T.V. DEBATE	0	
59	DON'T LIKE WAY HE CAMPAIGNED	1	0.1%
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM, DON'T AGREE WITH HIM	1	0.1%
66	TOO EASILY LED BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	1	0.1%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	92	10.9%
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	369	43.9%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	62	7.4%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	10	1.2%
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL SAME AS BEFORE	1	0.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1916	
98	REFUSED	4	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2113: DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=60 /-] [Invalid=2701 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q27B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	1	1.7%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES	4	6.7%
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	5	8.3%
4	RADICAL CHANGES/IDEAS	0	
5	HE HASN'T DONE/DOESN'T DO MUCH	1	1.7%
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	5	8.3%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	1	1.7%
8	LACKS POISE	0	
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	

v2113: DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10	UNABLE TO CARRY OUT POLICIES BECAUSE PARTY TOO WEAK	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
11	EVERYTHING	2	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	7	<div><div></div></div> 11.7%
13	TOO EASILY PERSUADED, NOT PERSISTENT ENOUGH	0	
14	SUPPORTS THE LIBERALS TOO MUCH, MORE LIBERAL THAN N.D.P.	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
15	NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
16	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
17	CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	0	
18	HIS TEMPER, IMPATIENCE	2	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
19	AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS ARGUING/FIGHTING	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
20	TOO ENGLISH	0	
21	NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY ANY CREDIT	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
22	TOO SERIOUS	0	
23	DOESN'T SUPPORT INDUSTRY	2	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
24	INSINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
25	NOT INFORMED ENOUGH, IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
26	POOR SPEAKER, HIS VOICE	0	
27	SENSATIONALIST, EXCITEABLE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
28	TOO ARROGANT, EGOTISTICAL	0	
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	5	<div><div></div></div> 8.3%
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS STYLE/WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIC)	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
31	ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE	0	
32	FEARS HIS OWN PARTY	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, LACK OF POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
34	OVER ESTIMATES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS PARTY	0	
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND TOO EASY	2	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
36	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	3	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	0	
38	AGAINST LEGALIZING MARIJUANA	0	
39	HASN'T ENOUGH GOOD PEOPLE WORKING FOR HIM	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
41	DOESN'T ACT ON UNPOPULAR ISSUES	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
42	INTERFERES TOO MUCH, GIVE CLARK A CHANCE	0	
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	0	
44	HE SUPPORTS THE SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	0	
45	POOR RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC	0	
46	TOO OUTSPOKEN	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
47	HE IS BORING	0	
50		1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
51	MORE FOR WEST, NOTHING FOR EAST	0	
52	EASTERN ATTITUDE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%

# v2113: DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
53	TOO CRITICAL	1	<div></div> 1.7%
54	TOO PARTY ORIENTED	0	
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	3	<div></div> 5.0%
57	HE LOST THE ELECTION	0	
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V., IN T.V. DEBATE	0	
59	DON'T LIKE WAY HE CAMPAIGNED	1	<div></div> 1.7%
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM, DON'T AGREE WITH HIM	0	
66	TOO EASILY LED BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2701	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2114: DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 3			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=9 /-] [Invalid=2752 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBENT? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q27B.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS, HE IS IN THE WRONG PARTY	1	<div></div> 11.1%
2	HIS POLICIES, PLATFORM, SOME OF HIS POLICIES	0	
3	HIS IDEAS, N.D.P. PHILOSOPHY	0	
4	RADICAL CHANGES/IDEAS	0	
5	HE HASN'T DONE/DOESN'T DO MUCH	0	
6	TIES WITH UNIONS, DON'T LIKE UNIONS	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, WOULDN'T WANT HIM AS LEADER OF GOVERNMENT	0	
8	LACKS POISE	0	
9	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
10	UNABLE TO CARRY OUT POLICIES BECAUSE PARTY TOO WEAK	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	TOO SOCIALISTIC, SOCIALISM	2	<div></div> 22.2%
13	TOO EASILY PERSUADED, NOT PERSISTENT ENOUGH	0	
14	SUPPORTS THE LIBERALS TOO MUCH, MORE LIBERAL THAN N.D.P.	0	
15	NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH	0	
16	HIS PERSONALITY	0	

v2114: DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
17	CHANGES HIS MIND, ERRATIC	0	
18	HIS TEMPER, IMPATIENCE	0	
19	AGGRESSIVE, ALWAYS ARGUING/FIGHTING	1	11.1%
20	TOO ENGLISH	0	
21	NAME CALLING, NEVER GIVES OTHER PARTY ANY CREDIT	0	
22	TOO SERIOUS	0	
23	DOESN'T SUPPORT INDUSTRY	0	
24	INSINCERE, DON'T TRUST HIM	0	
25	NOT INFORMED ENOUGH, IRRESPONSIBLE STATEMENTS	0	
26	POOR SPEAKER, HIS VOICE	0	
27	SENSATIONALIST, EXCITEABLE	0	
28	TOO ARROGANT, EGOTISTICAL	0	
29	EASY FOR HIM TO MAKE PROMISES WHEN HE KNOWS HE WON'T GET IN	0	
30	ATTITUDE, MANNER, HIS STYLE/WAY, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIE	0	
31	ATTITUDE TOWARD CANADIAN PEOPLE	0	
32	FEARS HIS OWN PARTY	0	
33	NOT CAPABLE, LACK OF POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	0	
34	OVER ESTIMATES THE IMPRORTANCE OF HIS PARTY	0	
35	NOT REALISTIC, TOO VISIONARY, SOLUTIONS SOUND TOO EASY	1	11.1%
36	HIS ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE, LOOKS	0	
38	AGAINST LEGALIZING MARIJUANA	0	
39	HASN'T ENOUGH GOOD PEOPLE WORKING FOR HIM	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM	0	
41	DOESN'T ACT ON UNPOPULAR ISSUES	0	
42	INTERFERES TOO MUCH, GIVE CLARK A CHANCE	0	
43	SPEAKS FRENCH POORLY	0	
44	HE SUPPORTS THE SEPARATION OF QUEBEC	0	
45	POOR RELATIONS WITH QUEBEC	0	
46	TOO OUTSPOKEN	0	
47	HE IS BORING	0	
50		1	11.1%
51	MORE FOR WEST, NOTHING FOR EAST	1	11.1%
52	EASTERN ATTITUDE	0	
53	TOO CRITICAL	0	
54	TOO PARTY ORIENTED	0	
56	POLICIES INVOLVE SPENDING OF TOO MUCH MONEY	2	22.2%
57	HE LOST THE ELECTION	0	
58	DIDN'T LIKE HIM ON T.V., IN T.V. DEBATE	0	
59	DON'T LIKE WAY HE CAMPAIGNED	0	
61	HIS SINGLE-MINDEDNESS	0	
63	WOULDN'T VOTE FOR HIM, DON'T AGREE WITH HIM	0	

# v2114: DISLIKE ABOUT BROADBT-RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
66	TOO EASILY LED BY RADICAL MEMBERS OF HIS PARTY, MISGUIDED	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SEE 1979 STUDY -- FEEL SAME AS BEFORE	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2752	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2115: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=207 /-] [Invalid=2554 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q28A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART	1	0.5%
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT	14	6.8%
3	LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE, NICE PERSONALITY	2	1.0%
4	GOOD SPEAKER, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	4	1.9%
5	GOOD MAN	6	2.9%
6	HARD WORKER, TRIES HARD	5	2.4%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	1	0.5%
8	WOULD REPRESENT COUNTRY WELL	1	0.5%
9	TRIES TO HELP FARMERS	0	
10	HE IS CONFIDENT, POSITIVE	1	0.5%
11	CAN HELP THE CONSERVATIVES	0	
12	GOOD LOSER	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	3	1.4%
14	DYNAMIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, ENERGETIC	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY/	1	0.5%
16	HIS DETERMINATION, PERSISTENT, TENACIOUS	5	2.4%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	1	0.5%
18	NEW IDEAS, DIFFERENT IDEAS	1	0.5%
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	2	1.0%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	1	0.5%
21	GOOD POLICIES	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
24	COMICAL, ENTERTAINING	1	0.5%
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, HIS GUTS	9	4.3%
27	AS GOOD AS OTHERS	1	0.5%

# v2115: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
29	FIGHTER	1	0.5%
30	DOWN-TO-EARTH, REALISTIC	0	
31	A SIMPLE MAN	2	1.0%
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE IS FOR QUEBEC, GOOD FOR Q	3	1.4%
34	NEW OUTLOOK ON QUEBEC IN RELATION TO REST OF CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/WORKING PEOPLE	2	1.0%
39	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHANC	11	5.3%
45	HE WORKS FOR/UNDERSTANDS/WANTS TO HELP THE POOR	0	
46	WELL INFORMED, KNOWS THE PROBLEMS	0	
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0	
52	SYMPATHETIC	1	0.5%
57	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	2	1.0%
64	LIKE TO SEE HIM GET IN TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD DO	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	29	14.0%
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	50	24.2%
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	40	19.3%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	6	2.9%
99	SAME AS 1979 STUDY	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2553	
98	REFUSED	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2116: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=28 /-] [Invalid=2733 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q28A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART	0	
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT	3	10.7%
3	LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE, NICE PERSONALITY	0	
4	GOOD SPEAKER, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	0	
5	GOOD MAN	1	3.6%
6	HARD WORKER, TRIES HARD	1	3.6%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	2	7.1%
8	WOULD REPRESENT COUNTRY WELL	1	3.6%
9	TRIES TO HELP FARMERS	0	
10	HE IS CONFIDENT, POSITIVE	0	
11	CAN HELP THE CONSERVATIVES	0	

# v2116: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
12	GOOD LOSER	1	<div></div>	3.6%
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	0		
14	DYNAMIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, ENERGETIC	1	<div></div>	3.6%
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY/	3	<div></div>	10.7%
16	HIS DETERMINATION, PERSISTENT, TENACIOUS	2	<div></div>	7.1%
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	1	<div></div>	3.6%
18	NEW IDEAS, DIFFERENT IDEAS	0		
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	4	<div></div>	14.3%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	0		
21	GOOD POLICIES	0		
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0		
24	COMICAL, ENTERTAINING	0		
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0		
26	HIS COURAGE, HIS GUTS	1	<div></div>	3.6%
27	AS GOOD AS OTHERS	0		
29	FIGHTER	1	<div></div>	3.6%
30	DOWN-TO-EARTH, REALISTIC	0		
31	A SIMPLE MAN	0		
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE IS FOR QUEBEC, GOOD FOR Q	2	<div></div>	7.1%
34	NEW OUTLOOK ON QUEBEC IN RELATION TO REST OF CANADA	0		
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/WORKING PEOPLE	0		
39	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHANC	0		
45	HE WORKS FOR/UNDERSTANDS/WANTS TO HELP THE POOR	0		
46	WELL INFORMED, KNOWS THE PROBLEMS	0		
48	HE IS O.K.	0		
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0		
52	SYMPATHETIC	2	<div></div>	7.1%
57	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	2	<div></div>	7.1%
64	LIKE TO SEE HIM GET IN TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD DO	0		
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0		
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0		
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0		
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0		
99	SAME AS 1979 STUDY	0		
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2733		
98	REFUSED	0		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2117: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/98]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=5 /-] [Invalid=2756 /-]			

# v2117: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3			
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R LIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q28A.3 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	INTELLIGENT, SMART	0	
2	HONEST, SINCERE, DIRECT	0	
3	LIKE HIM, LIKEABLE, NICE PERSONALITY	0	
4	GOOD SPEAKER, LIKE LISTENING TO HIM	1	20.0%
5	GOOD MAN	0	
6	HARD WORKER, TRIES HARD	1	20.0%
7	GOOD LEADER, WOULD BE A GOOD LEADER	0	
8	WOULD REPRESENT COUNTRY WELL	0	
9	TRIES TO HELP FARMERS	0	
10	HE IS CONFIDENT, POSITIVE	0	
11	CAN HELP THE CONSERVATIVES	0	
12	GOOD LOSER	0	
13	FRENCH CANADIAN	0	
14	DYNAMIC, ENTHUSIASTIC, ENERGETIC	0	
15	HE IS DEDICATED TO HIS CAUSE, REALLY BELIEVES IN HIS PARTY/	0	
16	HIS DETERMINATION, PERSISTENT, TENACIOUS	0	
17	OUTSPOKEN, SAYS WHAT HE THINKS	0	
18	NEW IDEAS, DIFFERENT IDEAS	0	
19	GOOD IDEAS, PRINCIPLES	1	20.0%
20	COLOURFUL, HIS STYLE, A CHARACTER	0	
21	GOOD POLICIES	0	
22	A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
24	COMICAL, ENTERTAINING	0	
25	FRIENDLY, EASY TO MEET, WARM	0	
26	HIS COURAGE, HIS GUTS	0	
27	AS GOOD AS OTHERS	0	
29	FIGHTER	0	
30	DOWN-TO-EARTH, REALISTIC	0	
31	A SIMPLE MAN	0	
33	WANTS TO HELP FRENCH CANADIANS, HE IS FOR QUEBEC, GOOD FOR Q	0	
34	NEW OUTLOOK ON QUEBEC IN RELATION TO REST OF CANADA	0	
35	HE IS CONCERNED ABOUT PEOPLE/WORKING PEOPLE	1	20.0%
39	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, HARD TO SAY, HASN'T HAD A CHANC	0	
45	HE WORKS FOR/UNDERSTANDS/WANTS TO HELP THE POOR	0	
46	WELL INFORMED, KNOWS THE PROBLEMS	0	
48	HE IS O.K.	0	
49	LIKE HIS PARTY	0	
52	SYMPATHETIC	1	20.0%

# v2117: LIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	I TRUST HIM, HE IS CONVINCING	0	
64	LIKE TO SEE HIM GET IN TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD DO	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING LIKED, CAN'T STAND HIM, DISLIKE EVERYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
99	SAME AS 1979 STUDY	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2756	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2118: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=208 /-] [Invalid=2553 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT MR. ROY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q28B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	6	2.9%
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAMME	1	0.5%
3	HIS IDEAS	1	0.5%
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	0	
5	INCOMPETENT, NOT CAPABLE	4	1.9%
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMMES	6	2.9%
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	9	4.3%
8	CHANGES POLITICAL AFFILIATION/PARTY TOO OFTEN	9	4.3%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	4	1.9%
10	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	10	4.8%
11	EVERYTHING	3	1.4%
12	NOT EXPERIENCED	4	1.9%
13	LACKS ORGANIZATION	2	1.0%
14	HE IS CRAZY, NO BRAINS	1	0.5%
15	JUST A COMMON MAN	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	4	1.9%
17	NOT WELL EDUCATED	0	
18	THIS ASSOCIATION WITH LEVESQUE, HELP FROM LEVESQUE	0	
19	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETRO-CAN	0	
20	PARTY WHICH LOSES	4	1.9%
21	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP/ PARTY	2	1.0%
23	VERY ARROGANT	1	0.5%
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	

# v2118: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
25	NOT CONSCIENTIOUS	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER, KEEPS REPEATING HIMSELF	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
27	NOT A GOOD POLITICIAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	2	<div><div></div></div> 1.0%
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	0	
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
31	NAIVE/CHILDISH	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
32	TOO CRITICAL OF OTHERS	0	
33	SPEAKS AGAINST CAOUETTE	0	
34	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.9%
36	TOO MANY PROMISES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
38	STUBBORN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
39	UNSYMPATHETIC/LACKS UNDERSTANDING	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	6	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
41	POOR ADMINISTRATOR	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
42	OPPORTUNIST	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
43	TOO AMBITIOUS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
44	NARROW MINDED	0	
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
50	MISSALANIOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	24	<div><div></div></div> 11.5%
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	57	<div><div></div></div> 27.4%
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	22	<div><div></div></div> 10.6%
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2553	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2119: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=29 /-] [Invalid=2732 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q28B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	1	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAMME	0	
3	HIS IDEAS	2	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	1	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
5	INCOMPETENT, NOT CAPABLE	0	
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMMES	1	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%

v2119: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	8	27.6%
8	CHANGES POLITICAL AFFILIATION/PARTY TOO OFTEN	5	17.2%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
10	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	1	3.4%
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	NOT EXPERIENCED	0	
13	LACKS ORGANIZATION	1	3.4%
14	HE IS CRAZY, NO BRAINS	0	
15	JUST A COMMON MAN	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	2	6.9%
17	NOT WELL EDUCATED	0	
18	THIS ASSOCIATION WITH LEVESQUE, HELP FROM LEVESQUE	0	
19	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETRO-CAN	0	
20	PARTY WHICH LOSES	0	
21	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP/ PARTY	1	3.4%
23	VERY ARROGANT	1	3.4%
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	
25	NOT CONSCIENTIOUS	1	3.4%
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER, KEEPS REPEATING HIMSELF	0	
27	NOT A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	0	
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	0	
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
31	NAIVE/CHILDISH	0	
32	TOO CRITICAL OF OTHERS	0	
33	SPEAKS AGAINST CAOUETTE	0	
34	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	1	3.4%
36	TOO MANY PROMISES	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
38	STUBBORN	0	
39	UNSYMPATHETIC/LACKS UNDERSTANDING	1	3.4%
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	0	
41	POOR ADMINISTRATOR	0	
42	OPPORTUNIST	0	
43	TOO AMBITIOUS	0	
44	NARROW MINDED	1	3.4%
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
50	MISSALANIOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	1	3.4%
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	

v2119: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2732	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

v2120: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-98] [Missing=*/0/98]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=3 /-] [Invalid=2758 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 2. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	WHAT DOES R DISLIKE ABOUT ROY? (THIRD MENTION)		
Notes	Q28B.3 in the documentation.		

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	HIS PARTY, HIS POLITICS	0	
2	HIS POLICIES, HIS PLATFORM, HIS PROGRAMME	0	
3	HIS IDEAS	0	
4	HE IS FRENCH, HE SHOULD SPEAK ENGLISH	0	
5	INCOMPETENT, NOT CAPABLE	0	
6	UNREALISTIC IDEAS, POLICIES, PROGRAMMES	0	
7	NOT A GOOD LEADER, NOT A MAN TO BE THERE	1	
8	CHANGES POLITICAL AFFILIATION/PARTY TOO OFTEN	1	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	
10	CHANGES HIS MIND TOO OFTEN	0	
11	EVERYTHING	0	
12	NOT EXPERIENCED	0	
13	LACKS ORGANIZATION	0	
14	HE IS CRAZY, NO BRAINS	0	
15	JUST A COMMON MAN	0	
16	HE IS DISHONEST, A PHONEY, NOT SINCERE	0	
17	NOT WELL EDUCATED	0	
18	THIS ASSOCIATION WITH LEVESQUE, HELP FROM LEVESQUE	0	
19	HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETRO-CAN	0	
20	PARTY WHICH LOSES	0	
21	HIS PERSONALITY	0	
22	HE IS VERY LOCAL, REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL GROUP/ PARTY	1	
23	VERY ARROGANT	0	
24	DON'T TRUST HIM, HE SCARES ME	0	
25	NOT CONSCIENTIOUS	0	
26	NOT A GOOD SPEAKER, KEEPS REPEATING HIMSELF	0	
27	NOT A GOOD POLITICIAN	0	
28	A COMIC, SCATTERBRAIN	0	
29	INEFFECTIVE, HASN'T DONE MUCH, WOULDN'T DO MUCH	0	

# v2120: DISLIKE ABOUT FAB ROY-RESPONSE 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
30	HIS MANNER, THE WAY HE ACTS, GENERAL DISLIKE (UNSPECIFIED)	0	
31	NAIVE/CHILDISH	0	
32	TOO CRITICAL OF OTHERS	0	
33	SPEAKS AGAINST CAQUETTE	0	
34	NOT AGGRESSIVE ENOUGH	0	
35	TOO WEAK, NOT STRONG ENOUGH	0	
36	TOO MANY PROMISES	0	
37	HIS APPEARANCE	0	
38	STUBBORN	0	
39	UNSYMPATHETIC/LACKS UNDERSTANDING	0	
40	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT HIM, DON'T PAY ATTENTION TO HIM	0	
41	POOR ADMINISTRATOR	0	
42	OPPORTUNIST	0	
43	TOO AMBITIOUS	0	
44	NARROW MINDED	0	
49	PROPOSES SOCIAL CREDIT PROGRAMS	0	
50	MISSALANIOUS SINGLE MENTIONS	0	
88	NO OPINION, D.K., NOT STATED	0	
95	NOTHING IN PARTICULAR, NO	0	
96	NOTHING DISLIKED, LIKE HIM	0	
97	DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HIM	0	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 1, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	2758	
98	REFUSED	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=899 /-] [Invalid=1862 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Notes	Q29A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	44	<div><div></div></div> 4.9%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	8	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	4	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	18	2.0%
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	3	0.3%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	2	0.2%
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	29	3.2%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	1	0.1%
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.2%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	4	0.4%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	3	0.3%
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	6	0.7%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.3%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	10	1.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.3%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	12	1.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.2%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	3	0.3%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	2	0.2%
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	4	0.4%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	1	0.1%

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	4	0.4%
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	1	0.1%
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	8	0.9%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	10	1.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	1	0.1%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	8	0.9%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.4%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	1	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.2%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	2	0.2%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	15	1.7%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	1	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	1	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	1	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.1%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	5	0.6%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	2	0.2%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.1%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	1	0.1%
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	4	0.4%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.1%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	7	0.8%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.2%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	3	0.3%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	2	0.2%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	6	0.7%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	1	0.1%
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	3	0.3%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.1%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	9	1.0%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	50	5.6%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	1	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	3	0.3%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	11	1.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	5	0.6%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	4	0.4%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	1	0.1%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	10	1.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	3	0.3%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	4	0.4%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	6	0.7%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	2	0.2%
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	1	0.1%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	10	1.1%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	3	0.3%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	2	0.2%
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	4	0.4%
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	

v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	14	1.6%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	5	0.6%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	3	0.3%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	2	0.2%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	8	0.9%

# v2121: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	2	0.2%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.1%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	6	0.7%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	6	0.7%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	2	0.2%
900	EVERYTHING	8	0.9%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	3	0.3%
903	SOME THINGS	3	0.3%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	4	0.4%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	12	1.3%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	38	4.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.3%
948	NOTHING	90	10.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	191	21.2%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	29	3.2%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	3	0.3%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	45	5.0%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	7	0.8%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	3	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA. IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? ANYTHING ELSE?		
Literal question	Q29A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q29A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	6	0.7%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	2	0.2%

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	1	0.1%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	4	0.4%
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	4	0.4%
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	1	0.1%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	7	0.8%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	1	0.1%
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.2%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	3	0.3%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	3	0.3%
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	4	0.4%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	4	0.4%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	4	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	2	0.2%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	1	0.1%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	2	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	1	0.1%
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.1%
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	1	0.1%
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	5	0.6%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	3	0.3%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	2	0.2%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	3	0.3%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	1	0.1%
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.2%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	4	0.4%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	1	0.1%
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	6	0.7%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	1	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	1	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	2	0.2%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	1	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.2%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.1%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	1	0.1%
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.1%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	3	0.3%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	1	0.1%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.1%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	4	0.4%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	3	0.3%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.2%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	2	0.2%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	6	0.7%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.1%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	7	0.8%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	21	2.3%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	1	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	3	0.3%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	1	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	6	0.7%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	1	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	1	0.1%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	5	0.6%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	3	0.3%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	1	0.1%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	2	0.2%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.2%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	6	0.7%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	1	0.1%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	2	0.2%

v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	1	0.1%
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	2	0.2%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	5	0.6%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	3	0.3%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	2	0.2%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	

# v2122: LIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	4	0.4%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	3	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	0.1%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	6	0.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.3%
948	NOTHING	56	6.2%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	217	24.1%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	10	1.1%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	11	1.2%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	369	40.9%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=900 /-] [Invalid=1861 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		

# v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1			
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q29B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q29B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	41	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	10	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	22	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	1	0.1%
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	4	0.4%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	4	0.4%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	6	0.7%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	3	0.3%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	1	0.1%
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.1%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	4	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	3	0.3%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	5	0.6%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	1	0.1%
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	5	0.6%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	5	0.6%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	6	0.7%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.1%
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.1%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	5	0.6%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	3	0.3%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	2	0.2%

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.2%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	4	0.4%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	1	0.1%
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	5	0.6%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	3	0.3%
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	1	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	2	0.2%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	4	0.4%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	3	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	3	0.3%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	2	0.2%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	5	0.6%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	2	0.2%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	3	0.3%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	6	0.7%
223	FOREIGN AID	1	0.1%
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.2%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	1	0.1%
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.1%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	1	0.1%
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	3	0.3%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	2	0.2%
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	1	0.1%
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	5	0.6%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	1	0.1%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	2	0.2%

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	2	0.2%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	2	0.2%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	4	0.4%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	1	0.1%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	1	0.1%
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	1	0.1%
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	9	1.0%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	7	0.8%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	2	0.2%
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	5	0.6%

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	8	0.9%
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	1	0.1%
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	1	0.1%
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.1%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	5	0.6%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	2	0.2%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	10	1.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	3	0.3%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	2	0.2%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	11	1.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	3	0.3%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	3	0.3%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	7	0.8%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	6	0.7%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.1%

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	29	<div><div></div></div> 3.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	7	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	28	<div><div></div></div> 3.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	19	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	4	0.4%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	1	0.1%
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.2%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	1	0.1%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	1	0.1%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	3	0.3%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	7	0.8%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	11	1.2%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	1	0.1%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	5	0.6%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	2	0.2%
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	9	1.0%
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	2	0.2%

v2123: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	9	1.0%
733	POWER HUNGRY	3	0.3%
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	2	0.2%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.1%
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	1	0.1%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	2	0.2%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	4	0.4%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	3	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	10	1.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	18	2.0%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	54	6.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	229	25.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	21	2.3%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	2	0.2%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	43	4.8%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	10	1.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q29B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q29B.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	4	0.4%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	1	0.1%
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	1	0.1%
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	1	0.1%
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	10	1.1%
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	1	0.1%
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	1	0.1%
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	2	0.2%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	2	0.2%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.1%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	3	0.3%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.1%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	6	0.7%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.1%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	4	0.4%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	1	0.1%
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	1	0.1%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	1	0.1%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	3	0.3%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	3	0.3%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	1	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	1	0.1%
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	7	0.8%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.1%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	2	0.2%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	4	0.4%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	1	0.1%
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.1%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	5	0.6%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	2	0.2%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	2	0.2%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	4	0.4%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	2	0.2%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	1	0.1%
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	1	0.1%
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	5	0.6%
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	4	0.4%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	1	0.1%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.3%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.2%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.2%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	2	0.2%

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.1%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	1	0.1%
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	6	0.7%
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	1	0.1%
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	3	0.3%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	2	0.2%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	1	0.1%
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	5	0.6%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	1	0.1%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	4	0.4%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	1	0.1%
517	WEAK	1	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	4	0.4%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	9	1.0%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	3	0.3%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.1%
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	3	0.3%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	1	0.1%
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	6	0.7%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	10	1.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.1%
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	4	0.4%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	1	0.1%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	0.2%
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.1%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.2%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	7	0.8%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	5	0.6%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	

v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	3	0.3%
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	2	0.2%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	3	0.3%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	1	0.1%
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	2	0.2%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	2	0.2%
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	1	0.1%
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.2%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	6	0.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	45	5.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	246	27.3%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	6	0.7%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	

# v2124: DISLIKE FEDERAL LIBERALS-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	8	0.9%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	357	39.6%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=899 /-] [Invalid=1862 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q30A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q30A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	6	0.7%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	5	0.6%
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	7	0.8%
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	2	0.2%
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	1	0.1%
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	6	0.7%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	7	0.8%
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	3	0.3%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	3	0.3%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	6	0.7%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	1	0.1%
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	1	0.1%
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	1	0.1%
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	6	0.7%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	5	0.6%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	17	1.9%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	3	0.3%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	38	4.2%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	8	0.9%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.2%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	2	0.2%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	9	1.0%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	1	0.1%
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	1	0.1%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	10	1.1%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	1	0.1%
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.1%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	1	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	5	0.6%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	1	0.1%
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	1	0.1%
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	1	0.1%
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.1%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	1	0.1%
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.1%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	3	0.3%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.2%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.1%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	5	0.6%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	8	0.9%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	7	0.8%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	12	1.3%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	2	0.2%
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	3	0.3%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	10	1.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	14	1.6%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	2	0.2%
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	3	0.3%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	6	0.7%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	24	2.7%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	1	0.1%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	2	0.2%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	5	0.6%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	4	0.4%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	13	1.4%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	3	0.3%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	4	0.4%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	21	2.3%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	2	0.2%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	1	0.1%
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	2	0.2%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	1	0.1%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	10	1.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	4	0.4%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	2	0.2%
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	2	0.2%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	2	0.2%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	3	0.3%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	2	0.2%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	6	0.7%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	20	2.2%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	3	0.3%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	3	0.3%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	3	0.3%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	13	1.4%

v2125: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	33	3.7%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	90	10.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	246	27.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	21	2.3%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	4	0.4%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	63	7.0%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	19	2.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.
Literal question	Q30A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY
Notes	Q29A.1, Q30A.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	8	0.9%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	4	0.4%
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	2	0.2%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	4	0.4%
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	1	0.1%
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	1	0.1%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	2	0.2%
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	3	0.3%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	4	0.4%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	10	1.1%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	2	0.2%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	18	2.0%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	7	0.8%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	3	0.3%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	3	0.3%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	4	0.4%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	1	0.1%
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	2	0.2%
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	5	0.6%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	1	0.1%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.2%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	3	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	0.1%
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	1	0.1%
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	3	0.3%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	1	0.1%
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	1	0.1%
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	3	0.3%
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.1%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.1%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	1	0.1%
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	1	0.1%
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	4	0.4%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	2	0.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	4	0.4%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	6	0.7%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	2	0.2%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	4	0.4%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	3	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	1	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	3	0.3%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.3%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	10	1.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	1	0.1%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	1	0.1%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	2	0.2%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	2	0.2%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	6	0.7%

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	2	0.2%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	2	0.2%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	9	1.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	0.2%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	1	0.1%
607	LEFT WING	1	0.1%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.1%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	5	0.6%

v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	1	0.1%
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	20	2.2%

# v2126: LIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	1	0.1%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	3	0.3%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.1%
948	NOTHING	47	5.2%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	218	24.2%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	9	1.0%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	10	1.1%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	390	43.2%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=900 /-] [Invalid=1861 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q30B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q30B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	42	4.7%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	32	3.6%
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	17	1.9%
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	29	3.2%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	1	0.1%
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	1	0.1%
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	2	0.2%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	19	2.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	4	0.4%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	3	0.3%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	2	0.2%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	7	0.8%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	5	0.6%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	32	3.6%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	2	0.2%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	1	0.1%
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	2	0.2%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.1%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	1	0.1%
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	8	0.9%
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	9	1.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	4	0.4%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.1%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	3	0.3%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	1	0.1%
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	1	0.1%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	1	0.1%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	1	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	1	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	3	0.3%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	11	1.2%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.1%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	5	0.6%
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.1%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	1	0.1%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	2	0.2%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.1%
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.2%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.1%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	1	0.1%
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	18	2.0%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	1	0.1%
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	2	0.2%
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.1%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.1%
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	11	1.2%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	16	1.8%

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	4	0.4%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	13	1.4%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	2	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	44	4.9%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	8	0.9%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	3	0.3%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.2%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	7	0.8%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.4%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	4	0.4%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	1	0.1%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	2	0.2%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	4	0.4%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	4	0.4%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	3	0.3%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	4	0.4%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	1	0.1%
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	3	0.3%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	1	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	1	0.1%
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	1	0.1%
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	1	0.1%
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	2	0.2%
600	CONSERVATISM	3	0.3%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	1	0.1%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.1%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	21	2.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	13	1.4%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	6	0.7%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.1%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	1	0.1%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	2	0.2%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	

v2127: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.2%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	6	0.7%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	3	0.3%
900	EVERYTHING	8	0.9%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	3	0.3%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	17	1.9%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.1%
948	NOTHING	58	6.4%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	213	23.7%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	28	3.1%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	44	4.9%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	13	1.4%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.
Literal question	Q30B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY
Notes	Q29A.1, Q30B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	6	0.7%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	1	0.1%
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	10	1.1%
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	2	0.2%
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	10	1.1%
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	2	0.2%
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	2	0.2%
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	3	0.3%
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	1	0.1%
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	5	0.6%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	3	0.3%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	7	0.8%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.2%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	2	0.2%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	14	1.6%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	3	0.3%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	1	0.1%
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	1	0.1%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	7	0.8%
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	3	0.3%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	4	0.4%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.1%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.1%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.1%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	4	0.4%
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	10	1.1%
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	1	0.1%
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	1	0.1%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	1	0.1%
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	4	0.4%
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	1	0.1%
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	4	0.4%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.1%
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	1	0.1%
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	6	0.7%

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	2	0.2%
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	1	0.1%
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	1	0.1%
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	3	0.3%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.1%
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
418	PRO-AMERICAN	1	0.1%
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.7%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	11	1.2%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	8	0.9%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	0.1%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	11	1.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	9	1.0%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	1	0.1%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	1	0.1%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	3	0.3%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	3	0.3%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.1%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	2	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	3	0.3%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	1	0.1%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	2	0.2%
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	5	0.6%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	1	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	1	0.1%
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	1	0.1%
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.1%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	1	0.1%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	2	0.2%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	

v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.1%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	3	0.3%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	1	0.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	2	0.2%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	1	0.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	1	0.1%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	1	0.1%
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	

# v2128: DISLIKE FEDERAL PC-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	1	0.1%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	3	0.3%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	1	0.1%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	2	0.2%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	2	0.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	41	4.5%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	247	27.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	5	0.6%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	1	0.1%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	6	0.7%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	360	39.9%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=900 /-] [Invalid=1861 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q31A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q31A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	76	8.4%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	1	0.1%
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	11	1.2%
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	16	1.8%
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	17	1.9%
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	3	0.3%
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	2	0.2%
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	29	3.2%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	1	0.1%
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	2	0.2%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	1	0.1%
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.2%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	2	0.2%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	3	0.3%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	44	4.9%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	1	0.1%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	6	0.7%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	1	0.1%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	2	0.2%
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	4	0.4%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	0.1%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.2%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	8	0.9%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	3	0.3%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	1	0.1%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	6	0.7%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	2	0.2%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	1	0.1%
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	4	0.4%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	1	0.1%
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	3	0.3%

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.1%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	1	0.1%
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	2	0.2%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	12	1.3%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	35	3.9%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.2%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	2	0.2%
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	5	0.6%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.1%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	1	0.1%
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	1	0.1%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	7	0.8%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.1%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	1	0.1%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	1	0.1%
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	2	0.2%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	3	0.3%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	5	0.6%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	9	1.0%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	13	1.4%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	2	0.2%

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	4	0.4%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	1	0.1%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	2	0.2%
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	1	0.1%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	1	0.1%
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	16	1.8%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	9	1.0%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	2	0.2%
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	5	0.6%

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.2%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	1	0.1%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	5	0.6%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	2	0.2%
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	1	0.1%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.2%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	1	0.1%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	

v2129: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	2	0.2%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	2	0.2%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	8	0.9%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	18	2.0%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	3	0.3%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	5	0.6%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	14	1.6%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.1%
948	NOTHING	63	7.0%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	234	26.0%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	43	4.8%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	1	0.1%
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	66	7.3%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	7	0.8%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Literal question		Q31A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY	
Notes		Q29A.1, Q31A.2 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	7	0.8%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	1	0.1%
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	2	0.2%
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	1	0.1%
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	1	0.1%
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	8	0.9%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	1	0.1%
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.2%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.2%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	1	0.1%
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	23	2.5%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	1	0.1%
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	1	0.1%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	3	0.3%
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	2	0.2%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	3	0.3%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	2	0.2%
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	1	0.1%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	3	0.3%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	4	0.4%
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	1	0.1%
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	1	0.1%
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	5	0.6%
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	9	1.0%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	2	0.2%
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	5	0.6%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	5	0.6%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	3	0.3%
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	1	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	1	0.1%
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	4	0.4%
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	1	0.1%
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.1%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	2	0.2%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	1	0.1%
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	11	1.2%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	9	1.0%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.2%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	2	0.2%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	1	0.1%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.1%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	0.1%
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	1	0.1%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	2	0.2%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.7%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	2	0.2%
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	1	0.1%
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	2	0.2%
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	1	0.1%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	2	0.2%
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	3	0.3%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	1	0.1%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	1	0.1%
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	5	0.6%
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	2	0.2%
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	3	0.3%
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	1	0.1%
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	1	0.1%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	5	0.6%
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	2	0.2%
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	2	0.2%

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	0.1%
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	2	0.2%
603	COMMUNISM	1	0.1%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	2	0.2%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	2	0.2%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	6	0.7%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	1	0.1%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	0.2%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	

v2130: LIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	1	0.1%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	5	0.6%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	1	0.1%
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	2	0.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	3	0.3%
948	NOTHING	43	4.8%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	238	26.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	10	1.1%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	10	1.1%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	380	42.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=901 /-] [Invalid=1860 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q31B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL N.D.P.? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q31B.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	7	0.8%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	3	0.3%
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	1	0.1%
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	2	0.2%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	5	0.6%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	4	0.4%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	1	0.1%
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	2	0.2%
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	15	1.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	4	0.4%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	10	1.1%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.1%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	2	0.2%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.1%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	6	0.7%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	1	0.1%
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	2	0.2%
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	3	0.3%
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	2	0.2%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	3	0.3%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	1	0.1%
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	2	0.2%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	1	0.1%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	1	0.1%
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	2	0.2%
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	1	0.1%
223	FOREIGN AID	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	1	0.1%
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	2	0.2%
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	2	0.2%
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	0.1%
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.1%
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	1	0.1%
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.2%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.1%
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	1	0.1%
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	18	2.0%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	14	1.6%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	1	0.1%
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	6	0.7%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	2	0.2%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	9	1.0%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.2%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	6	0.7%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	2	0.2%
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	1	0.1%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	2	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	2	0.2%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	2	0.2%
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	1	0.1%
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	7	0.8%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	1	0.1%
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	4	0.4%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	1	0.1%
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	1	0.1%
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	0.1%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	1	0.1%
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	28	3.1%
603	COMMUNISM	7	0.8%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	11	1.2%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	24	2.7%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	4	0.4%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	6	0.7%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	5	0.6%
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	1	0.1%
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.1%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	3	0.3%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	21	2.3%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	4	0.4%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	10	1.1%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	5	0.6%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	

v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	1	0.1%
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	4	0.4%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	3	0.3%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	6	0.7%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	3	0.3%
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	1	0.1%
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	0.1%
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	1	0.1%
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	0	
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	12	1.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	13	1.4%
900	EVERYTHING	5	0.6%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.1%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.1%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	19	2.1%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	4	0.4%
948	NOTHING	66	7.3%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	315	35.0%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	42	4.7%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	

# v2131: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 1						
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage			
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	70	<div></div>	7.8%		
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	19	<div></div>	2.1%		
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859				
950	REFUSAL	1				
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.						
# v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2						
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]					
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=902 /-] [Invalid=1859 /-]					
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1.					
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.					
Literal question	Q31B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY					
Notes	Q29A.1, Q31B.2 in the documentation.					
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage			
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	0				
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0				
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0				
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0				
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0				
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0				
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0				
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0				
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0				
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0				
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0				
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0				
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0				
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0				
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0				
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0				
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0				
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0				
26	CLARK, POLICY	0				
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0				
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0				
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0				
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	1			0.1%	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0				
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0				

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	1	0.1%
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	4	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	6	0.7%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	2	0.2%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	6	0.7%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	4	0.4%
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	1	0.1%
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.1%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	2	0.2%
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	1	0.1%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	1	0.1%
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	1	0.1%
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	1	0.1%
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	1	0.1%
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	2	0.2%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	1	0.1%
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	1	0.1%
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	1	0.1%
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	1	0.1%
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.1%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.1%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	7	0.8%
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	5	0.6%
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	3	0.3%
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	3	0.3%
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	2	0.2%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.1%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	2	0.2%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	3	0.3%
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	4	0.4%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	2	0.2%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.1%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	2	0.2%
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	3	0.3%
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	1	0.1%
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	1	0.1%
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	1	0.1%
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.1%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	8	0.9%
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	1	0.1%
549	EXTRAVAGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	7	0.8%
603	COMMUNISM	2	0.2%
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	3	0.3%
608	TOO SOCIALIST	3	0.3%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	1	0.1%
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	1	0.1%
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.1%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	2	0.2%
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	1	0.1%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.2%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	1	0.1%
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	5	0.6%
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	

v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPLEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	0.1%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.1%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	1	0.1%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	1	0.1%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	1	0.1%
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	3	0.3%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.1%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.1%

# v2132: DISLIKE FEDERAL NDP-RESPONSE 2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	2	0.2%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	40	4.4%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	268	29.7%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	9	1.0%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	8	0.9%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	442	49.0%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, HALF SAMPLE 2, NO 2ND/3RD MENTION	1859	
950	REFUSAL	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=238 /-] [Invalid=2523 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q32A.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q32A.1 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	2	0.8%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	1	0.4%
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	1	0.4%
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	5	2.1%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	1	0.4%
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	1	0.4%
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	1	0.4%
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	4	1.7%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	1	0.4%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	1	0.4%
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	1	0.4%
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	0.4%
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	1	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	1	0.4%
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	1	0.4%
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	1	0.4%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	2	0.8%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	1	0.4%
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	4	1.7%
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	2	0.8%
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	1	0.4%
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	2	0.8%
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	1	0.4%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	1	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	4	1.7%

v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	5	2.1%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	1	0.4%

# v2133: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	8	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
948	NOTHING	48	<div><div></div></div> 20.2%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	82	<div><div></div></div> 34.5%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	19	<div><div></div></div> 8.0%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	23	<div><div></div></div> 9.7%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.8%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW OR INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2523	
950	REFUSAL	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=238 /-] [Invalid=2523 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.		
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.		
Literal question	Q32A.2 SECOND MENTION OF LIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY		
Notes	Q29A.1, Q32A.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	0.8%
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	0	
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	0	
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOUCETTE, ALL REFERENCES	2	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	2	0.8%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	0	
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	1	0.4%
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	1	0.4%
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	0.4%
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	1	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	2	0.8%
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	1	0.4%
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	0.4%
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	1	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	0	0.4%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	0	
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	1	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	0.4%
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	0	
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	0.4%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	0	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	1	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	0.8%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	0.8%
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	0.4%
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	0.4%
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	0.4%
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	0.4%
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.4%
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	0.4%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	0.4%
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	0.4%
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	0.4%
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	0	0.4%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	0.4%
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	0.4%
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	0.4%
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	0.4%
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	1	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	0.4%
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	0.4%
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	0.4%
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	0.4%

v2134: LIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	1	0.4%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	1	0.4%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	0	
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.4%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.4%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	18	7.6%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	83	34.9%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	2	0.8%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	1	0.4%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	113	47.5%
0	NO SECOND MENTION OR INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2523	
950	REFUSAL	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=238 /-] [Invalid=2523 /-]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.
Literal question	Q32B.1 IS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY? (FIRST MENTION)
Notes	Q29A.1, Q32B.1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	10	4.2%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	1	0.4%
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	6	2.5%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOINETTE, ALL REFERENCES	0	
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONED)	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P.'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	2	0.8%
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.8%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	1	0.4%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	2	0.8%
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.4%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	2	0.8%
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	1	0.4%
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	4	1.7%
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	1	0.4%
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	3	1.3%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	2	0.8%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	3	1.3%
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	2	0.8%
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	2	0.8%
518	FOWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	2	0.8%
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	2	0.8%
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	3	1.3%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	1	0.4%
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	1	0.4%
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	3	1.3%
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	1	0.4%
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	1	0.4%
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	1	0.4%
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	1	0.4%
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	1	0.4%
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	17	7.1%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPELEMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	1	0.4%
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	5	2.1%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	

v2135: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	3	1.3%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	0	
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	2	0.8%
900	EVERYTHING	1	0.4%
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	1	0.4%
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	1	0.4%
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	6	2.5%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	0	
948	NOTHING	25	10.5%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	70	29.4%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	15	6.3%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	23	9.7%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	6	2.5%
0	NO 1980 INERVIEW OR INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2523	
950	REFUSAL	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*/0/950]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=238 -] [Invalid=2523 -]
Universe	Asked only to half-sample 1. Asked only to respondents residing in the province of Quebec.
Pre-question	Q29A.1 NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU WHAT YOU PERSONALLY THINK ARE THE GOOD AND BAD POINTS ABOUT POLITICAL PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL IN CANADA.
Literal question	Q32B.2 SECOND MENTION OF DISLIKE ABOUT THE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY
Notes	Q29A.1, Q32B.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	GENERAL LEADER REFERENCE FOR ALL PARTIES (TRUDEAU, CLARK, B	3	1.3%
2	TRUDEAU, CULTURAL, INTELLECTUAL	0	
3	TRUDEAU, COURAGEOUS	0	
4	TRUDEAU, ARROGANT, SARCASTIC	0	
5	TRUDEAU, REFERENCE TO PERSONAL LIFE STYLE (WEALTH, TRAVELLIN	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	TRUDEAU, CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS, GOOD INTERNATIONAL PR	0	
7	TRUDEAU, ABILITY TO GOVERN, PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
8	TRUDEAU, INABILITY TO GOVERN	0	
9	TRUDEAU, COMPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT	0	
10	TRUDEAU, POLICY	0	
11	TRUDEAU, NATIONAL UNITY	0	
12	TRUDEAU'S RESIGNATION	0	
14	TRUDEAU, OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION	0	
20	CLARK HONEST, SINCERE, NICE GUY	0	
21	CLARK, GENERAL POSITIVE, GOOD LEADER, ABLE, ETC.	0	
22	CLARK NOT A STRONG LEADER, INDECISIVE, WISHY-WASHY	0	
23	CLARK, PEOPLE'S INTEREST AT HEART, TRYING TO DO SOMETHING, G	0	
25	CLARK INEXPERIENCED, TOO YOUNG, UNTRIED	0	
26	CLARK, POLICY	0	
27	CLARK, COMPOSITION OF GOVT.	0	
29	CLARK, THER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
31	BROADBENT, HONEST, NICE GUY, SINCERE	0	
32	BROADBENT, GOOD IDEAS, LIKE HIS POLICIES, ETC.	0	
33	BROADBENT, GOOD SPEAKER, FORCEFUL, DYNAMIC	0	
34	BROADBENT, STATESMAN, RESPECTED, ABLE	0	
35	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, PO	0	
36	BROADBENT, TIES WITH LABOUR, WORKING MAN, AVERAGE PERSON, NE	0	
38	BROADBENT, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCE	0	
44	ROY, HONEST, SINCERE, ETC.	0	
45	ROY, GOOD SPEAKER, CAMPAIGNER	0	
46	ROY, POLICIES	1	0.4%
49	ROY, OTHER SPECIFIC REFERENCES	2	0.8%
51	DIEFENBAKER, ALL REFERENCES	0	
52	PEARSON, ALL REFERENCES	0	
53	STANFIELD, ALL REFERENCES	0	
54	CAOQUETTE, ALL REFERENCES	2	0.8%
55	DAVID LEWIS, ALL REFERENCES	0	
56	ALL OTHER PAST LEADER MENTIONS	0	
57	JOHN CROSBIE	0	
58	LLOYD AXWORTHY	0	
59	DAVID CROMBIE	0	
60	TRUDEAU, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
61	CLARK, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
62	BROADBENT, PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES	0	
63	PERFORMANCE IN DEBATES, GENERAL (NO SPECIFIC LEADER MENTIONE	0	
64	OTTO LANG	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
65	JOHN TURNER	0	
66	EUGENE WHELAN	0	
67	JEAN CHRETIEN	0	
68	JACK HORNER	0	
69	OTHER CABINET MINISTERS	0	
70	COMPOSITION OF CABINET	0	
71	MARC LALONDE	0	
76	FLORA MACDONALD	0	
77	COMPOSITION OF PARTY (INDIVIDUAL M.P'S)	0	
80	OTHER PROMINENT FIGURES (PARLIAMENT)	0	
83	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS STRONG	0	
84	LEADER OR LEADERSHIP IS WEAK	0	
85	LOCAL OR REGIONAL TIES TO LEADER (FAVOURITE SON)	0	
86	LOCAL CANDIDATE	0	
87	CANDIDATES (GENERAL)	0	
89	CANDIDATE AS 'UNDERDOG'	0	
90	REFERENCE TO CONSTITUENCY SERVICE	0	
91	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO BACKBENCH M.P.'S	0	
92	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	0	
93	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO PARTY MEMBERS, PEOPLE IN GENERAL	2	0.8%
95	RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES	0	
97	PROVINCIAL RESPONSE FOR FEDERAL PARTY	0	
120	POLICIES GOOD FOR COUNTRY	0	
122	POLICIES BAD FOR COUNTRY	0	
125	CAMPAIGN PLATFORM (GENERAL)	0	
126	POLICY OR POLICIES NOT NAMED, GOOD IDEAS	2	0.8%
127	POLICIES KNOWN, UNDERSTANDABLE	0	
128	POLICIES UNKNOWN OR CONFUSING	0	
129	POLICIES PRACTICAL	0	
130	POLICIES IMPRACTICAL, UNWORKABLE, IDEAS IMPRACTICAL, NAIVE	1	0.4%
131	CHILD TAX REBATE	0	
132	INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE	0	
133	MONETARY POLICY (INTEREST RATES)	0	
134	ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PROSPERITY	0	
135	BUDGET, FISCAL POLICY	0	
136	ECONOMIC POLICY (NOT SPECIFIC)	0	
137	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	0	
138	NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS	0	
139	PROMOTES FREE ENTERPRISE	0	
140	TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE (REFERENCE TO	0	
141	APPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	
142	DISAPPROVE HEAVIER TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
143	BUSINESS REGULATION, BUSINESS POLICY	0	
144	TAX INCENTIVES FOR CORPORATIONS HURT ORDINARY MAN	0	
145	GENERAL REFERENCE TO TAXATION	0	
146	GENERAL REFERENCE TO STAND ON INFLATION	0	
147	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
148	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS	0	
149	CUT BACKS (CIVIL SERVICE, BUDGET, ETC.)	0	
150	MORTGAGE DEDUCTIBILITY	0	
153	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
154	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS COUNTRY	0	
156	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE GOOD	0	
157	NATURE OF THE TIMES, THINGS ARE BAD	0	
158	ECONOMIC TIMES GOOD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
159	ECONOMIC TIMES BAD (WHEN THEY ARE IN)	0	
161	PRICES TOO HIGH, COST OF LIVING	0	
162	PRICES TOO LOW	0	
164	WAGES TOO LOW	0	
165	PROMOTES HIGH PRICES	0	
166	PROMOTES HIGH WAGES	0	
167	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
168	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FAMILY ALLOWANCE	0	
169	HEALTH POLICY (MEDICAL INSURANCE)	0	
170	GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME, INCOMES POLICY	0	
171	PENSION POLICY OR POLICY VIS A VIS ELDERLY	0	
172	DRUGS, MARIJUANA, DRUG POLICY	0	
173	FARM POLICY (INCLUDING FARM POLICIES IN WEST OR PRAIRIES - F	0	
175	LABOUR POLICY (HANDLING OF STRIKES)	0	
176	FISHING POLICY	0	
177	18 CENT GASOLINE TAX	0	
179	HOUSING POLICY	0	
180	TRANSPORTATION POLICY	0	
181	RESOURCE POLICY (POLICIES)	0	
182	REFERENCE TO OIL OR ENERGY POLICY	0	
183	OIL ROYALTIES AND TAXATION	0	
184	STANCE ON OIL POLICY VIS A VIS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	0	
185	SELLING PETROCAN, PETROCAN POLICY	0	
186	SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES	0	
187	NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD "GIVEAWAY" PROGRAMS (UNEMPLOYMENT,	0	
188	TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS, MAKE PEOPLE WORK	0	
189	GENERAL SOCIAL POLICY (POLICIES)	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
190	REFERENCE TO EMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT POLICY	0	
191	PRO-STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, CENTRALIZATION	0	
192	DECENTRALIZATION, PRO-PROVINCIAL RIGHTS	0	
193	STANCE VIS A VIS FEDERALISM	0	
194	STAND ON SEPARATISM	0	
195	NOT SEPARATIST ENOUGH	0	
196	TOO SEPARATIST	0	
197	HANDLING OF F.L.Q. CRISIS	0	
198	STANCE VIS A VIS QUEBEC'S PLACE IN CONFEDERATION	0	
199	SOVEREIGNTY REFERENCE, CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE	0	
200	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
201	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO SYMBOLS (FLAG, MONARCHY, ETC.)	0	
203	POLICY ON CANADIAN UNITY, CARES ABOUT ALL OF CANADA	0	
204	DIVIDES COUNTRY	0	
208	CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, REPATRIATION OF BNA ACT, POSITION ON	0	
211	URBAN POLICIES	0	
212	IMMIGRATION POLICY (ALSO REFUGEE POLICY, BOAT PEOPLE, ETC.)	0	
213	STAND ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT	0	
214	POLICY VIS A VIS INDIANS, LAND CLAIMS, ETC.	0	
215	POLICIES TOWARD YOUTH	0	
216	ABORTION	0	
219	PRO-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
220	ANTI-WOMEN'S RIGHTS	0	
221	LANGUAGE POLICY, BILL 22, ETC.	0	
222	BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM	0	
223	FOREIGN AID	0	
224	FOREIGN TRADE (INCLUDING SELLING PRODUCE ABROAD, WHEAT ETC.,	0	
225	FOREIGN POLICY (NOT NAMED)	0	
226	OLYMPIC BOYCOTT	0	
227	JERUSALEM EMBASSY POLICY	0	
228	IRAN EMBASSY CRISIS	0	
237	DEATH DUTIES, INHERITANCE TAXES	0	
238	FREIGHT RATES	0	
241	POLICY ON CROWN CORPORATIONS (GENERAL)	0	
245	MINING POLICY	0	
250	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
251	NEGATIVE REFERENCE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT	0	
252	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP	0	
253	ATTRACTS INDUSTRY	0	
254	FAILURE TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
261	PATRONAGE (GENERAL)	0	
262	TOO MUCH PATRONAGE	0	
265	JOBS (WORK) AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
266	JOBS NOT AVAILABLE WHEN PARTY IN POWER	0	
267	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (GENERAL)	0	
268	POSITIVE REFERENCE TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS (NOT ENOUGH IMP	0	
269	RECREATION, PARKS ETC.	0	
272	LAW AND JUSTICE	0	
274	OFFSHORE RIGHTS	0	
276	ROAD BUILDING (GENERAL)	0	
278	SALES TAX, TAX CUT POLICY (SALES)	0	
279	18 YEAR OLD MAJORITY	0	
284	EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOLS	0	
285	THE METRIC SYSTEM	0	
286	UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES, ARMED FORCES GENERALLY	0	
287	PRO CIVIL LIBERTIES, CIVIL RIGHTS	0	
288	GUN CONTROL	0	
289	HOME IMPROVMENT GRANTS (INSULATION, ETC.)	0	
290	ARTS POLICY	0	
291	NUCLEAR POWER	0	
292	DIVORCE LAWS, REFORM, ETC.	0	
295	FEDERAL LOTTERY, LOTO-CANADA	0	
296	WEAKNESS OF DEFENCE POLICIES (NATO, ALLIANCES, ETC.)	0	
297	HERITAGE TRUST FUND	0	
298	LAND POLICY (GENERAL)	0	
330	PRO-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
331	ANTI-FRENCH-CANADIAN	0	
332	PRO-ENGLISH-CANADIAN	0	
334	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITHOUT BIAS	0	
335	TREATS ALL ETHNIC GROUPS WITH BIAS, BIGOTED	0	
336	NOT ENOUGH ATTENTION PAID TO MINORITIES	0	
338	TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS	0	
345	PRO-UPPER CLASS, WEALTHY, RICH, ETC.	0	
347	PRO-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
348	ANTI-MIDDLE CLASS	0	
349	PRO-LOWER CLASS	0	
350	ANTI-LOWER CLASS	0	
351	FOR MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
352	AGAINST MY CLASS, MY KIND OF PEOPLE	0	
353	FOR ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
354	AGAINST ORDINARY MAN, ALL THE PEOPLE	0	
355	FOR WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	
356	AGAINST WORKING-MAN, LABOUR	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
357	FOR POOR PEOPLE	0	
358	AGAINST POOR PEOPLE	0	
359	FOR FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
360	AGAINST FARMERS, FISHERMEN	0	
361	FOR BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
362	AGAINST BIG BUSINESS, MONEYED INTERESTS	0	
363	INFLUENCED BY BIG BUSINESS	0	
364	FOR TRADE UNIONS	0	
365	AGAINST TRADE UNIONS	0	
366	INFLUENCED BY TRADE UNIONS, LABOUR	0	
367	FOR INDIANS	0	
368	AGAINST INDIANS	0	
369	FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS	0	
370	FOR PROTESTANTS	0	
371	FOR SMALL BUSINESS	0	
372	PRO-WOMEN	0	
373	ANTI-WOMEN	0	
374	AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS	0	
375	PRO-YOUTH	0	
376	ANTI-YOUTH	0	
377	FOR ELDERLY	0	
378	AGAINST ELDERLY	0	
379	DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION, POOR ALLOCATION OF SEATS	0	
380	PARTY INFLUENCED BY CIVIL SERVANTS	0	
381	UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
383	GOOD FOR CIVIL SERVANTS, GOVT. EMPLOYEES	0	
390	PRO-MARITIMES	0	
391	ANTI-MARITIMES	0	
392	PRO-QUEBEC, AWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
393	ANTI-QUEBEC, UNAWARE OF QUEBECS NEEDS	0	
394	PRO-ONTARIO	0	
398	PRO-BRITISH COLUMBIA	0	
400	PRO-EAST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF EAST	0	
402	PRO-WEST, AWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
403	ANTI-WEST, UNAWARE OF NEEDS OF WEST	0	
404	NEGLECTS ONTARIO	0	
405	INFLUENCED BY QUEBEC	0	
406	INFLUENCED BY ONTARIO AND QUEBEC	0	
407	TREATS ALL PROVINCES EQUALLY	0	
408	REFERENCE TO LOCAL BENEFITS	0	
409	PRO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
410	ANTI-ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR OWN REGION OR PROVINCE	0	
411	FOR HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
412	AGAINST HAVE-NOT PARTS OF CANADA	0	
413	FOR HAVE PARTS OF CANADA	0	
415	REGION OR LOCALITY NEGLECTED	0	
416	IN FAVOUR OF SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
417	AGAINST SMALL COMMUNITIES	0	
418	PRO-AMERICAN	0	
419	ANTI-AMERICAN	0	
500	GENERAL IMAGE, STYLE, APPROACH	0	
501	ABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING GOOD JOB, EXPERIENCE, SHOWED ABILIT	0	
502	INABILITY TO GOVERN, DOING A POOR JOB, POOR PAST PERFORMANCE	0	
503	PARTY UNREALISTIC	1	0.4%
504	GIVE THEM A CHANCE, SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO (REAL CHANGE, DESER	0	
505	A GOOD TEAM, A BETTER TEAM	0	
506	WORKS TOGETHER, UNITED, ORGANIZED	0	
507	DISUNITED, DISORGANIZED	1	0.4%
508	YOUTHFUL, NEW BLOOD, FRESH IDEAS, ETC.	0	
509	OLD	0	
510	ACTIVE, EFFECTIVE, SOLVES PROBLEMS OR ISSUES, DOES OR TRIES	0	
511	INACTIVE, INEFFECTIVE, DOESN'T SOLVE PROBLEMS, CAN'T DO ANYT	0	
512	MOVES QUICKLY, FAST, IMPULSIVELY, ETC.	0	
513	MOVES SLOWLY, DELIBERATELY, CAREFULLY, ETC.	0	
514	MODERN, UP-TO-DATE	0	
515	OUT OF DATE, TRADITIONAL, OLD FASHIONED	0	
516	POWERFUL	0	
517	WEAK	0	
518	FORWARD LOOKING, PROGRESSIVE, TRIES TO CHANGE THINGS IN A POS	0	
519	NOT PROGRESSIVE (EG. STATUS QUO), NOT INNOVATIVE	0	
520	FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
521	LACK OF FIRMNESS OF BELIEFS, CONVICTIONS, ETC.	0	
522	SINCERE, HONEST, FAIR	0	
523	INSINCERE, LACK OF SERIOUSNESS, DISHONEST, UNFAIR CORRUPT, S	1	0.4%
524	COMPETENT, BUSINESS-LIKE, EFFICIENT, GOOD MANAGERS ETC.	0	
525	INCOMPETENT, INEFFICIENT	0	
526	TOO FORCEFUL, TOO PUSHY	0	
527	NOT FORCEFUL ENOUGH	0	
528	COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES	0	
529	NOT COOPERATIVE WITH OTHER PARTIES, TOO CRITICAL, MUCKRAKING	0	
530	AWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS, DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE, HELPS PEOPLE	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
531	UNAWARE OF PEOPLES NEEDS	0	
532	FOLLOWS PEOPLES WISHES, INVOLVEMENT WITH "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
533	IGNORES "GRASS ROOTS"	0	
534	FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE, REGIONS	0	
535	PRACTICAL, DOWN TO EARTH, ETC.	0	
536	DEMOCRATIC, OPEN, RESPONSIVE	0	
537	PARTY MAKES SOME MISTAKES	0	
538	SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	0	
539	AUTHORITARIAN (AS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRATIC STYLE)	0	
540	OVERLY BUREAUCRATIC	0	
541	COMPLACENCY, ARROGANCE, GLORY-SEEKING, VAIN, SELF-CENTERED	0	
542	SANCTIMONIOUS, MORAL SUPERIORITY	0	
543	TROUBLEMAKERS (ENCOURAGE STRIKES), TROUBLESOME	0	
544	STABLE GOVERNMENT	0	
546	FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	0	
547	EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING, PROGRAMS TOO EXPENSIVE,	0	
548	EXTRAVAGANCE (SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES)	0	
549	EXTRAVANGANCE VIS A VIS LIFE STYLE (EG. TRAVELS TOO MUCH), P	0	
550	GENERAL PRO-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
551	GENERAL CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
553	SPECIFIC CON-REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATION	0	
554	BUREAUCRATIC PROLIFERATION (EG. EMPIRE-BUILDING)	0	
555	POSITIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
556	NEGATIVE PARLIAMENTARY PERFORMANCE	0	
557	EFFECTIVE OPPOSITION, KEEPS OTHERS "ON TOES"	0	
558	INEFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.	0	
560	TELEVISION IN PARLIAMENT	0	
565	TOP MEN LEFT PARTY, TOO MUCH SHIFTING OF PERSONNEL	0	
566	WAITED TOO LONG TO CALL PARLIAMENT	0	
567	PUT UP A GOOD FIGHT, TRYING HARD, DOING THE BEST THEY CAN	0	
569	GETTING STRONGER, PARTY ON THE RISE	0	
570	GETTING WEAKER, PARTY ON THE DECLINE	3	
571	GOOD INTERNATIONAL PROFILE, IMAGE	0	
575	ABILITY TO HANDLE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS	0	
600	CONSERVATISM	0	
601	LIBERALISM	0	
602	SOCIALISM	0	
603	COMMUNISM	0	
604	SOCIAL CREDIT IDEOLOGY	0	
605	RIGHT WING	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
606	CENTRE	0	
607	LEFT WING	0	
608	TOO SOCIALIST	0	
609	NOT SOCIALIST ENOUGH	0	
610	TOO RADICAL, EXTREME	0	
611	PHILOSOPHY, IDEOLOGY NOT NAMED	0	
612	DOGMATISM, TOO RIGID IN BELIEFS OR IDEOLOGY	0	
616	IDEALISM, MORAL PRINCIPLES	0	
617	UNSCRUPULOUS, LACK OF IDEALS, OPPORTUNISM	0	
618	INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, FREEDOM	0	
619	INJECTION OF MORAL STANDARDS INTO POLICY	0	
620	PRO FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	1	0.4%
621	ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE, REF. TO ECON. PLANNING, ROLE OF GOVT.,	0	
625	TOO NATIONALISTIC, NATIONALISM	0	
700	GENERAL REFERENCE TO PARTY AS A WHOLE (APPROVE-DISAPPROVE I	2	0.8%
701	REFERENCE TO GOOD MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
702	REFERENCE TO POOR MEDIA CAMPAIGN	0	
703	KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISES	0	
704	FAILS TO KEEP CAMPAIGN PROMISES,OR CAMPAIGN PROMISES UNREALI	0	
706	REFERENCE TO POOR LEADER CAMPAIGN	0	
707	APPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
708	DISAPPROVE OF CAMPAIGN ATTACKS ON LIBERALS	0	
709	LIKES CAMPAIGNS PROMISES AND WANTS TO SEE IMPEMMENTATION	0	
710	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	
712	ABILITY TO WIN	0	
713	INABILITY TO WIN	0	
714	CAN FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
715	CAN'T FORM A MAJORITY GOV'T	0	
717	LACK OF WESTERN REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN WEST	0	
718	LACK OF QUEBEC REPRESENTATION, WEAK IN QUEBEC	0	
720	REFERENCE TO NATIONAL PARTY	0	
721	NOT A NATIONAL PARTY	0	
722	REFERENCE TO LARGE PARTY SIZE (HAS MANPOWER) HAS RESOURCES	0	
723	REFERENCES TO SMALL PARTY SIZE (LACKS MANPOWER) LACKS RESOUR	2	0.8%
725	COULD HAVE DONE MORE, TRIED HARDER	0	
730	TIME FOR A CHANGE	0	
731	BEEN IN POWER TOO LONG	0	
733	POWER HUNGRY	0	
734	FORCED THE ELECTION (1980)	0	
750	A MINORITY PARTY. IT DISRUPTS THE PARTY SYSTEM	0	

v2136: DISLIKE FEDERAL SOCIAL CREDIT-RESPONSE 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
751	SPLITS OPPOSITION VOTE, REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES DISRUPTIN	0	
752	PARTY FINANCING (WAY PARTY IS FINANCED, DISCLOSURE OF PARTY	0	
757	BEST ALTERNATIVE, LESSER OF TWO EVILS	0	
758	LIKED OTHER PARTY BETTER	0	
759	BENEFICIAL, A GOOD PARTY	0	
760	HARMFUL, A BAD PARTY	0	
764	DOMINATED BY LEADER	0	
765	WON'T SUPPORT LEADER, UNDERMINES LEADER	0	
766	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM LIBERALS	0	
767	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM P.C.'S	0	
768	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM N.D.P.	0	
769	INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM S.C.	0	
770	ALL PARTIES THE SAME	0	
775	PARTY DOES NOT EXIST AROUND HERE, DOES NOT RUN ANY CANDIDATE	4	1.7%
778	DON'T KNOW, HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO GOVERN, TOO EARLY TO TEL	1	0.4%
780	NOT INTERESTED IN THEM/THAT PARTY	1	0.4%
900	EVERYTHING	0	
901	A GREAT DEAL, A LOT OF THINGS	0	
903	SOME THINGS	0	
904	PRETTY GOOD, ALL RIGHT, OKAY	0	
905	NOT MUCH, NOT SO GOOD, BAD	0	
906	NOTHING SPECIAL, NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	0.4%
910	GENERAL POSITIVE ATTITUDE WITH REFERENCE TO PARTY WEAKNESS	1	0.4%
948	NOTHING	20	8.4%
949	NO, NOT REALLY	78	32.8%
966	DON'T KNOW (CAN'T SAY), DON'T CARE NOT INTERESTED	2	0.8%
969	NOT INTERESTED IN FEDERAL POLITICS	0	
988	NO COMMENT, NO OPINION, DONT KNOW, NEUTRAL	3	1.3%
999	NOT ASCERTAINABLE, NO ANSWER	103	43.3%
0	NO SECOND MENTION OR INAP., R NOT FROM QUEBEC	2523	
950	REFUSAL	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2137: PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1602 /-] [Invalid=1159 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, THAT IS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL ... NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE).
Literal question	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC, SAY: LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?)
Notes	Q33A in the documentation.

# v2137: PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	INDEPENDENT	113	<div></div> 7.1%	
1	LIBERAL	577	<div></div> 36.0%	
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	453	<div></div> 28.3%	
3	N.D.P.	224	<div></div> 14.0%	
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	79	<div></div> 4.9%	
5	OTHER	5	<div></div> 0.3%	
6	UNION NATIONALE	7	<div></div> 0.4%	
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	144	<div></div> 9.0%	
8	D.K.	86		
9	REFUSED	60		
99	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2138: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1485 /-] [Invalid=1276 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q33A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?			
Notes	Q33B in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY STRONGLY	598	<div></div> 40.3%	
2	FAIRLY	691	<div></div> 46.5%	
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	196	<div></div> 13.2%	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013		
8	D.K.	4		
9	INAP., CODED 0,8 OR 9 IN Q33A	259		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2139: PROVINCIAL INDEPENDENT-LEAN?				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=238 /-] [Invalid=2523 /-]			
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "don't know" or "independent" for Q66A.			
Pre-question	Q33A. WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, THAT IS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL ... NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE). THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC, SAY: LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?)			
Literal question	Q34A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?			
Notes	Q33A, Q34A in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	YES	86	<div></div> 36.1%	
2	NO	132	<div></div> 55.5%	
7	REFUSED	20	<div></div> 8.4%	
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013		

# v2139: PROVINCIAL INDEPENDENT-LEAN?			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8	D.K.	20	
9	INAP., CODED 1 TO 7 IN Q33A, N.A.	1490	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2140: PROVINCIAL PARTY FEEL CLOSE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=72 /-] [Invalid=2689 /-]		
Universe	Q34B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q34B.		
Pre-question	Q33A. WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT PARTIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, THAT IS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL ... NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE). THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., SOCIAL CREDIT, OR WHAT? (IN QUEBEC, SAY: LIBERAL, PARTI QUEBECOIS, SOCIAL CREDIT UNION NATIONALE, OR WHAT?) ; Q34A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE) DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?		
Literal question	Q34B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?		
Notes	Q33A, Q34A, Q34B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	15	<div><div></div></div> 20.8%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	23	<div><div></div></div> 31.9%
3	N.D.P.	17	<div><div></div></div> 23.6%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	4	<div><div></div></div> 5.6%
6	UNION NATIONALE	1	<div><div></div></div> 1.4%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	12	<div><div></div></div> 16.7%
8	D.K.	3	
9	INAP., CODED 2 TO 9 IN Q34A	1662	
10	REFUSED	11	
99	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2141: ANY PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY ID?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1695 /-] [Invalid=1066 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Notes	Q35A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	531	<div><div></div></div> 31.3%
2	NO	1164	<div><div></div></div> 68.7%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K.	29	
9	REFUSED	24	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2142: PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=520 /-] [Invalid=2241 /-]		

# v2142: PAST PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Universe	Q35B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q35A.		
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	Q35B. WHICH PARTY WAS THAT?		
Notes	Q35A, Q35B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	185	<div><div></div></div> 35.6%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE	152	<div><div></div></div> 29.2%
3	N.D.P. (INCLUDE C.C.F.)	82	<div><div></div></div> 15.8%
4	SOCIAL CREDIT	50	<div><div></div></div> 9.6%
5	OTHER	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
6	UNION NATIONALE	36	<div><div></div></div> 6.9%
7	PARTI QUEBECOIS	14	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
8	D.K.	5	
9	INAP., CODED 2 TO 9 IN Q35A	1217	
10	REFUSED	6	
99	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2143: WHEN CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=477 /-] [Invalid=2284 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	Q35C. WHEN DID YOU CHANGE FROM THAT PARTY, THAT IS, THE (NAME OF PARTY MENTIONED IN Q35B) TO YOUR PRESENT ONE?		
Notes	Q35A, Q35C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LAST ELECTION	44	<div><div></div></div> 9.2%
2	1979, LAST YEAR, 1 YEAR AGO	19	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
3	1978, 2 YEARS AGO	25	<div><div></div></div> 5.2%
4	1977, 3 YEARS AGO	21	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
5	1976, 4 YEARS AGO	42	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
6	1975, 5 YEARS AGO	32	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
7	1974, 6 YEARS AGO	19	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
8	1973, 7 YEARS AGO	13	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
9	1972, 8 YEARS AGO	13	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
10	1971, 9 YEARS AGO	19	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
11	1970, 10 YEARS AGO	43	<div><div></div></div> 9.0%
12	1969, 11 OR MORE YEARS AGO	75	<div><div></div></div> 15.7%
13	GENERAL, A LONG TIME AGO	16	<div><div></div></div> 3.4%
14	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED, TEMPORARY CHANGE, DON'T REALLY BELONG	46	<div><div></div></div> 9.6%
15	SINCE/AFTER LAST ELECTION (UNABLE TO DETERMINE YEAR)	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%

# v2143: WHEN CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
16	TIME NOT SPECIFIED, UNABLE TO DETERMINE FROM RESPONSE	37	<div></div>	7.8%
17	THIS YEAR, 1980	12	<div></div>	2.5%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q35A OR CODED 0 OR 8 IN Q35B	2241		
88	D.K., N.A., NOT SPECIFIED	43		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v2144: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-1				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=520 /-] [Invalid=2241 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?			
Literal question	Q35D.1 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? ANYTHING ELSE?			
Notes	Q35A, Q35D.1 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	7	<div></div>	1.3%
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	7	<div></div>	1.3%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	14	<div></div>	2.7%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	19	<div></div>	3.7%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	11	<div></div>	2.1%
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	7	<div></div>	1.3%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	5	<div></div>	1.0%
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONALE,	0		
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONAL	0		
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	11	<div></div>	2.1%
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	9	<div></div>	1.7%
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	5	<div></div>	1.0%
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	7	<div></div>	1.3%
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	5	<div></div>	1.0%
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	6	<div></div>	1.2%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0		
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONA	1	<div></div>	0.2%
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0		
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	5	<div></div>	1.0%
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	3	<div></div>	0.6%
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	6	<div></div>	1.2%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	5	<div></div>	1.0%
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	8	<div></div>	1.5%
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	14	<div></div>	2.7%
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	6	<div></div>	1.2%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN UN	1	<div></div>	0.2%

v2144: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	4	0.8%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	11	2.1%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	5	1.0%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	7	1.3%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	0	
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	16	3.1%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	10	1.9%
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN U	2	0.4%
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THA	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	2	0.4%
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	1	0.2%
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	26	5.0%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	2	0.4%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	18	3.5%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	1	0.2%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	7	1.3%
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	0.2%
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	11	2.1%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHE	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OT	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	3	0.6%
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	12	2.3%
50	RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	3	0.6%
51	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	27	5.2%
52	"THE MAN" (D.K. IF LEADER OR CANDIDATE)	10	1.9%
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL", DIDN	36	6.9%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	1	0.2%
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	6	1.2%
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	3	0.6%
58	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	1	0.2%
59	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	10	1.9%
60	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	8	1.5%
61	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
62	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	

# v2144: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-1			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
64	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
65	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
66	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
67	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
68	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
69	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
70	APPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
71	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
72	APPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	8	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
73	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	0	
74	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	0	
75	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
76	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
77	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
78	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
79	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	11	<div><div></div></div> 2.1%
80	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
81	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
82	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
83	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
84	APPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
85	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
86	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED	21	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	46	<div><div></div></div> 8.8%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q35A OR CODED 0 OR 8 IN Q35B, NO SECON	2241	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2145: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-2			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=30 /-] [Invalid=2731 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q35A. THINKING STILL OF POLITICS HERE IN (NAME PROVINCE), WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN YOU THOUGHT OF YOURSELF AS CLOSER TO ANY OTHER PARTY IN (NAME PROVINCE)?		
Literal question	Q35D.2 WHAT WAS THE MAIN THING THAT MADE YOU CHANGE? (SECOND MENTION)		
Notes	Q35A, Q35D.2 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LEADERSHIP, UNSPECIFIED	0	
2	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	1	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
3	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL LEADER	1	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
4	APPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	2	<div><div></div></div> 6.7%
5	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. LEADER	0	

v2145: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	1	3.3%
7	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. LEADER	0	
8	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONALE,	0	
9	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY LEADER (OTHER THAN UNION NATIONAL	0	
10	CANDIDATE(S), UNSPECIFIED	0	
11	APPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	0	
12	DISAPPROVAL OF LIBERAL CANDIDATE	1	3.3%
13	APPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
14	DISAPPROVAL OF P.C. CANDIDATE	0	
15	APPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	1	3.3%
16	DISAPPROVAL OF N.D.P. CANDIDATE	0	
17	APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0	
18	DISAPPROVAL OF OTHER PARTY CANDIDATE (OTHER THAN UNION NATI	0	
19	SPECIFIC POLICY, UNSPECIFIED	0	
20	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	0	
21	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC LIBERAL POLICY	1	3.3%
22	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	0	
23	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC P.C. POLICY	0	
24	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	0	
25	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC N.D.P. POLICY	1	3.3%
26	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN UN	0	
27	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC POLICY OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN	0	
28	GENERAL POLICIES, UNSPECIFIED	1	3.3%
29	APPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	1	3.3%
30	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL LIBERAL POLICIES	2	6.7%
31	APPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	2	6.7%
32	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL P.C. POLICIES	0	
33	APPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	1	3.3%
34	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL N.D.P. POLICIES	0	
35	APPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THAN U	0	
36	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL POLICIES OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHER THA	0	
37	PERFORMANCE, UNSPECIFIED	0	
38	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	0	
39	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF LIBERAL PERFORMANCE	1	3.3%
40	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	1	3.3%
41	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF P.C. PERFORMANCE	1	3.3%
42	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	1	3.3%
43	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF N.D.P. PERFORMANCE	0	

v2145: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
44	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	0	
45	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CREDIT PERFORMANCE	1	<div></div> 3.3%
46	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OTHE	0	
47	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF ANOTHER PARTY (OT	0	
48	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
49	NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR	0	
50	RESPONSE TO A FEDERAL FACTOR, ATTITUDE UNSPECIFIED	0	
51	PERSONAL REASONS, FACTORS	0	
52	"THE MAN" (D.K. IF LEADER OR CANDIDATE)	0	
53	VAGUE REASONS, "FOR A CHANGE", "EVERYTHING IN GENERAL", DIDN	1	<div></div> 3.3%
54	WANTED THE LIBERALS TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
55	WANTED THE P.C.'S TO HAVE A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT	0	
56	N.D.P. NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERNMENT	0	
57	SOCIAL CREDIT NOT STRONG ENOUGH, NO CHANCE OF FORMING GOVERN	0	
58	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
59	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE LEADER	0	
60	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
61	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS LEADER	0	
62	APPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	0	
63	DISAPPROVAL OF UNION NATIONALE CANDIDATE	1	<div></div> 3.3%
64	APPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	1	<div></div> 3.3%
65	DISAPPROVAL OF PARTI QUEBECOIS CANDIDATE	0	
66	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
67	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC UNION NATIONALE POLICY	0	
68	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	0	
69	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICY	0	
70	APPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
71	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL UNION NATIONALE POLICIES	0	
72	APPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	1	<div></div> 3.3%
73	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL PARTI QUEBECOIS POLICIES	0	
74	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	0	
75	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF UNION NATIONALE PERFORMANCE	0	
76	FAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	1	<div></div> 3.3%
77	UNFAVOURABLE ASSESSMENT OF PARTI QUEBECOIS PERFORMANCE	0	
78	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	0	
79	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT LEADER	1	<div></div> 3.3%

# v2145: WHY CHANGE PROVINCIAL PARTY ID-2			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
80	APPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
81	DISAPPROVAL OF SOCIAL CREDIT CANDIDATE	0	
82	APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
83	DISAPPROVAL OF SPECIFIC SOCIAL CREDIT POLICY	0	
84	APPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	1	<div></div> 3.3%
85	DISAPPROVAL OF GENERAL SOCIAL CREDIT POLICIES	1	<div></div> 3.3%
86	HAVEN'T REALLY CHANGED	1	<div></div> 3.3%
88	NO ANSWER, CAN'T REMEMBER, REFUSED	0	
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q35A OR CODED 0 OR 8 IN Q35B, NO SECON	2731	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2146: QUEBEC REFERENDUM VOTE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=376 /-] [Invalid=2385 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec. Asked only if necessary.		
Pre-question	. RESIDENTS OF QUEBEC WILL SHORTLY BE ASKED TO VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTION IN A REFERENDUM. "THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC HAS MADE PUBLIC ITS PROPOSAL TO NEGOTIATE A NEW AGREEMENT WITH THE REST OF CANADA, BASED ON THE EQUALITY OF NATIONS. THIS AGREEMENT WOULD ENABLE QUEBEC TO ACQUIRE THE THE EXCLUSIVE POWER TO MAKE ITS LAWS, ADMINISTER ITS TAXES, AND ESTABLISH RELATIONS ABROAD --- IN OTHER WORDS, SOVEREIGNTY --- AND AT THE SAME TIME, TO MAINTAIN WITH CANADA AN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION INCLUDING A COMMON CURRENCY. ANY CHANGE IN POLITICAL STATUS RESULTING FROM THESE NEGOTIATIONS WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE THROUGH A REFERENDUM. ON THESE TERMS DO YOU AGREE TO GIVE THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC THE MANDATE TO NEGOTIATE THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN QUEBEC AND CANADA?"		
Literal question	WILL YOU VOTE YES OR NO?		
Notes	Q36A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	188	<div></div> 50.0%
2	NO	188	<div></div> 50.0%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, NOT A QUEBEC RESPONDENT	2315	
8	D.K., N.A.	70	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2147: QUEBEC REFERENDUM TURNOUT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=424 /-] [Invalid=2337 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who reside in the province of Quebec.		
Literal question	DO YOU PLAN TO VOTE IN THE REFERENDUM?		
Notes	Q36B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	411	<div></div> 96.9%
2	NO	13	<div></div> 3.1%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW, NOT A QUEBEC RESPONDENT	2315	
8	D.K., N.A.	22	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v2148: UNEMPLOYED SINCE MAY 79?			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1747 /-] [Invalid=1014 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	AND NOW A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU. HAVE YOU BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?		
Notes	Q37A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NO, NEITHER/R IS HOMEMAKER	1555	<div></div> 89.0%
2	YES, UNEMPLOYED ONLY	90	<div></div> 5.2%
3	YES, LAID OFF ONLY	70	<div></div> 4.0%
4	YES, BOTH UNEMPLOYED AND LAID OFF	24	<div></div> 1.4%
5	R HAS BEEN ON STRIKE	8	<div></div> 0.5%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
8	D.K., N.A.	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2149: DATE UNEMPLOYMENT BEGIN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=182 /-] [Invalid=2579 /-]		
Universe	Q37B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q37A.		
Pre-question	Q37A. AND NOW A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU. HAVE YOU BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?		
Literal question	Q37B. IN WHAT MONTH DID YOU BECOME UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF?		
Notes	Q37A, Q37B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BEFORE MAY, 1979	24	<div></div> 13.2%
2	MAY, 1979	15	<div></div> 8.2%
3	JUNE, 1979	14	<div></div> 7.7%
4	JULY, 1979	6	<div></div> 3.3%
5	AUGUST, 1979	11	<div></div> 6.0%
6	SEPTEMBER, 1979	13	<div></div> 7.1%
7	OCTOBER, 1979	17	<div></div> 9.3%
8	NOVEMBER, 1979	20	<div></div> 11.0%
9	DECEMBER, 1979	19	<div></div> 10.4%
10	JANUARY, 1980	14	<div></div> 7.7%
11	FEBRUARY, 1980	11	<div></div> 6.0%
12	MARCH, 1980	6	<div></div> 3.3%
13	APRIL, 1980	2	<div></div> 1.1%
15	OTHER	10	<div></div> 5.5%
0	NA., INAP., CODED 1 OR 0 IN Q37A	2577	
88	DON'T KNOW	2	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2150: DATE BACK TO WORK			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=183 /-] [Invalid=2578 /-]		

# v2150: DATE BACK TO WORK			
Universe	Q37C asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q37A.		
Pre-question	Q37A. AND NOW A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU. HAVE YOU BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?		
Literal question	Q37C. IN WHAT MONTH DID YOU GO BACK TO WORK?		
Notes	Q37A, Q37C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BEFORE MAY, 1979	0	
2	MAY, 1979	0	
3	JUNE, 1979	7	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
4	JULY, 1979	5	<div><div></div></div> 2.7%
5	AUGUST, 1979	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
6	SEPTEMBER, 1979	11	<div><div></div></div> 6.0%
7	OCTOBER, 1979	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.5%
8	NOVEMBER, 1979	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
9	DECEMBER, 1979	8	<div><div></div></div> 4.4%
10	JANUARY, 1980	6	<div><div></div></div> 3.3%
11	FEBRUARY, 1980	4	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
12	MARCH, 1980	11	<div><div></div></div> 6.0%
13	APRIL, 1980	12	<div><div></div></div> 6.6%
14		103	<div><div></div></div> 56.3%
15	OTHER	7	<div><div></div></div> 3.8%
0	NA., INAP., CODED 1 OR 0 IN Q37A	2577	
88	DON'T KNOW	1	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2151: MARITAL STATUS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1748 /-] [Invalid=1013 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	ARE YOU MARRIED, WIDOWED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR ARE YOU SINGLE?		
Notes	Q38 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MARRIED	1243	<div><div></div></div> 71.1%
2	<VOLUNTEERED> COMMON-LAW	10	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
3	WIDOWED	108	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
4	SEPARATED	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
5	DIVORCED	32	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
6	SINGLE	323	<div><div></div></div> 18.5%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2152: SPOUSE UNEMPLOYMENT SINCE MAY 79			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1245 /-] [Invalid=1516 /-]		
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are married or common-law.		
Literal question	HAS YOUR (HUSBAND/WIFE/ SPOUSE) BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?		

# v2152: SPOUSE UNEMPLOYMENT SINCE MAY 79			
Notes		Q37A in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	NO, NEITHER/R'S SPOUSE IS A HOMEMAKER	1154	<div></div> 92.7%
2	YES, UNEMPLOYED ONLY	44	<div></div> 3.5%
3	YES, LAID OFF ONLY	31	<div></div> 2.5%
4	YES, BOTH UNEMPLOYED AND LAID OFF	16	<div></div> 1.3%
0	INAP., NOT CODED 1 OR 2 IN Q38; NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1508	
8	D.K.	8	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2153: DATE SPOUSE UNEMPLOYMENT BEGAN			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=90 /-] [Invalid=2671 /-]	
Universe		Q39B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q39A.	
Pre-question		Q39A. HAS YOUR (HUSBAND/WIFE/ SPOUSE) BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?	
Literal question		Q39B. IN WHAT MONTH DID HE/SHE BECOME UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF?	
Notes		Q39A, Q39B in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BEFORE MAY, 1979	15	<div></div> 16.7%
2	MAY, 1979	6	<div></div> 6.7%
3	JUNE, 1979	7	<div></div> 7.8%
4	JULY, 1979	2	<div></div> 2.2%
5	AUGUST, 1979	4	<div></div> 4.4%
6	SEPTEMBER, 1979	10	<div></div> 11.1%
7	OCTOBER, 1979	1	<div></div> 1.1%
8	NOVEMBER, 1979	15	<div></div> 16.7%
9	DECEMBER, 1979	9	<div></div> 10.0%
10	JANUARY, 1980	7	<div></div> 7.8%
11	FEBRUARY, 1980	4	<div></div> 4.4%
12	MARCH, 1980	5	<div></div> 5.6%
13	APRIL, 1980	1	<div></div> 1.1%
15	OTHER	4	<div></div> 4.4%
0	NA., INAP., CODED 1 OR 0 IN Q39A	2670	
88	DON'T KNOW	1	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v2154: DATE SPOUSE BACK TO WORK			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-88] [Missing=*/0/88]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=90 /-] [Invalid=2671 /-]	
Universe		Q39C asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q39A.	
Pre-question		Q39A. HAS YOUR (HUSBAND/WIFE/ SPOUSE) BEEN UNEMPLOYED OR LAID OFF IN THE PERIOD SINCE MAY, 1979?	
Literal question		Q39C. IN WHAT MONTH DID HE/SHE GO BACK TO WORK?	
Notes		Q39A, Q39C in the documentation.	

v2154: DATE SPOUSE BACK TO WORK

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	BEFORE MAY, 1979	0	
2	MAY, 1979	0	
3	JUNE, 1979	0	
4	JULY, 1979	5	5.6%
5	AUGUST, 1979	6	6.7%
6	SEPTEMBER, 1979	3	3.3%
7	OCTOBER, 1979	4	4.4%
8	NOVEMBER, 1979	0	
9	DECEMBER, 1979	4	4.4%
10	JANUARY, 1980	3	3.3%
11	FEBRUARY, 1980	5	5.6%
12	MARCH, 1980	6	6.7%
13	APRIL, 1980	11	12.2%
14		40	44.4%
15	OTHER	3	3.3%
0	NA., INAP., CODED 1 OR 0 IN Q39A	2670	
88	DON'T KNOW	1	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v2155: AGE IN YEARS

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1734 /-] [Invalid=1027 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?
Notes	Q40 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 YEARS OLD	7	0.4%
19	19 YEARS OLD	47	2.7%
20	20 YEARS OLD	45	2.6%
21	21 YEARS OLD	27	1.6%
22	22 YEARS OLD	40	2.3%
23	23 YEARS OLD	46	2.7%
24	24 YEARS OLD	43	2.5%
25	25 YEARS OLD	40	2.3%
26	26 YEARS OLD	28	1.6%
27	27 YEARS OLD	36	2.1%
28	28 YEARS OLD	25	1.4%
29	29 YEARS OLD	35	2.0%
30	30 YEARS OLD	30	1.7%
31	31 YEARS OLD	45	2.6%
32	32 YEARS OLD	36	2.1%
33	33 YEARS OLD	35	2.0%
34	34 YEARS OLD	45	2.6%
35	35 YEARS OLD	33	1.9%
36	36 YEARS OLD	33	1.9%

v2155: AGE IN YEARS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
37	37 YEARS OLD	26	1.5%
38	38 YEARS OLD	24	1.4%
39	39 YEARS OLD	35	2.0%
40	40 YEARS OLD	26	1.5%
41	41 YEARS OLD	22	1.3%
42	42 YEARS OLD	20	1.2%
43	43 YEARS OLD	19	1.1%
44	44 YEARS OLD	22	1.3%
45	45 YEARS OLD	40	2.3%
46	46 YEARS OLD	30	1.7%
47	47 YEARS OLD	34	2.0%
48	48 YEARS OLD	32	1.8%
49	49 YEARS OLD	32	1.8%
50	50 YEARS OLD	41	2.4%
51	51 YEARS OLD	28	1.6%
52	52 YEARS OLD	46	2.7%
53	53 YEARS OLD	38	2.2%
54	54 YEARS OLD	35	2.0%
55	55 YEARS OLD	27	1.6%
56	56 YEARS OLD	30	1.7%
57	57 YEARS OLD	29	1.7%
58	58 YEARS OLD	30	1.7%
59	59 YEARS OLD	31	1.8%
60	60 YEARS OLD	27	1.6%
61	61 YEARS OLD	27	1.6%
62	62 YEARS OLD	18	1.0%
63	63 YEARS OLD	17	1.0%
64	64 YEARS OLD	22	1.3%
65	65 YEARS OLD	27	1.6%
66	66 YEARS OLD	19	1.1%
67	67 YEARS OLD	25	1.4%
68	68 YEARS OLD	27	1.6%
69	69 YEARS OLD	21	1.2%
70	70 YEARS OLD	12	0.7%
71	71 YEARS OLD	17	1.0%
72	72 YEARS OLD	14	0.8%
73	73 YEARS OLD	13	0.7%
74	74 YEARS OLD	7	0.4%
75	75 YEARS OLD	13	0.7%
76	76 YEARS OLD	5	0.3%
77	77 YEARS OLD	4	0.2%
78	78 YEARS OLD	7	0.4%
79	79 YEARS OLD	8	0.5%
80	80 YEARS OLD	7	0.4%
81	81 YEARS OLD	5	0.3%

# v2155: AGE IN YEARS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
82	82 YEARS OLD	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.2%
83	83 YEARS OLD	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
84	84 YEARS OLD	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
85	85 YEARS OLD	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
86	86 YEARS OLD	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
87	87 YEARS OLD	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
88	88 YEARS OLD	6	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
89	89 YEARS OLD	0	
90	90 YEARS OLD	0	
91	91 YEARS OLD	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
92	92 YEARS OLD	0	
93	93 YEARS OLD	0	
94	94 YEARS OLD	0	
95	95 YEARS OLD	0	
96	96 YEARS OLD	0	
97	97 YEARS OLD	0	
98	98 YEARS OLD	0	
99	99 OR OVER	0	
0	REFUSED (NO ESTIMATE), NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1027	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v2156: SEX OF RESPONDENT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1748 /-] [Invalid=1013 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	RESPONDENT'S SEX:		
Notes	Q41 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MALE	846	<div><div></div></div> 48.4%
2	FEMALE	902	<div><div></div></div> 51.6%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW	1013	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4325] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	QUEBEC REFERENDUM RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
Notes	NOTE: THIS RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER IS UNIQUE; IT DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO THE 1979 OR 1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4001		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
4002		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
4003		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
4004		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4005		1	0.3%
4006		1	0.3%
4007		1	0.3%
4008		1	0.3%
4009		1	0.3%
4010		1	0.3%
4011		1	0.3%
4012		1	0.3%
4013		1	0.3%
4014		1	0.3%
4015		1	0.3%
4016		1	0.3%
4017		1	0.3%
4018		1	0.3%
4019		1	0.3%
4020		1	0.3%
4021		1	0.3%
4022		1	0.3%
4023		1	0.3%
4024		1	0.3%
4025		1	0.3%
4026		1	0.3%
4027		1	0.3%
4028		1	0.3%
4029		1	0.3%
4030		1	0.3%
4031		1	0.3%
4032		1	0.3%
4033		1	0.3%
4034		1	0.3%
4035		1	0.3%
4036		1	0.3%
4037		1	0.3%
4038		1	0.3%
4039		1	0.3%
4040		1	0.3%
4041		1	0.3%
4042		1	0.3%
4043		1	0.3%
4044		1	0.3%
4045		1	0.3%
4046		1	0.3%
4047		1	0.3%
4048		1	0.3%
4049		1	0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4050		1	0.3%
4051		1	0.3%
4052		1	0.3%
4053		1	0.3%
4054		1	0.3%
4055		1	0.3%
4056		1	0.3%
4057		1	0.3%
4058		1	0.3%
4059		1	0.3%
4060		1	0.3%
4061		1	0.3%
4062		1	0.3%
4063		1	0.3%
4064		1	0.3%
4065		1	0.3%
4066		1	0.3%
4067		1	0.3%
4068		1	0.3%
4069		1	0.3%
4070		1	0.3%
4071		1	0.3%
4072		1	0.3%
4073		1	0.3%
4074		1	0.3%
4075		1	0.3%
4076		1	0.3%
4077		1	0.3%
4078		1	0.3%
4079		1	0.3%
4080		1	0.3%
4081		1	0.3%
4082		1	0.3%
4083		1	0.3%
4084		1	0.3%
4085		1	0.3%
4086		1	0.3%
4087		1	0.3%
4088		1	0.3%
4089		1	0.3%
4090		1	0.3%
4091		1	0.3%
4092		1	0.3%
4093		1	0.3%
4094		1	0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4095		1	0.3%
4096		1	0.3%
4097		1	0.3%
4098		1	0.3%
4099		1	0.3%
4100		1	0.3%
4101		1	0.3%
4102		1	0.3%
4103		1	0.3%
4104		1	0.3%
4105		1	0.3%
4106		1	0.3%
4107		1	0.3%
4108		1	0.3%
4109		1	0.3%
4110		1	0.3%
4111		1	0.3%
4112		1	0.3%
4113		1	0.3%
4114		1	0.3%
4115		1	0.3%
4116		1	0.3%
4117		1	0.3%
4118		1	0.3%
4119		1	0.3%
4120		1	0.3%
4121		1	0.3%
4122		1	0.3%
4123		1	0.3%
4124		1	0.3%
4125		1	0.3%
4126		1	0.3%
4127		1	0.3%
4128		1	0.3%
4129		1	0.3%
4130		1	0.3%
4131		1	0.3%
4132		1	0.3%
4133		1	0.3%
4134		1	0.3%
4135		1	0.3%
4136		1	0.3%
4137		1	0.3%
4138		1	0.3%
4139		1	0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4140		1	0.3%
4141		1	0.3%
4142		1	0.3%
4143		1	0.3%
4144		1	0.3%
4145		1	0.3%
4146		1	0.3%
4147		1	0.3%
4148		1	0.3%
4149		1	0.3%
4150		1	0.3%
4151		1	0.3%
4152		1	0.3%
4153		1	0.3%
4154		1	0.3%
4155		1	0.3%
4156		1	0.3%
4157		1	0.3%
4158		1	0.3%
4159		1	0.3%
4160		1	0.3%
4161		1	0.3%
4162		1	0.3%
4163		1	0.3%
4164		1	0.3%
4165		1	0.3%
4166		1	0.3%
4167		1	0.3%
4168		1	0.3%
4169		1	0.3%
4170		1	0.3%
4171		1	0.3%
4172		1	0.3%
4173		1	0.3%
4174		1	0.3%
4175		1	0.3%
4176		1	0.3%
4177		1	0.3%
4178		1	0.3%
4179		1	0.3%
4180		1	0.3%
4181		1	0.3%
4182		1	0.3%
4183		1	0.3%
4184		1	0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4185		1	0.3%
4186		1	0.3%
4187		1	0.3%
4188		1	0.3%
4189		1	0.3%
4190		1	0.3%
4191		1	0.3%
4192		1	0.3%
4193		1	0.3%
4194		1	0.3%
4195		1	0.3%
4196		1	0.3%
4197		1	0.3%
4198		1	0.3%
4199		1	0.3%
4200		1	0.3%
4201		1	0.3%
4202		1	0.3%
4203		1	0.3%
4204		1	0.3%
4205		1	0.3%
4206		1	0.3%
4207		1	0.3%
4208		1	0.3%
4209		1	0.3%
4210		1	0.3%
4211		1	0.3%
4212		1	0.3%
4213		1	0.3%
4214		1	0.3%
4215		1	0.3%
4216		1	0.3%
4217		1	0.3%
4218		1	0.3%
4219		1	0.3%
4220		1	0.3%
4221		1	0.3%
4222		1	0.3%
4223		1	0.3%
4224		1	0.3%
4225		1	0.3%
4226		1	0.3%
4227		1	0.3%
4228		1	0.3%
4229		1	0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4230		1	0.3%
4231		1	0.3%
4232		1	0.3%
4233		1	0.3%
4234		1	0.3%
4235		1	0.3%
4236		1	0.3%
4237		1	0.3%
4238		1	0.3%
4239		1	0.3%
4240		1	0.3%
4241		1	0.3%
4242		1	0.3%
4243		1	0.3%
4244		1	0.3%
4245		1	0.3%
4246		1	0.3%
4247		1	0.3%
4248		1	0.3%
4249		1	0.3%
4250		1	0.3%
4251		1	0.3%
4252		1	0.3%
4253		1	0.3%
4254		1	0.3%
4255		1	0.3%
4256		1	0.3%
4257		1	0.3%
4258		1	0.3%
4259		1	0.3%
4260		1	0.3%
4261		1	0.3%
4262		1	0.3%
4263		1	0.3%
4264		1	0.3%
4265		1	0.3%
4266		1	0.3%
4267		1	0.3%
4268		1	0.3%
4269		1	0.3%
4270		1	0.3%
4271		1	0.3%
4272		1	0.3%
4273		1	0.3%
4274		1	0.3%

v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
4275		1		0.3%
4276		1		0.3%
4277		1		0.3%
4278		1		0.3%
4279		1		0.3%
4280		1		0.3%
4281		1		0.3%
4282		1		0.3%
4283		1		0.3%
4284		1		0.3%
4285		1		0.3%
4286		1		0.3%
4287		1		0.3%
4288		1		0.3%
4289		1		0.3%
4290		1		0.3%
4291		1		0.3%
4292		1		0.3%
4293		1		0.3%
4294		1		0.3%
4295		1		0.3%
4296		1		0.3%
4297		1		0.3%
4298		1		0.3%
4299		1		0.3%
4300		1		0.3%
4301		1		0.3%
4302		1		0.3%
4303		1		0.3%
4304		1		0.3%
4305		1		0.3%
4306		1		0.3%
4307		1		0.3%
4308		1		0.3%
4309		1		0.3%
4310		1		0.3%
4311		1		0.3%
4312		1		0.3%
4313		1		0.3%
4314		1		0.3%
4315		1		0.3%
4316		1		0.3%
4317		1		0.3%
4318		1		0.3%
4319		1		0.3%

# v3001: RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION QUEBEC 80				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
4320		1		0.3%
4321		1		0.3%
4322		1		0.3%
4323		1		0.3%
4324		1		0.3%
4325		1		0.3%
0	NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW	2436		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3002: PRE(1)-POST(2) REFERENDUM WAVE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	(PRE-POST) REFERENDUM DAY INTERVIEWS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	INTERVIEWED BEFORE MAY 21	163		50.2%
2	INTERVIEWED AFTER MAY 20	162		49.8%
9	NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW	2436		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3003: QUEBEC REFERENDUM WEIGHT				
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.45] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.121 /-] [StdDev=0.334 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	REFERENDUM WEIGHT			
Notes	ALL REFERENDUM INTERVIEWS HAVE A WEIGHT OF 1 EXCEPT YOUTH SUPPLEMENT CASES WHO HAVE A WEIGHT OF 1.45. ALL OTHER CASES ARE WEIGHTED 0. THE WEIGHTED N IS 335.			
# v3004: QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER:1				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF THE QUEBEC REFERENDUM STUDY	2436		88.2%
1	CASE IS PART OF THE QUEBEC REFERENDUM STUDY	325		11.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3007: DATE OF INTERVIEW				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-31] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Literal question	DATE OF INTERVIEW:			
Notes	Q14 in the documentation.			

# v3007: DATE OF INTERVIEW			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
14	MAY 14 PRE-REFERENDUM	92	<div><div></div></div> 28.3%
15	MAY 15	35	<div><div></div></div> 10.8%
16	MAY 16	22	<div><div></div></div> 6.8%
17	MAY 17	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.8%
18	MAY 18	0	
19	MAY 19	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
20	MAY 20 <REFERENDUM DAY>	0	
21	MAY 21 POST-REFERENDUM	60	<div><div></div></div> 18.5%
22	MAY 22	36	<div><div></div></div> 11.1%
23	MAY 23	23	<div><div></div></div> 7.1%
24	MAY 24	8	<div><div></div></div> 2.5%
25	MAY 25	0	
26	MAY 26	13	<div><div></div></div> 4.0%
27	MAY 27	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
28	MAY 28	6	<div><div></div></div> 1.8%
29	MAY 29	5	<div><div></div></div> 1.5%
30	MAY 30	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
31	MAY 31	3	<div><div></div></div> 0.9%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3041: LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED:		
Notes	Q13 in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	<div><div></div></div> 88.2%
1	ENGLISH	30	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
2	FRENCH	295	<div><div></div></div> 10.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3042: RESPONDENT ID 1979			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9273] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1979 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
Notes	CASES WITHOUT 1979 INTERVIEW, OR WITHOUT REFERENDUM INTERVIEW, ARE CODED 0000		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW OR NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4445] [Missing=*/0]		

# v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980				
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=325 -/] [Invalid=2436 -/]		
Universe		All respondents		
Literal question		1980 RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
Notes		CASES WITHOUT 1980 INTERVIEW, OR WITHOUT REFERENDUM INTERVIEW, ARE CODED 0000		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
4001		1		0.3%
4002		1		0.3%
4003		1		0.3%
4004		1		0.3%
4005		1		0.3%
4006		1		0.3%
4007		1		0.3%
4008		1		0.3%
4009		1		0.3%
4010		1		0.3%
4012		1		0.3%
4013		1		0.3%
4015		1		0.3%
4016		1		0.3%
4017		1		0.3%
4018		1		0.3%
4019		1		0.3%
4021		1		0.3%
4023		1		0.3%
4024		1		0.3%
4025		1		0.3%
4026		1		0.3%
4027		1		0.3%
4028		1		0.3%
4029		1		0.3%
4030		1		0.3%
4031		1		0.3%
4032		1		0.3%
4033		1		0.3%
4034		1		0.3%
4035		1		0.3%
4036		1		0.3%
4037		1		0.3%
4039		1		0.3%
4040		1		0.3%
4041		1		0.3%
4042		1		0.3%
4043		1		0.3%
4044		1		0.3%
4045		1		0.3%

v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4046		1	0.3%
4047		1	0.3%
4049		1	0.3%
4050		1	0.3%
4051		1	0.3%
4052		1	0.3%
4054		1	0.3%
4055		1	0.3%
4056		1	0.3%
4057		1	0.3%
4059		1	0.3%
4060		1	0.3%
4062		1	0.3%
4063		1	0.3%
4064		1	0.3%
4065		1	0.3%
4068		1	0.3%
4069		1	0.3%
4070		1	0.3%
4071		1	0.3%
4072		1	0.3%
4074		1	0.3%
4075		1	0.3%
4076		1	0.3%
4077		1	0.3%
4078		1	0.3%
4080		1	0.3%
4081		1	0.3%
4082		1	0.3%
4083		1	0.3%
4086		1	0.3%
4087		1	0.3%
4089		1	0.3%
4091		1	0.3%
4092		1	0.3%
4093		1	0.3%
4095		1	0.3%
4096		1	0.3%
4097		1	0.3%
4098		1	0.3%
4102		1	0.3%
4103		1	0.3%
4104		1	0.3%
4105		1	0.3%
4106		1	0.3%

v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
4107		1		0.3%
4108		1		0.3%
4110		1		0.3%
4111		1		0.3%
4113		1		0.3%
4114		1		0.3%
4115		1		0.3%
4116		1		0.3%
4117		1		0.3%
4118		1		0.3%
4119		1		0.3%
4120		1		0.3%
4121		1		0.3%
4122		1		0.3%
4124		1		0.3%
4125		1		0.3%
4126		1		0.3%
4127		1		0.3%
4129		1		0.3%
4134		1		0.3%
4135		1		0.3%
4136		1		0.3%
4139		1		0.3%
4140		1		0.3%
4141		1		0.3%
4142		1		0.3%
4144		1		0.3%
4145		1		0.3%
4146		1		0.3%
4147		1		0.3%
4148		1		0.3%
4149		1		0.3%
4150		1		0.3%
4152		1		0.3%
4153		1		0.3%
4154		1		0.3%
4155		1		0.3%
4157		1		0.3%
4158		1		0.3%
4159		1		0.3%
4160		1		0.3%
4161		1		0.3%
4162		1		0.3%
4163		1		0.3%
4164		1		0.3%

v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4165		1	0.3%
4166		1	0.3%
4167		1	0.3%
4169		1	0.3%
4170		1	0.3%
4171		1	0.3%
4173		1	0.3%
4176		1	0.3%
4177		1	0.3%
4178		1	0.3%
4180		1	0.3%
4181		1	0.3%
4182		1	0.3%
4184		1	0.3%
4186		1	0.3%
4187		1	0.3%
4189		1	0.3%
4191		1	0.3%
4193		1	0.3%
4195		1	0.3%
4196		1	0.3%
4197		1	0.3%
4198		1	0.3%
4199		1	0.3%
4202		1	0.3%
4203		1	0.3%
4204		1	0.3%
4205		1	0.3%
4206		1	0.3%
4207		1	0.3%
4209		1	0.3%
4211		1	0.3%
4212		1	0.3%
4213		1	0.3%
4214		1	0.3%
4215		1	0.3%
4216		1	0.3%
4218		1	0.3%
4219		1	0.3%
4220		1	0.3%
4221		1	0.3%
4223		1	0.3%
4224		1	0.3%
4225		1	0.3%
4226		1	0.3%

v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4227		1	0.3%
4229		1	0.3%
4231		1	0.3%
4232		1	0.3%
4233		1	0.3%
4234		1	0.3%
4237		1	0.3%
4238		1	0.3%
4239		1	0.3%
4240		1	0.3%
4241		1	0.3%
4243		1	0.3%
4244		1	0.3%
4246		1	0.3%
4247		1	0.3%
4249		1	0.3%
4250		1	0.3%
4252		1	0.3%
4255		1	0.3%
4259		1	0.3%
4260		1	0.3%
4263		1	0.3%
4265		1	0.3%
4269		1	0.3%
4270		1	0.3%
4271		1	0.3%
4272		1	0.3%
4273		1	0.3%
4274		1	0.3%
4275		1	0.3%
4276		1	0.3%
4279		1	0.3%
4282		1	0.3%
4283		1	0.3%
4284		1	0.3%
4285		1	0.3%
4286		1	0.3%
4287		1	0.3%
4288		1	0.3%
4290		1	0.3%
4291		1	0.3%
4292		1	0.3%
4293		1	0.3%
4294		1	0.3%
4295		1	0.3%

v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4296		1	0.3%
4297		1	0.3%
4298		1	0.3%
4300		1	0.3%
4301		1	0.3%
4302		1	0.3%
4303		1	0.3%
4305		1	0.3%
4306		1	0.3%
4308		1	0.3%
4309		1	0.3%
4310		1	0.3%
4311		1	0.3%
4313		1	0.3%
4314		1	0.3%
4315		1	0.3%
4316		1	0.3%
4317		1	0.3%
4318		1	0.3%
4320		1	0.3%
4321		1	0.3%
4324		1	0.3%
4326		1	0.3%
4329		1	0.3%
4330		1	0.3%
4331		1	0.3%
4332		1	0.3%
4333		1	0.3%
4334		1	0.3%
4335		1	0.3%
4336		1	0.3%
4337		1	0.3%
4339		1	0.3%
4340		1	0.3%
4341		1	0.3%
4342		1	0.3%
4343		1	0.3%
4344		1	0.3%
4345		1	0.3%
4349		1	0.3%
4351		1	0.3%
4355		1	0.3%
4356		1	0.3%
4357		1	0.3%
4358		1	0.3%

v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4359		1	0.3%
4360		1	0.3%
4361		1	0.3%
4363		1	0.3%
4364		1	0.3%
4366		1	0.3%
4368		1	0.3%
4369		1	0.3%
4370		1	0.3%
4371		1	0.3%
4372		1	0.3%
4375		1	0.3%
4376		1	0.3%
4379		1	0.3%
4380		1	0.3%
4384		1	0.3%
4386		1	0.3%
4387		1	0.3%
4389		1	0.3%
4390		1	0.3%
4391		1	0.3%
4393		1	0.3%
4395		1	0.3%
4397		1	0.3%
4398		1	0.3%
4399		1	0.3%
4400		1	0.3%
4401		1	0.3%
4403		1	0.3%
4406		1	0.3%
4407		1	0.3%
4409		1	0.3%
4410		1	0.3%
4411		1	0.3%
4412		1	0.3%
4413		1	0.3%
4414		1	0.3%
4415		1	0.3%
4416		1	0.3%
4417		1	0.3%
4418		1	0.3%
4419		1	0.3%
4423		1	0.3%
4425		1	0.3%
4426		1	0.3%

# v3043: RESPONDENT ID 1980				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
4427		1		0.3%
4428		1		0.3%
4429		1		0.3%
4430		1		0.3%
4431		1		0.3%
4432		1		0.3%
4433		1		0.3%
4434		1		0.3%
4438		1		0.3%
4440		1		0.3%
4441		1		0.3%
4442		1		0.3%
4443		1		0.3%
4444		1		0.3%
4445		1		0.3%
0	NO 1980 INTERVIEW OR NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW	2436		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3005: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-912] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 -/] [Invalid=2436 -/]			
Universe	All respondents			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	BONAVISTA-TRINITY-CONCEPTION (086, 132, 178, 190)	0		
2	GANDER TWILLINGATE (028, 137, 187, 210)	0		
3	HUMBER-PORT-AU-PORT-ST. BARBE (006, 073, 143, 179)	0		
4	ST. JOHN'S EAST (005, 014, 160, 189, 205)	0		
101	CARDIGAN (013, 037, 045, 052, 082)	0		
102	EGMONT (003, 024, 044, 068)	0		
103	HILLSBOROUGH (012, 023, 035, 036, 046, 047, 052, 054)	0		
104	MALPEQUE (006, 007, 039, 056, 062, 077)	0		
201	ANNAPOLIS VALLEY-HANTS (069, 097, 112, 171)	0		
202	CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS-CANSO (013, 142, 148, 195, 217)	0		
203	CENTRAL NOVA (060, 094, 101, 146, 168)	0		
204	CUMBERLAND-COLCHESTER (011, 020, 087, 120, 146, 143)	0		
205	DARTMOUTH-HALIFAX EAST (010, 011, 054, 055, 057, 131, 136, 2	0		
206	HALIFAX (152)	0		
207	HALIFAX WEST (062, 123, 153, 174)	0		
208	SOUTH NOVA (039)	0		
301	FUNDY-ROYAL (024, 025, 051, 059, 063)	0		
302	MADAWASKA-VICTORIA (020, 055, 076, 113, 116)	0		
303	RESTIGOUCHE (024, 063, 079, 080, 081, 139, 149)	0		
304	SAINT JOHN (051, 052, 058, 059, 071, 095, 096, 097, 098, 10	0		
401	ARGENTEUIL (040)	3		0.9%

v3005: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
402	CHICOUTIMI (004, 005, 058, 059, 159)	15	4.6%
403	FRONTENAC (012, 044, 150, 174)	11	3.4%
404	GASPE (041, 097, 139, 146)	6	1.8%
405	HULL (040, 049, 085, 233)	13	4.0%
406	JONQUIERE (050, 051, 076, 077, 078, 086, 091)	15	4.6%
407	LAPRAIRIE (038, 188, 189, 190)	9	2.8%
408	LEVIS (075, 152, 219, 235)	7	2.2%
409	LONGUEUIL (017, 018, 066, 131, 133, 135, 220, 222, 224)	15	4.6%
410	LOTBINIERE (089, 090, 113, 114, 115, 169, 231)	10	3.1%
411	SAINT DENIS (089, 090, 113, 114, 115, 169, 231)	4	1.2%
412	BOURASSA (096, 100, 227, 228, 229)	5	1.5%
413	DOLLARD (093, 134, 173)	8	2.5%
414	GAMELIN (005, 080, 108, 111, 180, 191)	13	4.0%
415	LACHINE (112, 175)	5	1.5%
416	SAINTE-MAIRE (HACHELAGA) (007, 045, 046)	5	1.5%
417	ROSEMONT (178, 217, 210, 211)	11	3.4%
418	MOUNT ROYAL (004, 014, 181)	9	2.8%
419	PORTNEUF (101, 171, 178)	8	2.5%
420	QUEBEC EAST (094, 095, 096, 163, 194, 216, 242)	11	3.4%
421	RICHMOND (015, 087, 092, 164)	8	2.5%
422	ROBERVAL (068, 085, 087, 128, 161)	8	2.5%
423	SAINT-HYACINTHE (120, 122, 174, 189, 224, 226)	13	4.0%
424	SAINT-MAURICE (097, 103, 110, 162)	10	3.1%
425	SHERBROOKE (004, 114, 145, 231)	9	2.8%
426	TERREBONNE (110, 125, 218, 267, 335)	8	2.5%
427	TROIS-RIVIERES (061, 112)	8	2.5%
428	VAUDREUIL (068, 114, 115, 167, 168, 169, 177, 224, 267)	17	5.2%
429	BLAINVILLE-DEUX-MONTAGNES (025, 026, 104, 105, 199, 200, 20)	12	3.7%
430	CHATEAUQUAY (039, 040, 107, 108, 113, 115)	8	2.5%
431	CHAMBLY (014, 015)	1	0.3%
432	LAVAL-DES RAPIDES (193, 203, 210, 211, 250)	10	3.1%
433	SAINT MICHEL (138, 139, 145, 148)	7	2.2%
434	NOTRE DAME-DE-GRAVE (035, 047)	6	1.8%
435	SAINT HENRI-WESTMOUNT (179)	5	1.5%
436	HACHELAGA-MAISONNEUVE (002)	1	0.3%
437	CHAMPLAIN (037, 053, 054)	11	3.4%
501	ALGOMA (037, 056, 119, 156)	0	
502	BRANT (037, 118, 120, 283, 284)	0	
503	THUNDER BAY-ATIHOKAN (044, 072, 083, 128)	0	
504	HALTON (028, 147, 234, 269)	0	
505	HAMILTON EAST (063, 066, 086)	0	
506	PRINCE EDWARD-HASTINGS (082, 103, 156)	0	
507	HURON-BRUCE (033, 059, 162, 168)	0	
508	KINGSTON AND THE ISLANDS (013, 090, 182, 270, 274, 275, 276)	0	

v3005: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
509	KITCHENER (125, 177, 223)	0	
510	KENT (100, 200)	0	
511	LONDON-MIDDLESEX (009, 010, 087, 138)	0	
512	DURHAM-NORTHUMBERLAND (057, 058, 070)	0	
513	ONTARIO (052, 060, 065, 066, 194, 229)	0	
514	OTTAWA WEST (028, 180, 181, 205)	0	
515	SIMCOE SOUTH (015, 017, 158, 159)	0	
516	MISSISSAUGA NORTH (009, 013, 019)	0	
517	SARNIA (040, 041, 099, 114, 115, 198, 199)	0	
518	SIMCOE-NORTH (059, 070, 074, 148, 178)	0	
519	BROADVIEW GREENWOOD (052, 055, 056)	0	
520	DON VALLEY (121, 166, 281, 312)	0	
521	ETOBICOKE-LAKESHORE (077, 130, 159, 194)	0	
522	ROSEDALE (059, 060, 143, 217, 210, 215)	0	
523	ST. PAULS (102, 103, 181, 188)	0	
524	YORK CENTRE (145, 180, 182, 196, 197, 198, 206)	0	
525	YORK-SCARBOROUGH (218, 219)	0	
526	YORK-WEST (118, 143, 151, 173, 174)	0	
527	WELLINGTON-DUFFERIN-SIMCOE (050, 051, 064, 065, 072)	0	
528	WINDSOR-WALKERVILLE (061, 104, 112, 113, 134)	0	
529	BRAMPTON-GEORGETOWN (010, 048, 051, 073, 077, 078, 173, 299)	0	
530	HAMILTON WEST (250)	0	
531	HASTINGS-FRONTENAC (029)	0	
532	WATERLOO (043, 044)	0	
533	ESSEX-KENT (020)	0	
534	LONDON-MIDDLESEX (017, 179, 180)	0	
535	NORTHUMBERLAND (057, P058, 070)	0	
536	VICTORIA-HALIBURTON (177)	0	
537	OTTAWA CENTRE (135, 142, 143)	0	
538	YORK-PEEL (257)	0	
539	MISSISSAUGA SOUTH (084, 254)	0	
540	SPADINA (062)	0	
541	YORK EAST (230)	0	
542	DON VALLEY EAST (068, 072, 223, 244, 248)	0	
543	SCARBOROUGH CENTRE (032)	0	
544	YORK SOUTH-WESTON (055)	0	
545	GUELPH (196, 197)	0	
601	BRANDON-SOURIS (027, 038, 080, 156, 157, 158, 200)	0	
602	PORTAGE-MARQUETTE (043, 080, 107, 141)	0	
603	WINNIPEG NORTH (004, 052, 053, 079, 089, 090, 108, 138, 139,	0	
604	WINNIPEG-ST. JAMES (063, 064, 065, 075, 079, 111, 181)	0	
605	WINNIPEG-ASSINIBOINE (122, 123, 124, 161, 216)	0	
701	KINDERSLEY-LLOYDMINSTER (068, 081, 095, 151)	0	
702	MOOSE JAW (022, 048, 070, 136)	0	

# v3005: CONSTITUENCY NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
703	REGINA EAST (004, 043, 101, 122, 204)	0	
704	SASKATOON EAST (001, 113)	0	
705	HUMBOLDT-LAKE CENTRE (091, 179, 180)	0	
801	CROWFOOT (020, 074, 086, 087, 088, 152)	0	
802	CALGARY SOUTH (093, 110)	0	
803	EDMONTON-WEST (092, 116)	0	
804	MEDICINE HAT (078, 110, 230, 206, 238, 239, 240)	0	
805	BOW RIVER (026, 225)	0	
806	WETASKIWIN (012, 013, 092, 093, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 157)	0	
807	VEGREVILLE (008, 025)	0	
808	CALGARY WEST (117, 166, 168, 233, 236)	0	
809	CALGARY EAST (232)	0	
810	EDMONTON NORTH (039)	0	
811	EDMONTON EAST (170)	0	
812	CALGARY NORTH (014, 161, 162)	0	
813	YELLOWHEAD (170, 171)	0	
901	RICHMOND-SOUTH DELTA (007, 008, 027, 031, 032, 165, 166, 25)	0	
902	NORTH VANCOUVER-BURNABY (006, 105, 176, 182)	0	
903	FRASER VALLEY WEST (006, 024, 075, 077, 215, 230, 252)	0	
904	KOOTENAY EAST-REVELSTOKE (032, 033, 123, 155, 156, 157)	0	
905	SURREY, WHITE ROCK-NORTH DELTA (017, 085, 087, 088, 089, 138)	0	
906	VANCOUVER KINGSWAY (031, 041, 064, 137, 168)	0	
907	VANCOUVER QUADRA (004, 018, 051, 142, 219)	0	
908	VICTORIA (147, 174, 195, 196, 212, 223)	0	
909	BURNABY (034, 036)	0	
910	MIS ION-PORT MOODY (064, 065, 066, 070, 071, 151)	0	
911	NEW WESTMINSTER-COQUITLAM (017, 018)	0	
912	OKANAGAN NORTH (028, 084, 085)	0	
0	NO 1979 INTERVIEW; RESPONDENT MOVED FROM ONE PROVINCE TO AN	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3006: POLL NUMBER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-335] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	REFERENDUM POLL NUMBER		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2436	88.2%
1	POLL NUMBER 1	0	
2	POLL NUMBER 2	1	0.0%
3	POLL NUMBER 3	0	
4	POLL NUMBER 4	9	0.3%
5	POLL NUMBER 5	7	0.3%

# v3006: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	POLL NUMBER 6	0	
7	POLL NUMBER 7	3	0.1%
8	POLL NUMBER 8	0	
9	POLL NUMBER 9	0	
10	POLL NUMBER 10	0	
11	POLL NUMBER 11	3	0.1%
12	POLL NUMBER 12	2	0.1%
13	POLL NUMBER 13	0	
14	POLL NUMBER 14	5	0.2%
15	POLL NUMBER 15	2	0.1%
16		3	0.1%
17	POLL NUMBER 17	3	0.1%
18	POLL NUMBER 18	0	
19	POLL NUMBER 19	0	
20	POLL NUMBER 20	0	
22	POLL NUMBER 22	0	
23	POLL NUMBER 23	0	
24	POLL NUMBER 24	0	
25	POLL NUMBER 25	2	0.1%
26	POLL NUMBER 26	0	
27	POLL NUMBER 27	0	
28	POLL NUMBER 28	0	
29	POLL NUMBER 29	0	
31	POLL NUMBER 31	0	
32	POLL NUMBER 32	0	
33	POLL NUMBER 33	0	
34	POLL NUMBER 34	0	
35	POLL NUMBER 35	2	0.1%
36	POLL NUMBER 36	0	
37	POLL NUMBER 37	6	0.2%
38	POLL NUMBER 38	4	0.1%
39	POLL NUMBER 39	3	0.1%
40	POLL NUMBER 40	6	0.2%
41	POLL NUMBER 41	1	0.0%
43	POLL NUMBER 43	0	
44	POLL NUMBER 44	1	0.0%
45	POLL NUMBER 45	1	0.0%
46	POLL NUMBER 46	1	0.0%
47	POLL NUMBER 47	4	0.1%
48	POLL NUMBER 48	0	
49	POLL NUMBER 49	2	0.1%
50	POLL NUMBER 50	4	0.1%
51	POLL NUMBER 51	0	
52	POLL NUMBER 52	0	
53	POLL NUMBER 53	5	0.2%

# v3006: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
54	POLL NUMBER 54	0	
55	POLL NUMBER 55	0	
56	POLL NUMBER 56	0	
57	POLL NUMBER 57	0	
58	POLL NUMBER 58	4	0.1%
59	POLL NUMBER 59	0	
60	POLL NUMBER 60	0	
61	POLL NUMBER 61	2	0.1%
62	POLL NUMBER 62	0	
63	POLL NUMBER 63	0	
64	POLL NUMBER 64	0	
65	POLL NUMBER 65	0	
66	POLL NUMBER 66	5	0.2%
68	POLL NUMBER 68	4	0.1%
69	POLL NUMBER 69	0	
70	POLL NUMBER 70	0	
71	POLL NUMBER 71	0	
72	POLL NUMBER 72	0	
73	POLL NUMBER 73	0	
74	POLL NUMBER 74	0	
75	POLL NUMBER 75	0	
76	POLL NUMBER 76	4	0.1%
77	POLL NUMBER 77	0	
78	POLL NUMBER 78	0	
79	POLL NUMBER 79	0	
80	POLL NUMBER 80	4	0.1%
81	POLL NUMBER 81	0	
82	POLL NUMBER 82	0	
83	POLL NUMBER 83	0	
84	POLL NUMBER 84	0	
85	POLL NUMBER 85	8	0.3%
86	POLL NUMBER 86	1	0.0%
87	POLL NUMBER 87	1	0.0%
88	POLL NUMBER 88	0	
89	POLL NUMBER 89	5	0.2%
90	POLL NUMBER 90	0	
91	POLL NUMBER 91	6	0.2%
92	POLL NUMBER 92	2	0.1%
93	POLL NUMBER 93	1	0.0%
94	POLL NUMBER 94	4	0.1%
95	POLL NUMBER 95	0	
96	POLL NUMBER 96	3	0.1%
97	POLL NUMBER 97	3	0.1%
98	POLL NUMBER 98	0	
99	POLL NUMBER 99	0	

v3006: POLL NUMBER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
100	POLL NUMBER 100	0	
101	POLL NUMBER 101	2	0.1%
102	POLL NUMBER 102	0	
103	POLL NUMBER 103	2	0.1%
104	POLL NUMBER 104	1	0.0%
105	POLL NUMBER 105	0	
107	POLL NUMBER 107	4	0.1%
108	POLL NUMBER 108	2	0.1%
110	POLL NUMBER 110	1	0.0%
111	POLL NUMBER 111	0	
112	POLL NUMBER 112	8	0.3%
113	POLL NUMBER 113	5	0.2%
114	POLL NUMBER 114	6	0.2%
115	POLL NUMBER 115	0	
116	POLL NUMBER 116	0	
117	POLL NUMBER 117	0	
118	POLL NUMBER 118	0	
119	POLL NUMBER 119	0	
120	POLL NUMBER 120	3	0.1%
121	POLL NUMBER 121	0	
122	POLL NUMBER 122	0	
123	POLL NUMBER 123	0	
124	POLL NUMBER 124	0	
125	POLL NUMBER 125	0	
126	POLL NUMBER 126	0	
127	POLL NUMBER 127	0	
128	POLL NUMBER 128	1	0.0%
129	POLL NUMBER 129	0	
130	POLL NUMBER 130	0	
131	POLL NUMBER 131	4	0.1%
132	POLL NUMBER 132	0	
133	POLL NUMBER 133	0	
134	POLL NUMBER 134	4	0.1%
135	POLL NUMBER 135	0	
136	POLL NUMBER 136	0	
137	POLL NUMBER 137	0	
138	POLL NUMBER 138	2	0.1%
139	POLL NUMBER 139	2	0.1%
140	POLL NUMBER 140	1	0.0%
141	POLL NUMBER 141	0	
142	POLL NUMBER 142	0	
143	POLL NUMBER 143	0	
145	POLL NUMBER 145	3	0.1%
146	POLL NUMBER 146	2	0.1%
147	POLL NUMBER 147	0	

# v3006: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
148	POLL NUMBER 148	5	0.2%
149	POLL NUMBER 149	0	
150	POLL NUMBER 150	4	0.1%
151	POLL NUMBER 151	0	
152	POLL NUMBER 152	3	0.1%
153	POLL NUMBER 153	0	
155	POLL NUMBER 155	0	
156	POLL NUMBER 156	0	
157	POLL NUMBER 157	0	
158	POLL NUMBER 158	0	
159	POLL NUMBER 159	4	0.1%
160	POLL NUMBER 160	0	
161	POLL NUMBER 161	3	0.1%
162	POLL NUMBER 162	5	0.2%
163	POLL NUMBER 163	1	0.0%
164	POLL NUMBER 164	3	0.1%
165	POLL NUMBER 165	0	
166	POLL NUMBER 166	0	
167	POLL NUMBER 167	3	0.1%
168	POLL NUMBER 168	0	
169	POLL NUMBER 169	2	0.1%
170	POLL NUMBER 170	0	
171	POLL NUMBER 171	4	0.1%
173	POLL NUMBER 173	3	0.1%
174	POLL NUMBER 174	8	0.3%
175	POLL NUMBER 175	3	0.1%
176	POLL NUMBER 176	0	
177	POLL NUMBER 177	0	
178	POLL NUMBER 178	5	0.2%
179	POLL NUMBER 179	5	0.2%
180	POLL NUMBER 180	2	0.1%
181	POLL NUMBER 181	3	0.1%
182	POLL NUMBER 182	0	
187	POLL NUMBER 187	0	
188	POLL NUMBER 188	5	0.2%
189	POLL NUMBER 189	3	0.1%
190	POLL NUMBER 190	0	
191	POLL NUMBER 191	2	0.1%
193	POLL NUMBER 193	4	0.1%
194	POLL NUMBER 194	2	0.1%
195	POLL NUMBER 195	0	
196	POLL NUMBER 196	0	
197	POLL NUMBER 197	0	
198	POLL NUMBER 198	0	
199	POLL NUMBER 199	3	0.1%

# v3006: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
200	POLL NUMBER 200	0	
201	POLL NUMBER 201	0	
203	POLL NUMBER 203	0	
204	POLL NUMBER 204	0	
205	POLL NUMBER 205	0	
206	POLL NUMBER 206	0	
208	POLL NUMBER 208	0	
210	POLL NUMBER 210	5	0.2%
211	POLL NUMBER 211	0	
212	POLL NUMBER 212	0	
215	POLL NUMBER 215	0	
216	POLL NUMBER 216	2	0.1%
217	POLL NUMBER 217	5	0.2%
218	POLL NUMBER 218	0	
219	POLL NUMBER 219	2	0.1%
220	POLL NUMBER 220	3	0.1%
222	POLL NUMBER 222	0	
223	POLL NUMBER 223	0	
224	POLL NUMBER 224	8	0.3%
225	POLL NUMBER 225	0	
226	POLL NUMBER 226	0	
227	POLL NUMBER 227	2	0.1%
228	POLL NUMBER 228	0	
229	POLL NUMBER 229	0	
230	POLL NUMBER 230	0	
231	POLL NUMBER 231	3	0.1%
232	POLL NUMBER 232	0	
233	POLL NUMBER 233	3	0.1%
234	POLL NUMBER 234	0	
235	POLL NUMBER 235	2	0.1%
236	POLL NUMBER 236	0	
238	POLL NUMBER 238	2	0.1%
239	POLL NUMBER 239	0	
240	POLL NUMBER 240	0	
242	POLL NUMBER 242	5	0.2%
243	POLL NUMBER 243	0	
244	POLL NUMBER 244	0	
248	POLL NUMBER 248	0	
250	POLL NUMBER 250	4	0.1%
251	POLL NUMBER 251	0	
252	POLL NUMBER 252	0	
254	POLL NUMBER 254	0	
255	POLL NUMBER 255	3	0.1%
256	POLL NUMBER 256	0	
257	POLL NUMBER 257	0	

# v3006: POLL NUMBER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
258	POLL NUMBER 258	0	
267	POLL NUMBER 267	1	0.0%
269	POLL NUMBER 269	0	
270	POLL NUMBER 270	0	
274	POLL NUMBER 274	0	
275	POLL NUMBER 275	0	
276	POLL NUMBER 276	0	
281	POLL NUMBER 281	0	
283	POLL NUMBER 283	0	
284	POLL NUMBER 284	0	
295	POLL NUMBER 295	0	
296	POLL NUMBER 296	0	
297	POLL NUMBER 297	0	
299	POLL NUMBER 299	0	
312	POLL NUMBER 312	0	
335	POLL NUMBER 335	0	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3008: QUEBEC OPTIONS: NO CHANGE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	HELLO, I'M (INTERVIEWER'S NAME) OF CANADA FACTS, A MARKET RESEARCH COMPANY. MAY I SPEAK TO (LISTED NAME)? (RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY) LAST SUMMER OR FALL, ONE OF OUR CANADIAN FACTS INTERVIEWERS INTERVIEWED YOU ABOUT THE 1979 ELECTION AND OTHER POLITICAL QUESTIONS. WE ALSO INTERVIEWED YOU AGAIN AFTER THIS FEBRUARY'S FEDERAL ELECTION. DO YOU REMEMBER BEING INTERVIEWED? (IF NO, PROBE TO ESTABLISH WHO IN HOUSEHOLD WAS INTERVIEWED) WE ARE NOW DOING ANOTHER STUDY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR AND CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR ABOUT TEN MORE MINUTES OF YOUR TIME. MAY I INTERVIEW YOU NOW? (IF RESPONDENT CANNOT BE INTERVIEWED NOW, ARRANGE FOR A MORE CONVENIENT TIME.) I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT. NO CHANGE.		
Literal question	NO CHANGE		
Notes	Q1A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	34	<div></div> 10.5%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	57	<div></div> 17.5%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	56	<div></div> 17.2%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	163	<div></div> 50.2%
8	NO OPINION	15	<div></div> 4.6%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3009: QUEBEC OPTION: RENEWED FEDERALISM			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		

# v3009: QUEBEC OPTION: RENEWED FEDERALISM			
Pre-question	<p>Q1A. HELLO, I'M (INTERVIEWER'S NAME) OF CANADA FACTS, A MARKET RESEARCH COMPANY. MAY I SPEAK TO (LISTED NAME)? (RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY) LAST SUMMER OR FALL, ONE OF OUR CANADIAN FACTS INTERVIEWERS INTERVIEWED YOU ABOUT THE 1979 ELECTION AND OTHER POLITICAL QUESTIONS. WE ALSO INTERVIEWED YOU AGAIN AFTER THIS FEBRUARY'S FEDERAL ELECTION. DO YOU REMEMBER BEING INTERVIEWED? (IF NO, PROBE TO ESTABLISH WHO IN HOUSEHOLD WAS INTERVIEWED) WE ARE NOW DOING ANOTHER STUDY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR AND CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR ABOUT TEN MORE MINUTES OF YOUR TIME. MAY I INTERVIEW YOU NOW? (IF RESPONDENT CANNOT BE INTERVIEWED NOW, ARRANGE FOR A MORE CONVENIENT TIME.)</p> <p>I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.</p>		
Literal question	Q1B. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) RENEWED FEDERALISM.		
Notes	Q1A, Q1B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	95	<div></div> 29.2%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	106	<div></div> 32.6%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	56	<div></div> 17.2%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	44	<div></div> 13.5%
8	NO OPINION	24	<div></div> 7.4%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v3010: QUEBEC OPTION: SPECIAL STATUS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q1A. HELLO, I'M (INTERVIEWER'S NAME) OF CANADA FACTS, A MARKET RESEARCH COMPANY. MAY I SPEAK TO (LISTED NAME)? (RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY) LAST SUMMER OR FALL, ONE OF OUR CANADIAN FACTS INTERVIEWERS INTERVIEWED YOU ABOUT THE 1979 ELECTION AND OTHER POLITICAL QUESTIONS. WE ALSO INTERVIEWED YOU AGAIN AFTER THIS FEBRUARY'S FEDERAL ELECTION. DO YOU REMEMBER BEING INTERVIEWED? (IF NO, PROBE TO ESTABLISH WHO IN HOUSEHOLD WAS INTERVIEWED) WE ARE NOW DOING ANOTHER STUDY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR AND CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR ABOUT TEN MORE MINUTES OF YOUR TIME. MAY I INTERVIEW YOU NOW? (IF RESPONDENT CANNOT BE INTERVIEWED NOW, ARRANGE FOR A MORE CONVENIENT TIME.)</p> <p>I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.</p>		
Literal question	Q1C. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) SPECIAL STATUS IN CONFEDERATION.		
Notes	Q1A, Q1C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	33	<div></div> 10.2%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	99	<div></div> 30.5%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	67	<div></div> 20.6%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	57	<div></div> 17.5%
8	NO OPINION	69	<div></div> 21.2%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v3011: QUEBEC OPTION: SOVREIGNTY ASSOCIATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		

# v3011: QUEBEC OPTION: SOVREIGNTY ASSOCIATION				
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		Q1A. HELLO, I'M (INTERVIEWER'S NAME) OF CANADA FACTS, A MARKET RESEARCH COMPANY. MAY I SPEAK TO (LISTED NAME)? (RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY) LAST SUMMER OR FALL, ONE OF OUR CANADIAN FACTS INTERVIEWERS INTERVIEWED YOU ABOUT THE 1979 ELECTION AND OTHER POLITICAL QUESTIONS. WE ALSO INTERVIEWED YOU AGAIN AFTER THIS FEBRUARY'S FEDERAL ELECTION. DO YOU REMEMBER BEING INTERVIEWED? (IF NO, PROBE TO ESTABLISH WHO IN HOUSEHOLD WAS INTERVIEWED) WE ARE NOW DOING ANOTHER STUDY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR AND CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR ABOUT TEN MORE MINUTES OF YOUR TIME. MAY I INTERVIEW YOU NOW? (IF RESPONDENT CANNOT BE INTERVIEWED NOW, ARRANGE FOR A MORE CONVENIENT TIME.) I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.		
Literal question		Q1D. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION.		
Notes		Q1A, Q1D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	77	<div></div>	23.7%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	68	<div></div>	20.9%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	49	<div></div>	15.1%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	117	<div></div>	36.0%
8	NO OPINION	14	<div></div>	4.3%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3012: QUEBEC OPTION: INDEPENDENCE				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe		All respondents		
Pre-question		Q1A. HELLO, I'M (INTERVIEWER'S NAME) OF CANADA FACTS, A MARKET RESEARCH COMPANY. MAY I SPEAK TO (LISTED NAME)? (RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY) LAST SUMMER OR FALL, ONE OF OUR CANADIAN FACTS INTERVIEWERS INTERVIEWED YOU ABOUT THE 1979 ELECTION AND OTHER POLITICAL QUESTIONS. WE ALSO INTERVIEWED YOU AGAIN AFTER THIS FEBRUARY'S FEDERAL ELECTION. DO YOU REMEMBER BEING INTERVIEWED? (IF NO, PROBE TO ESTABLISH WHO IN HOUSEHOLD WAS INTERVIEWED) WE ARE NOW DOING ANOTHER STUDY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR AND CARLETON UNIVERSITY AND WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU FOR ABOUT TEN MORE MINUTES OF YOUR TIME. MAY I INTERVIEW YOU NOW? (IF RESPONDENT CANNOT BE INTERVIEWED NOW, ARRANGE FOR A MORE CONVENIENT TIME.) I AM GOING TO MENTION SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS FOR QUEBEC. AS I READ EACH OVER, PLEASE TELL ME WHETHER YOU ARE VERY FAVOURABLE TOWARD IT, SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE, SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE, OR VERY UNFAVOURABLE TOWARD IT.		
Literal question		Q1E. (R'S OPINION ABOUT) INDEPENDENCE.		
Notes		Q1A, Q1E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	VERY FAVOURABLE	37	<div></div>	11.4%
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOURABLE	42	<div></div>	12.9%
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAVOURABLE	47	<div></div>	14.5%
4	VERY UNFAVOURABLE	188	<div></div>	57.8%
8	NO OPINION	11	<div></div>	3.4%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3013: REFERENDUM TURNOUT				
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0/8]		

# v3013: REFERENDUM TURNOUT			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=315 /-] [Invalid=2446 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	ON MAY 20TH, RESIDENTS OF QUEBEC WILL BE/WERE ASKED TO VOTE IN A REFERENDUM.		
Literal question	DO YOU PLAN TO/DID YOU VOTE IN THE REFERENDUM?		
Notes	Q2A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	306	<div><div></div></div> 97.1%
2	NO	9	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
8	D.K.	10	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3014: REFERENDUM VOTE: YES/NO			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=291 /-] [Invalid=2470 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q2A. ON MAY 20TH, RESIDENTS OF QUEBEC WILL BE/WERE ASKED TO VOTE IN A REFERENDUM		
Literal question	Q2BC. DID YOU/WILL YOU VOTE YES OR NO?		
Notes	Q2A, Q2BC in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	127	<div><div></div></div> 43.6%
2	NO	143	<div><div></div></div> 49.1%
4	(PRE REF.) LEANING "YES"	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.7%
5	(PRE REF.) LEANING "NO"	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
6	(PRE REF.) STILL UNDECIDED	18	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
0	NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW	2436	
8	REFUSED	15	
9	INAP, CODED 2 OR 0 IN Q2A	19	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3015: WHEN DID R DECIDE REFERENDUM VOTE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=262 /-] [Invalid=2499 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR APPROXIMATE DATE WITHIN WEEKS BEFORE THE REFERENDUM, ONE WEEK, TWO WEEKS, ETC.)		
Notes	Q3A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	KNEW ALL ALONG	70	<div><div></div></div> 26.7%
2	QUITE A WHILE BEFORE REFERENDUM WAS CALLED	58	<div><div></div></div> 22.1%
3	WHEN REFERENDUM WAS CALLED	51	<div><div></div></div> 19.5%
4	6 WEEKS BEFORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
5	5 WEEKS BEFORE	3	<div><div></div></div> 1.1%
6	4 WEEKS BEFORE	12	<div><div></div></div> 4.6%

# v3015: WHEN DID R DECIDE REFERENDUM VOTE				
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
7	3 WEEKS BEFORE	7	<div><div></div></div>	2.7%
8	2 WEEKS BEFORE	9	<div><div></div></div>	3.4%
9	1 WEEK BEFORE	7	<div><div></div></div>	2.7%
10	AT THE POLL, REFERENDUM DAY	2	<div><div></div></div>	0.8%
11	REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC EVENT (UNDATED)	1	<div><div></div></div>	0.4%
12	JUST A FEW DAYS BEFORE	3	<div><div></div></div>	1.1%
13	7 TO 9 WEEKS BEFORE	15	<div><div></div></div>	5.7%
14	10 WEEKS BEFORE	23	<div><div></div></div>	8.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	1013		
88	D.K., CAN'T REMEMBER	8		
89	REFUSED	0		
99	INAP., CODED 6 TO 9 IN Q2CB	1478		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3016: WAS R SURE ABOUT REFERENDUM VOTE				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=262 /-] [Invalid=2499 /-]			
Universe	All respondents			
Pre-question	Q3A. CAN YOU REMEMBER EXACTLY WHEN YOU DECIDED HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR APPROXIMATE DATE WITHIN WEEKS BEFORE THE REFERENDUM, ONE WEEK, TWO WEEKS, ETC.)			
Literal question	Q3B. HAVE YOU BEEN/WERE YOU PRETTY SURE ALL ALONG HOW YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE OR WAS THERE ANY POINT WHEN YOU THOUGH YOU MIGHT VOTE DIFFERENTLY?			
Notes	Q3A, Q3B in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	SURE ALL ALONG	210	<div><div></div></div>	80.2%
2	CONSIDERED OTHER	52	<div><div></div></div>	19.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436		
7	INAP., CODED 6 TO 9 IN Q2CB; REFUSED	55		
8	D.K.	8		
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.				
# v3017: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 1				
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=282 /-] [Invalid=2479 /-]			
Universe	Q4.1 asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q2A.			
Pre-question	Q2A. ON MAY 20TH, RESIDENTS OF QUEBEC WILL BE/WERE ASKED TO VOTE IN A REFERENDUM. DO YOU PLAN TO/DID YOU VOTE IN THE REFERENDUM?			
Literal question	Q4.1 SOMETIMES, IN ASKING ALL THESE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS CAN LOSE TRACK OF WHAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT TO PEOPLE. SO COULD YOU TAKE A MOMENT TO THINK OVER ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO VOTE (YES/NO/WHY YOU ARE UNDECIDED AS TO HOW YOU WILL VOTE) IN THE REFERENDUM AND JUST BRIEFLY TELL ME THE THINGS THAT WERE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU? (FIRST MENTION)			
Notes	Q2A, Q4.1 in the documentation.			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage	
1	SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE - PRO	12	<div><div></div></div>	4.3%
2	SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE - CON	59	<div><div></div></div>	20.9%

v3017: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION - PRO	4	1.4%
4	SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION - CON	7	2.5%
5	FEDERALISM (RENEWED FEDERALISM) - PRO	4	1.4%
6	FEDERALISM (RENEWED FEDERALISM) - CON	2	0.7%
7	LEVESQUE - PRO	4	1.4%
8	LEVESQUE - CON	1	0.4%
9	TIME FOR A CHANGE, LIKE THINGS TO CHANGE	26	9.2%
10	DON'T LIKE CHANGE/UNCERTAINTY, AFRAID	11	3.9%
11	WANT TO REMAIN A CANADIAN, I AM A CANADIAN, I AM A FRENCH CA	31	11.0%
12	SEARCH FOR IDENTITY/OUR CULTURAL IDENTITY/ RECOGNITION AS A P	16	5.7%
13	MAINTAIN FRENCH AS A LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE PROBLEM IS THE MOST	2	0.7%
14	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS THE COUNTRY SHOULD REMAIN UNITED/ QUEBE	11	3.9%
15	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS QUEBEC SHOULD SEPARATE	5	1.8%
16	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS QUEBEC NEEDS MORE AUTONOMY	1	0.4%
17	TO NEGOTIATE ON AN EQUAL LEVEL	5	1.8%
18	TO BETTER THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC	6	2.1%
19	WANT SPECIAL STATUS FOR QUEBEC	2	0.7%
20	WOULD BE GOOD FOR QUEBEC POLITICALLY	2	0.7%
21	TO GIVE THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT POWER	2	0.7%
22	NOT TREATED EQUALLY WITH THE OTHER PROVINCES/ WE ARE EXPLOIT	10	3.5%
23	TO GIVE THE GOVERNMENT A CHANCE TO FULFILL ITS PROMISES	2	0.7%
24	HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	3	1.1%
25	DON'T LIKE THE PARTI QUEBECOIS	7	2.5%
26	WOULD BE GOOD FOR CANADA POLITICALLY	0	
27	WOULD BE GOOD FOR CANADA CULTURALLY	0	
28	TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION	2	0.7%
29	SOCIAL WELFARE REASONS	1	0.4%
30	FEDERAL ELECTION RESULTS	1	0.4%
31	AGAINST STATUS QUO THAT TRUDEAU WOULD SET IF VOTED "NON"	0	
32	A MAJORITY VOTE IS IMPORTANT TO ME	2	0.7%
33	PEOPLE SPOILED/PAMPERED HERE IN QUEBEC	1	0.4%
34	OTTAWA KEEPS ITS DOOR OPEN TO ALL PROVINCES	0	
35	TO LET US BE OUR OWN BOSS	1	0.4%
36	BETTER FOR FUTURE OF YOUTH	5	1.8%
37	INFLUENCE OF OTHERS, FAMILY TIES	3	1.1%
38	WANT TO TAKE TIME TO KNOW BOTH SIDES	3	1.1%
39	TERMINOLOGY STILL VAGUE -- "RENEWED FEDERALISM" / "SOVEREIGN	2	0.7%
40	NOT UP TO DATE ON QUESTION	2	0.7%

v3017: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
41	DON'T KNOW WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN FUTURE, NOT SURE OF OUTCOME,	4	1.4%
42	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS WHY STILL UNDECIDED - ELECTION	2	0.7%
43	TO NEGOTIATE	15	5.3%
44	REFERENDUM NOT NECESSARY TO NEGOTIATE (VOTED NO)	1	0.4%
45	BECAUSE I LIVED IN ONTARIO FOR 10 YEARS (VOTED YES)	1	0.4%
46	VERY HONEST PEOPLE	1	0.4%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
88	D.K.	7	
89	REFUSED	2	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q2A OR CODED 8 IN Q2BC, NO SECOND OR T	34	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3018: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=103 /-] [Invalid=2658 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	REASON WHY R VOTED/WILL VOTE (YES/NO) IN REFERENDUM? (SECOND MENTION)
Notes	Q4.2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE - PRO	4	3.9%
2	SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE - CON	10	9.7%
3	SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION - PRO	3	2.9%
4	SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION - CON	3	2.9%
5	FEDERALISM (RENEWED FEDERALISM) - PRO	3	2.9%
6	FEDERALISM (RENEWED FEDERALISM) - CON	2	1.9%
7	LEVESQUE - PRO	3	2.9%
8	LEVESQUE - CON	1	1.0%
9	TIME FOR A CHANGE, LIKE THINGS TO CHANGE	8	7.8%
10	DON'T LIKE CHANGE/UNCERTAINTY, AFRAID	5	4.9%
11	WANT TO REMAIN A CANADIAN, I AM A CANADIAN, I AM A FRENCH CA	8	7.8%
12	SEARCH FOR IDENTITY/OUR CULTURAL IDENTITY/ RECOGNITION AS A P	6	5.8%
13	MAINTAIN FRENCH AS A LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE PROBLEM IS THE MOST	5	4.9%
14	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS THE COUNTRY SHOULD REMAIN UNITED/ QUEBE	4	3.9%
15	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS QUEBEC SHOULD SEPARATE	8	7.8%
16	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS QUEBEC NEEDS MORE AUTONOMY	1	1.0%
17	TO NEGOTIATE ON AN EQUAL LEVEL	0	
18	TO BETTER THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC	5	4.9%
19	WANT SPECIAL STATUS FOR QUEBEC	1	1.0%

v3018: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 2

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
20	WOULD BE GOOD FOR QUEBEC POLITICALLY	2	1.9%
21	TO GIVE THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT POWER	1	1.0%
22	NOT TREATED EQUALLY WITH THE OTHER PROVINCES/ WE ARE EXPLOIT	4	3.9%
23	TO GIVE THE GOVERNMENT A CHANCE TO FULFILL ITS PROMISES	1	1.0%
24	HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	0	
25	DON'T LIKE THE PARTI QUEBECOIS	2	1.9%
26	WOULD BE GOOD FOR CANADA POLITICALLY	4	3.9%
27	WOULD BE GOOD FOR CANADA CULTURALLY	0	
28	TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION	4	3.9%
29	SOCIAL WELFARE REASONS	1	1.0%
30	FEDERAL ELECTION RESULTS	0	
31	AGAINST STATUS QUO THAT TRUDEAU WOULD SET IF VOTED "NON"	1	1.0%
32	A MAJORITY VOTE IS IMPORTANT TO ME	0	
33	PEOPLE SPOILED/PAMPERED HERE IN QUEBEC	0	
34	OTTAWA KEEPS ITS DOOR OPEN TO ALL PROVINCES	1	1.0%
35	TO LET US BE OUR OWN BOSS	1	1.0%
36	BETTER FOR FUTURE OF YOUTH	0	
37	INFLUENCE OF OTHERS, FAMILY TIES	0	
38	WANT TO TAKE TIME TO KNOW BOTH SIDES	0	
39	TERMINOLOGY STILL VAGUE -- "RENEWED FEDERALISM" / "SOVEREIGN	0	
40	NOT UP TO DATE ON QUESTION	0	
41	DON'T KNOW WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN FUTURE, NOT SURE OF OUTCOME,	0	
42	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS WHY STILL UNDECIDED - ELECTION	0	
43	TO NEGOTIATE	1	1.0%
44	REFERENDUM NOT NECESSARY TO NEGOTIATE (VOTED NO)	0	
45	BECAUSE I LIVED IN ONTARIO FOR 10 YEARS (VOTED YES)	0	
46	VERY HONEST PEOPLE	0	
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
88	D.K.	0	
89	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q2A OR CODED 8 IN Q2BC, NO SECOND OR T	222	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3019: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 3

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=24 /-] [Invalid=2737 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	REASON WHY R VOTED/WILL VOTE (YES/NO) IN REFERENDUM? (THIRD MENTION)
Notes	Q4.3 in the documentation.

v3019: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 3

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE - PRO	1	4.2%
2	SEPARATION, INDEPENDENCE - CON	0	
3	SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION - PRO	0	
4	SOVEREIGNTY ASSOCIATION - CON	1	4.2%
5	FEDERALISM (RENEWED FEDERALISM) - PRO	0	
6	FEDERALISM (RENEWED FEDERALISM) - CON	0	
7	LEVESQUE - PRO	0	
8	LEVESQUE - CON	0	
9	TIME FOR A CHANGE, LIKE THINGS TO CHANGE	1	4.2%
10	DON'T LIKE CHANGE/UNCERTAINTY, AFRAID	0	
11	WANT TO REMAIN A CANADIAN, I AM A CANADIAN, I AM A FRENCH CA	1	4.2%
12	SEARCH FOR IDENTITY/OUR CULTURAL IDENTITY/ RECOGNITION AS A P	2	8.3%
13	MAINTAIN FRENCH AS A LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE PROBLEM IS THE MOST	3	12.5%
14	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS THE COUNTRY SHOULD REMAIN UNITED/ QUEBE	1	4.2%
15	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS QUEBEC SHOULD SEPARATE	3	12.5%
16	FOR ECONOMIC REASONS QUEBEC NEEDS MORE AUTONOMY	0	
17	TO NEGOTIATE ON AN EQUAL LEVEL	0	
18	TO BETTER THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC	1	4.2%
19	WANT SPECIAL STATUS FOR QUEBEC	0	
20	WOULD BE GOOD FOR QUEBEC POLITICALLY	3	12.5%
21	TO GIVE THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT POWER	0	
22	NOT TREATED EQUALLY WITH THE OTHER PROVINCES/ WE ARE EXPLOIT	0	
23	TO GIVE THE GOVERNMENT A CHANCE TO FULFILL ITS PROMISES	0	
24	HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	2	8.3%
25	DON'T LIKE THE PARTI QUEBECOIS	0	
26	WOULD BE GOOD FOR CANADA POLITICALLY	0	
27	WOULD BE GOOD FOR CANADA CULTURALLY	0	
28	TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION	0	
29	SOCIAL WELFARE REASONS	1	4.2%
30	FEDERAL ELECTION RESULTS	0	
31	AGAINST STATUS QUO THAT TRUDEAU WOULD SET IF VOTED "NON"	0	
32	A MAJORITY VOTE IS IMPORTANT TO ME	0	
33	PEOPLE SPOILED/PAMPERED HERE IN QUEBEC	0	
34	OTTAWA KEEPS ITS DOOR OPEN TO ALL PROVINCES	0	
35	TO LET US BE OUR OWN BOSS	0	
36	BETTER FOR FUTURE OF YOUTH	0	
37	INFLUENCE OF OTHERS, FAMILY TIES	0	
38	WANT TO TAKE TIME TO KNOW BOTH SIDES	0	
39	TERMINOLOGY STILL VAGUE -- "RENEWED FEDERALISM" / "SOVEREIGN	0	










# v3019: REFERENDUM VOTE REASON: 3			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
40	NOT UP TO DATE ON QUESTION	0	
41	DON'T KNOW WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN FUTURE, NOT SURE OF OUTCOME,	0	
42	MISCELLANEOUS SINGLE MENTIONS WHY STILL UNDECIDED - ELECTION	0	
43	TO NEGOTIATE	4	<div><div></div></div> 16.7%
44	REFERENDUM NOT NECESSARY TO NEGOTIATE (VOTED NO)	0	
45	BECAUSE I LIVED IN ONTARIO FOR 10 YEARS (VOTED YES)	0	
46	VERY HONEST PEOPLE	0	
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
88	D.K.	0	
89	REFUSED	0	
99	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q2A OR CODED 8 IN Q2BC, NO SECOND OR T	301	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3020: DID R ATTEND PUBLIC RALLY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q5A. DID YOU DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DURING THE REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN FROM MARCH 19TH TO MAY 20TH?		
Literal question	ATTEND A RALLY OR PUBLIC MEETING?		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q5A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	74	<div><div></div></div> 22.8%
2	NO	115	<div><div></div></div> 35.4%
3	R DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES	136	<div><div></div></div> 41.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3021: DID R WEAR CAMPAIGN BUTTON			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q5A. DID YOU DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DURING THE REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN FROM MARCH 19TH TO MAY 20TH?		
Literal question	Q5B. (DID YOU) WEAR A BUTTON OR PUT UP A SIGN?		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q5A, Q5B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	91	<div><div></div></div> 28.0%
2	NO	98	<div><div></div></div> 30.2%

v3021: DID R WEAR CAMPAIGN BUTTON




Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	R DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES	136	41.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v3022: DID R SIGN CAMPAIGN PETITION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q5A. DID YOU DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DURING THE REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN FROM MARCH 19TH TO MAY 20TH?		
Literal question	Q5C. (DID YOU) SIGN A PETITION?		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q5A, Q5C in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	47	<div><div></div></div> 14.5%
2	NO	142	<div><div></div></div> 43.7%
3	R DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES	136	<div><div></div></div> 41.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3023: DID R CONVINCE OTHERS ABOUT VOTE			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q5A. DID YOU DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DURING THE REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN FROM MARCH 19TH TO MAY 20TH?		
Literal question	Q5D. (DID YOU) TRY TO CONVINCE FRIENDS TO VOTE THE SAME AS YOU?		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q5A, Q5D in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	125	<div><div></div></div> 38.5%
2	NO	64	<div><div></div></div> 19.7%
3	R DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES	136	<div><div></div></div> 41.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3024: DID R WORK IN REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q5A. DID YOU DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DURING THE REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN FROM MARCH 19TH TO MAY 20TH?		
Literal question	Q5E. (DID YOU) SPEND TIME WORKING IN THE CAMPAIGN?		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q5A, Q5E in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	25	<div><div></div></div> 7.7%
2	NO	164	<div><div></div></div> 50.5%
3	R DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES	136	<div><div></div></div> 41.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	

# v3024: DID R WORK IN REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN			
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v3025: DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q5A. DID YOU DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DURING THE REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN FROM MARCH 19TH TO MAY 20TH?		
Literal question	Q5F. (DID YOU) CONTRIBUTE MONEY?		
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST		
Notes	Q5A, Q5F in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	42	 12.9%
2	NO	147	 45.2%
3	R DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THE ACTIVITIES	136	 41.8%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v3026: PROVINCIAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=292 /-] [Invalid=2469 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A PARTI QUEBECOIS, LIBERAL, UNION NATIONALE, CREDITISTE, OR WHAT?		
Notes	Q6A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	INDEPENDENT, NONE	8	 2.7%
1	LIBERAL	158	 54.1%
2	PARTI QUEBECOIS	119	 40.8%
3	UNION NATIONALE	4	 1.4%
4	CREDITISTE	1	 0.3%
5	OTHER	2	 0.7%
7	D.K.	23	
8	REFUSED	10	
9	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v3027: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=283 /-] [Invalid=2478 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	Q6A. THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A PARTI QUEBECOIS, LIBERAL, UNION NATIONALE, CREDITISTE, OR WHAT?		
Literal question	Q6B. HOW STRONGLY (PARTY NAMED IN Q6A) DO YOU FEEL, VERY STRONGLY, FAIRLY STRONGLY, OR NOT VERY STRONGLY?		
Notes	Q6A, Q6B in the documentation.		



v3027: PROVINCIAL PARTY ID INTENSITY

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	VERY STRONGLY	142	 50.2%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	122	 43.1%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	19	 6.7%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
8	D.K.	1	
9	INAP.	41	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3028: IS R PARTY LEANER




Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=32 /-] [Invalid=2729 /-]
Universe	Q7A asked only to respondents who answered "independent" or "don't know" in Q6A.
Pre-question	Q6A. THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A PARTI QUEBECOIS, LIBERAL, UNION NATIONALE, CREDITISTE, OR WHAT?
Literal question	Q7A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
Notes	Q6A, Q7A in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	YES	19	 59.4%
2	NO	13	 40.6%
0	NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW	1013	
7	REFUSED	1430	
8	D.K.	2	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 0, 7 OR 8 IN Q6A	284	







Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3029: PROVINCIAL PARTY LEANING

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16 /-] [Invalid=2745 /-]
Universe	Q7B asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for Q7A.
Pre-question	Q6A. THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A PARTI QUEBECOIS, LIBERAL, UNION NATIONALE, CREDITISTE, OR WHAT? ; Q7A. WELL, STILL THINKING OF PROVINCIAL POLITICS HERE IN QUEBEC, DO YOU GENERALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE PARTIES THAN TO THE OTHERS?
Literal question	Q7B. WHICH PARTY IS THAT?
Notes	Q6A, Q7A, Q7B in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	LIBERAL	8	 50.0%
2	PARTI QUEBECOIS	7	 43.8%
3	UNION NATIONALE	0	
4	CREDITISTE	1	 6.2%
0	NO REFERENDUM INTERVIEW	2436	
7	REFUSED	3	
9	INAP., NOT CODED 1 IN Q7A	306	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

# v3030: RYAN FEELING THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=321 /-] [Invalid=2440 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>NOW I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN QUEBEC. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	FIRST THE LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC. HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THEIR LEADER, MR. RYAN? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q8A, Q in the documentation. (ROTATE ORDER OF PARTIES FROM INTERVIEW TO INTERVIEW)		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	65	 20.2%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	11	 3.4%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	2	 0.6%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	10	 3.1%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	4	 1.2%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	19	 5.9%

v3030: RYAN FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	0.6%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	13	4.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.6%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	58	18.1%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	30	9.3%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	4	1.2%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	31	9.7%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	19	5.9%

# v3030: RYAN FEELING THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	1	0.3%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	27	8.4%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	2	0.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	8	2.5%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	1	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	10	3.1%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2440	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3031: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=321 /-] [Invalid=2440 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>NOW I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN QUEBEC. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q8B. HOW ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY HERE IN QUEBEC TAKEN AS A WHOLE?		
Notes	Q8A, Q8B in the documentation. (ROTATE ORDER OF PARTIES FROM INTERVIEW TO INTERVIEW)		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	30	9.3%
2	2 SCORE	0	

v3031: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	4	1.2%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	1	0.3%
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	13	4.0%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	3	0.9%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	17	5.3%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	4	1.2%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	14	4.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	3	0.9%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	

v3031: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER










Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	59	18.4%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	3	0.9%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	36	11.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	8	2.5%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	31	9.7%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	25	7.8%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	37	11.5%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	7	2.2%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	10	3.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	

# v3031: PROVINCIAL LIBERAL PARTY THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	1	0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	15	4.7%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2440	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3032: LEVESQUE FEELING THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=320 /-] [Invalid=2441 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>NOW I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN QUEBEC. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q8C. HOW ABOUT THE LEADER OF THE PARTI QUEBECOIS, MR. LEVESQUE? WHERE WOULD YOU PLACE HIM ON THE THERMOMETER?		
Notes	Q8A, Q8C in the documentation. (ROTATE ORDER OF PARTIES FROM INTERVIEW TO INTERVIEW)		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	27	8.4%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	2	0.6%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	5	1.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	

v3032: LEVESQUE FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
20	20 SCORE	7	<div><div></div></div> 2.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	2	<div><div></div></div> 0.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	16	<div><div></div></div> 5.0%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	29	<div><div></div></div> 9.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	1	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	52	<div><div></div></div> 16.2%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	0	
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	31	<div><div></div></div> 9.7%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	

v3032: LEVESQUE FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
65	65 SCORE	5	 1.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	30	 9.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	13	 4.1%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	41	 12.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	3	 0.9%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	13	 4.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	6	 1.9%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	1	 0.3%
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	35	 10.9%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2441	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3033: PARTY QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=318 /-] [Invalid=2443 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD

v3033: PARTY QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER

A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.
NOW I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT SOME OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY LEADERS HERE IN QUEBEC. WE WILL USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER FOR THESE QUESTIONS.

Literal question Q8D. HOW ABOUT THE PARTI QUEBECOIS TAKEN AS A WHOLE?

Notes Q8A, Q8D in the documentation. (ROTATE ORDER OF PARTIES FROM INTERVIEW TO INTERVIEW)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	31	9.7%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	1	0.3%
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	5	1.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	8	2.5%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	5	1.6%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	26	8.2%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	3	0.9%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	

v3033: PARTY QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	30	<div></div> 9.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	<div></div> 1.3%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	51	<div></div> 16.0%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	<div></div> 0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	26	<div></div> 8.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	6	<div></div> 1.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	26	<div></div> 8.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	13	<div></div> 4.1%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	1	<div></div> 0.3%
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	35	<div></div> 11.0%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	

# v3033: PARTY QUEBECOIS THERMOMETER			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	13	<div><div></div></div> 4.1%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	4	<div><div></div></div> 1.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	24	<div><div></div></div> 7.5%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2443	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v3034: QUEBEC PROVINCE:FEELINGS			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>Q9A. NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL IN GENERAL ABOUT THIS PROVINCE OF QUEBEC?		
Notes	Q8A, Q9A in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	0	
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	0	

v3034: QUEBEC PROVINCE:FEELINGS

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	0	
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	0	
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	1	0.3%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	0	
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	2	0.6%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.6%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	16	4.9%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	0	

v3034: QUEBEC PROVINCE:FEELINGS







Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	18	5.5%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	1	0.3%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	34	10.5%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	18	5.5%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	54	16.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	6	1.8%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	45	13.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	7	2.2%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	1	0.3%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	120	36.9%

# v3034: QUEBEC PROVINCE:FEELINGS			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
<i>Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.</i>			
# v3035: QUEBEC GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=314 /-] [Invalid=2447 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Pre-question	<p>Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.</p> <p>Q9A. NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.</p>		
Literal question	Q9B. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF THIS PROVINCE OF QUEBEC?		
Notes	Q8A, Q9A, Q9B in the documentation.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	15	<div></div> 4.8%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	5	<div></div> 1.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	5	<div></div> 1.6%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	6	<div></div> 1.9%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	

v3035: QUEBEC GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	11	3.5%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	2	0.6%
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	17	5.4%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	4	1.3%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	59	18.8%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	35	11.1%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	6	1.9%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	1	0.3%
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	31	9.9%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	

v3035: QUEBEC GOVERNMENT THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	22	 7.0%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	37	 11.8%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	7	 2.2%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	15	 4.8%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	4	 1.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	30	 9.6%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2447	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3036: CANADA: FEELING THERMOMETER

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=323 /-] [Invalid=2438 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINGS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE. Q9A. NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q9C. HOW DO YOU FEEL, IN GENERAL, ABOUT CANADA?
Notes	Q8A, Q9A, Q9C in the documentation.




v3036: CANADA: FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	7	2.2%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	2	0.6%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	1	0.3%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.3%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	3	0.9%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	0	
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	10	3.1%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.6%

v3036: CANADA: FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	56	17.3%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	2	0.6%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	33	10.2%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	2	0.6%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	33	10.2%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	30	9.3%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	44	13.6%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	4	1.2%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	26	8.0%



v3036: CANADA: FEELING THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	3	 0.9%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	1	 0.3%
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	63	 19.5%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2438	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3037: CANADIAN GOVERNMENT: THERMOMETER









Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=320 /-] [Invalid=2441 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Pre-question	Q8A. NOW WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE FEELING THERMOMETER WHICH WE USED IN OUR 1979 STUDY AND WHICH WE SENT TO YOU IN THE MAIL FOR OUR 1980 STUDY. THE THERMOMETER IS GRADED FROM 0 TO 100. IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR FEELING ABOUT THE THINKS WE ARE ASKING ABOUT, PLACE THEM AT THE 50 DEGREE MARK. IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE VERY WARM TOWARD A PARTICULAR THING, YOU WOULD GIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 50 AND 100; THE WARMER THE FEELINGS, THE HIGHER THE SCORE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOUR FEELINGS ARE RELATIVELY COOL TOWARD SOMETHING, YOU WOULD PLACE THEM BETWEEN 0 AND 50. THE COOLER YOUR FEELINGS, THE CLOSER THE SCORE WILL BE TO ZERO. IF YOU DON'T KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ANY OF THE ITEM MENTIONED, JUST SAY SO AND WE WILL GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE. Q9A. NOW, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO USE THE FEELING THERMOMETER AGAIN FOR THESE QUESTIONS.
Literal question	Q9D. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA?
Notes	Q8A, Q9A, Q9D in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	0 OR 1 SCORE	13	 4.1%
2	2 SCORE	0	
3	3 SCORE	0	
4	4 SCORE	0	
5	5 SCORE	0	
6	6 SCORE	0	
7	7 SCORE	0	
8	8 SCORE	0	
9	9 SCORE	0	
10	10 SCORE	6	 1.9%
11	11 SCORE	0	
12	12 SCORE	0	
13	13 SCORE	0	
14	14 SCORE	0	
15	15 SCORE	0	
16	16 SCORE	0	
17	17 SCORE	0	
18	18 SCORE	0	

v3037: CANADIAN GOVERNMENT: THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
19	19 SCORE	0	
20	20 SCORE	7	2.2%
21	21 SCORE	0	
22	22 SCORE	0	
23	23 SCORE	0	
24	24 SCORE	0	
25	25 SCORE	1	0.3%
26	26 SCORE	0	
27	27 SCORE	0	
28	28 SCORE	0	
29	29 SCORE	0	
30	30 SCORE	12	3.8%
31	31 SCORE	0	
32	32 SCORE	0	
33	33 SCORE	0	
34	34 SCORE	0	
35	35 SCORE	0	
36	36 SCORE	0	
37	37 SCORE	0	
38	38 SCORE	0	
39	39 SCORE	0	
40	40 SCORE	16	5.0%
41	41 SCORE	0	
42	42 SCORE	0	
43	43 SCORE	0	
44	44 SCORE	0	
45	45 SCORE	2	0.6%
46	46 SCORE	0	
47	47 SCORE	0	
48	48 SCORE	0	
49	49 SCORE	0	
50	NEUTRAL	58	18.1%
51	51 SCORE	0	
52	52 SCORE	0	
53	53 SCORE	0	
54	54 SCORE	0	
55	55 SCORE	1	0.3%
56	56 SCORE	0	
57	57 SCORE	0	
58	58 SCORE	0	
59	59 SCORE	0	
60	60 SCORE	35	10.9%
61	61 SCORE	0	
62	62 SCORE	0	
63	63 SCORE	0	

v3037: CANADIAN GOVERNMENT: THERMOMETER

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
64	64 SCORE	0	
65	65 SCORE	12	 3.8%
66	66 SCORE	0	
67	67 SCORE	0	
68	68 SCORE	0	
69	69 SCORE	0	
70	70 SCORE	43	 13.4%
71	71 SCORE	0	
72	72 SCORE	0	
73	73 SCORE	0	
74	74 SCORE	0	
75	75 SCORE	27	 8.4%
76	76 SCORE	0	
77	77 SCORE	0	
78	78 SCORE	0	
79	79 SCORE	0	
80	80 SCORE	40	 12.5%
81	81 SCORE	0	
82	82 SCORE	0	
83	83 SCORE	0	
84	84 SCORE	0	
85	85 SCORE	5	 1.6%
86	86 SCORE	0	
87	87 SCORE	0	
88	88 SCORE	0	
89	89 SCORE	0	
90	90 SCORE	20	 6.2%
91	91 SCORE	0	
92	92 SCORE	0	
93	93 SCORE	0	
94	94 SCORE	0	
95	95 SCORE	1	 0.3%
96	96 SCORE	0	
97	97 SCORE	0	
98	98 SCORE	0	
99	99 OR 100 SCORE	21	 6.6%
0	NO OPINION, N.A., NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2441	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.




















v3039: AGE OF RESPONDENT

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=324 /-] [Invalid=2437 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	WHAT WAS YOUR EXACT AGE ON YOUR LAST BIRTHDAY?
Notes	Q11 in the documentation.

v3039: AGE OF RESPONDENT

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
18	18 YEARS OLD	1	0.3%
19	19 YEARS OLD	13	4.0%
20	20 YEARS OLD	10	3.1%
21	21 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
22	22 YEARS OLD	8	2.5%
23	23 YEARS OLD	9	2.8%
24	24 YEARS OLD	12	3.7%
25	25 YEARS OLD	10	3.1%
26	26 YEARS OLD	3	0.9%
27	27 YEARS OLD	7	2.2%
28	28 YEARS OLD	10	3.1%
29	29 YEARS OLD	7	2.2%
30	30 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
31	31 YEARS OLD	15	4.6%
32	32 YEARS OLD	3	0.9%
33	33 YEARS OLD	6	1.9%
34	34 YEARS OLD	10	3.1%
35	35 YEARS OLD	10	3.1%
36	36 YEARS OLD	6	1.9%
37	37 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
38	38 YEARS OLD	2	0.6%
39	39 YEARS OLD	6	1.9%
40	40 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
41	41 YEARS OLD	3	0.9%
42	42 YEARS OLD	3	0.9%
43	43 YEARS OLD	10	3.1%
44	44 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
45	45 YEARS OLD	9	2.8%
46	46 YEARS OLD	8	2.5%
47	47 YEARS OLD	2	0.6%
48	48 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
49	49 YEARS OLD	5	1.5%
50	50 YEARS OLD	9	2.8%
51	51 YEARS OLD	6	1.9%
52	52 YEARS OLD	7	2.2%
53	53 YEARS OLD	8	2.5%
54	54 YEARS OLD	6	1.9%
55	55 YEARS OLD	7	2.2%
56	56 YEARS OLD	3	0.9%
57	57 YEARS OLD	5	1.5%
58	58 YEARS OLD	6	1.9%
59	59 YEARS OLD	4	1.2%
60	60 YEARS OLD	3	0.9%
61	61 YEARS OLD	2	0.6%
62	62 YEARS OLD	5	1.5%

v3039: AGE OF RESPONDENT

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
63	63 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
64	64 YEARS OLD	3	 0.9%
65	65 YEARS OLD	4	 1.2%
66	66 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
67	67 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
68	68 YEARS OLD	4	 1.2%
69	69 YEARS OLD	4	 1.2%
70	70 YEARS OLD	3	 0.9%
71	71 YEARS OLD	0	
72	72 YEARS OLD	3	 0.9%
73	73 YEARS OLD	3	 0.9%
74	74 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
75	75 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
76	76 YEARS OLD	4	 1.2%
77	77 YEARS OLD	0	
78	78 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
79	79 YEARS OLD	0	
80	80 YEARS OLD	2	 0.6%
81	81 YEARS OLD	2	 0.6%
82	82 YEARS OLD	0	
83	83 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
84	84 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
85	85 YEARS OLD	0	
86	86 YEARS OLD	0	
87	87 YEARS OLD	0	
88	88 YEARS OLD	1	 0.3%
89	89 YEARS OLD	0	
90	90 YEARS OLD	0	
91	91 YEARS OLD	0	
92	92 YEARS OLD	0	
93	93 YEARS OLD	0	
94	94 YEARS OLD	0	
95	95 YEARS OLD	0	
96	96 YEARS OLD	0	
97	97 YEARS OLD	0	
98	98 YEARS OLD	0	
99	99 OR OVER	0	
0	REFUSED OR NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2437	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

v3040: SEX OF RESPONDENT

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=2436 /-]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	SEX:

# v3040: SEX OF RESPONDENT			
Notes		Q12 in the documentation.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	MALE	161	49.5%
2	FEMALE	164	50.5%
0	NOT INTERVIEWED IN REFERENDUM SURVEY	2436	
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4001: 1979 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.8] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.967 /-] [StdDev=0.32 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979 NATIONAL CROSS-SECTION WEIGHT	
Notes		NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 2670. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4002: 1979 FILTER:1			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979 CROSS-SECTION FILTER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1979 CROSS-SECTION	17	0.6%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1979 CROSS-SECTION	2744	99.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4003: 1979 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.83] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.165 /-] [StdDev=0.412 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979 MARITIME CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 455. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4004: 1979 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.75] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.207 /-] [StdDev=0.445 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979 ATLANTIC PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 573. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4005: 1979 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.61] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	

# v4005: 1979 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979 PRAIRIE PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 448. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2325	<div></div> 84.2%
0.88		117	<div></div> 4.2%
0.94		108	<div></div> 3.9%
1.11		184	<div></div> 6.7%
1.28		10	<div></div> 0.4%
1.36		5	<div></div> 0.2%
1.61		12	<div></div> 0.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4006: 1979 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.59] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979 WESTERN PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 726. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2052	<div></div> 74.3%
0.88		117	<div></div> 4.2%
0.94		108	<div></div> 3.9%
1		257	<div></div> 9.3%
1.1		184	<div></div> 6.7%
1.28		10	<div></div> 0.4%
1.36		5	<div></div> 0.2%
1.45		16	<div></div> 0.6%
1.59		12	<div></div> 0.4%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4007: 1980 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.91] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.647 /-] [StdDev=0.561 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 NATIONAL CROSS-SECTION WEIGHT	
Notes		NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 1786. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4008: 1980 FILTER:1			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	

# v4008: 1980 FILTER:1			
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 CROSS-SECTION FILTER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1980 CROSS-SECTION	1013	<div></div> 36.7%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1980 CROSS-SECTION	1748	<div></div> 63.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4009: 1980 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2.28] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.109 /-] [StdDev=0.359 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 MARITIME CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 300. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4010: 1980 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2.17] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.136 /-] [StdDev=0.386 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 375. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4011: 1980 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.74] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 271. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2495	<div></div> 90.4%
0.77		81	<div></div> 2.9%
0.98		66	<div></div> 2.4%
1.12		8	<div></div> 0.3%
1.2		107	<div></div> 3.9%
1.42		1	<div></div> 0.0%
1.74		3	<div></div> 0.1%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4012: 1980 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.8] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.166 /-] [StdDev=0.384 /-]	

# v4012: 1980 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1980 WESTERN PROVINCE CROSS-SECTION SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 457. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4013: P74-79-80 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.44] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.313 /-] [StdDev=0.531 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979-1980 NATIONAL PANEL WEIGHTS		
Notes	NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 865. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4014: P74-79-80 FILTER:1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979-1980 PANEL FILTER		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1974-1979-1980 PANEL	1939	<div></div> 70.2%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1974-1979-1980 PANEL	822	<div></div> 29.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4015: P74-79-80 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.7] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.0531 /-] [StdDev=0.253 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 147. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4016: P74-79-80 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.63] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.068 /-] [StdDev=0.276 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979-1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 188. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4017: P74-79-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.33] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

# v4017: P74-79-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1974-1979-1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 147. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2614	<div><div></div></div> 94.7%
0.77		48	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
0.84		45	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
1.33		54	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4018: P74-79-80 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.24] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1974-1979-1980 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 226. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2535	<div><div></div></div> 91.8%
0.72		48	<div><div></div></div> 1.7%
0.78		45	<div><div></div></div> 1.6%
1.13		79	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
1.24		54	<div><div></div></div> 2.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4019: P74-79 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.47] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.49 /-] [StdDev=0.594 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1974-1979 NATIONAL PANEL WEIGHTS	
Notes		NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 1353. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4020: P74-79 FILTER:1			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1974-1979 PANEL FILTER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1974-1979 PANEL	1466	<div><div></div></div> 53.1%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1974-1979 PANEL	1295	<div><div></div></div> 46.9%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v4021: P74-79 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.33] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.0893 /-] [StdDev=0.306 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 247. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4022: P74-79 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.28] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.113 /-] [StdDev=0.335 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 313. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4023: P74-79 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.21] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 228. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2530	<div></div> 91.6%
0.82		72	<div></div> 2.6%
0.87		68	<div></div> 2.5%
1.21		91	<div></div> 3.3%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4024: P74-79 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.23] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1979 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 338. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2421	<div></div> 87.7%
0.73		72	<div></div> 2.6%
0.78		68	<div></div> 2.5%
1.08		91	<div></div> 3.3%

# v4024: P74-79 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1.23		109	<div></div> 3.9%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4025: P79-80 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.91] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.641 /-] [StdDev=0.561 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1979-1980 PANEL WEIGHTS		
Notes	NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 1770. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4026: P79-80 FILTER:1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1979-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 296. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1979-1980 PANEL	1030	<div></div> 37.3%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1979-1980 PANEL	1731	<div></div> 62.7%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4027: P79-80 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2.28] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.107 /-] [StdDev=0.357 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1979-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 296. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4028: P79-80 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2.17] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.134 /-] [StdDev=0.384 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1979-1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 370. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4029: P79-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.74] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		

# v4029: P79-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979-1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 271. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2495	<div><div></div></div> 90.4%
0.77		81	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
0.98		66	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
1.12		8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
1.2		107	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
1.42		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
1.74		3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4030: P79-80 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.8] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1979-1980 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS	
Notes		THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 456. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2315	<div><div></div></div> 83.8%
0.8		81	<div><div></div></div> 2.9%
0.95		170	<div><div></div></div> 6.2%
1.01		66	<div><div></div></div> 2.4%
1.16		8	<div><div></div></div> 0.3%
1.24		107	<div><div></div></div> 3.9%
1.38		10	<div><div></div></div> 0.4%
1.46		1	<div><div></div></div> 0.0%
1.8		3	<div><div></div></div> 0.1%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4031: P74-80 NATIONAL WEIGHT			
Information		[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.44] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.314 /-] [StdDev=0.532 /-]	
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1974-1980 PANEL WEIGHTS	
Notes		NATIONAL SAMPLE WEIGHTS. THE NATIONAL SAMPLE IS WEIGHTED BY PROVINCE. TO FORM A VALID NATIONAL SAMPLE, THESE WEIGHTS MUST BE USED. THE EFFECTIVE NATIONAL SAMPLE SIZE USING THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE IS 866. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.	
# v4032: P74-80 FILTER:1			
Information		[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]		[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]	

# v4032: P74-80 FILTER:1			
Universe		All respondents	
Literal question		1974-1980 PANEL FILTER	
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF 1974-1980 PANEL	1936	<div></div> 70.1%
1	CASE IS PART OF 1974-1980 PANEL	825	<div></div> 29.9%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			

# v4033: P74-80 MARITIME WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.7] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.0536 /-] [StdDev=0.254 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1980 MARITIME PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 148. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4034: P74-80 ATLANTIC WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.63] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.0684 /-] [StdDev=0.277 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1980 ATLANTIC PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA, NEW BRUNSWICK AND NEWFOUNDLAND ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUBSAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 189. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
# v4035: P74-80 PRAIRIE WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.33] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1980 PRAIRIE PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 147. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2614	<div></div> 94.7%
0.77		48	<div></div> 1.7%
0.84		45	<div></div> 1.6%
1.33		54	<div></div> 2.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4036: P74-80 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.24] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	1974-1980 WESTERN PROVINCE PANEL SUB-SAMPLE WEIGHTS		
Notes	THIS WEIGHT VARIABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY WHEN THE WESTERN PROVINCES, MANITOBA, SASKATCHEWAN, ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE ANALYZED TOGETHER AS AN INDEPENDENT SUB-SAMPLE. THESE WEIGHTS PRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE SUB-SAMPLE SIZE OF 226. CONTAINS TWO DECIMAL PLACES.		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2535	<div></div> 91.8%
0.72		48	<div></div> 1.7%
0.78		45	<div></div> 1.6%
1.13		79	<div></div> 2.9%

# v4036: P74-80 WESTERN WEIGHT			
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1.24		54	<div></div> 2.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v4037: QUEBEC REFERENDUM WEIGHT			
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1.45] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=0.121 /-] [StdDev=0.334 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	REFERENDUM WEIGHT		
Notes	ALL REFERENDUM INTERVIEWS HAVE A WEIGHT OF 1 EXCEPT YOUTH SUPPLEMENT CASES WHO HAVE A WEIGHT OF 1.45. ALL OTHER CASES ARE WEIGHTED 0. THE WEIGHTED N IS 335.		
# v4038: QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER:1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Literal question	QUEBEC REFERENDUM FILTER		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	CASE IS NOT PART OF THE QUEBEC REFERENDUM STUDY	2436	<div></div> 88.2%
1	CASE IS PART OF THE QUEBEC REFERENDUM STUDY	325	<div></div> 11.8%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v5001: ICPSR STUDY NUMBER-8079			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 8079-8079] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
8079		2761	<div></div> 100.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v5002: ICPSR EDITION NUMBER-1			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-1] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		2761	<div></div> 100.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			
# v5003: ICPSR PART NUMBER-001			
Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-1] [Missing=*]		
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]		
Universe	All respondents		
Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		2761	<div></div> 100.0%
Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.			