Canada

John Meisel, Queen's University

Canadian Election Study, 1968

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-1968

Table of Contents

Canadian Election Study, 1968 (CES 1968)
Étude électorale canadienne 1968

Overview

Type	Canadian Election Study
Identification	CES-E-1968
Series	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. 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. 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.

Abstract
Data for this study were obtained from a probability cross-section sample of 2,767 adults interviewed following the June 1968 federal election. There are 530 variables in the dataset.
Besides basic background information, questions were asked about reactions to the election outcome, evaluations of the parties and candidates, regional conflicts within Canada and a wide variety of issues that were salient during the campaign.

Kind of Data	Survey data
Unit of Analysis	Individuals

Scope & Coverage

Keywords	Debate, Leaders, Candidates, Votes, Voting, Media
Topics	Election, Politics, Public Opinion
Countries	Canada

Geographic Coverage
Canada, Provinces

Universe
Canadian Electorate

Producers & Sponsors

Primary Investigator(s)	John Meisel, Queen's University
Other Producer(s)	Institute for Social Research (ISR) , York University , Distributor
Funding Agency/ies	Elections Canada

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates	CES 2011 Mail Back Survey: single 2011 CES 2011 Campaign Period Survey: single 2011-03-26 CES 2011 Web Survey: single 2011-05

CES 2011 Post Election Survey: single 2011-05-03

Accessibility

Distributor(s)	Canadian Opinion Research Archive

Citation Requirements

Publications based on CES data collection should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic ciations. 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

Disclaimer

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	2767
# Variable(s)	457

Variables Group(s)

Dataset contains 33 group(s)

Group Geographic Variables

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var001	Province	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
2	var004	Constituency	continuous	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-

Group Respondent Identification

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var003	Respondent identification number	continuous	numeric-4.0	2767	0	-

Group Collectivity/Political Leader Evaluation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var485	Rate clergymen from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2711	56	Clergymen
2	var486	Rate right wingers from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2630	137	Right Wingers
3	var487	Rate French Canadians from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2701	66	French Canadians
4	var488	Rate whites from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2707	60	Whites
5	var489	Rate Roman Catholics from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2709	58	Roman Catholics
6	var490	Rate Russians from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2638	129	Russians
7	var491	Rate labour unions from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2671	96	Labour unions
8	var492	Rate Englishmen from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2695	72	Englishmen
9	var493	Rate policemen from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2705	62	Policemen
10	var494	Rate people with ancestry other than British or French from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2667	100	People whose ancestors come from countries other than Britain or France
11	var495	Rate big business from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2685	82	Big business
12	var496	Rate Jews from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2694	73	Jews
13	var497	Rate Americans from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2704	63	Americans
14	var498	Rate Protestants from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2702	65	Protestants
15	var499	Rate left wingers from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2585	182	Left wingers
16	var500	Rate English Canadians from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2704	63	English Canadians
17	var501	Rate the military from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2694	73	Military

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
18	var502	Rate Negroes from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2700	67	Negroes
19	var503	Rate atheists from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2567	200	Athiests
20	var505	Rate Lester Pearson from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2706	61	Lester Pearson
21	var506	Rate Ontario Premier Robarts from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2694	73	Ontario's Premier Robarts
22	var507	Rate Marcel Faribault from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2641	126	Marcel Faribault
23	var508	Rate former U.S. president from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2636	131	U.S. President Lyndon Johnson
24	var509	Rate General de Gaulle from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2474	293	General de Gaulle
25	var510	Rate Dalton Camp from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2634	133	Dalton Camp
26	var511	Rate Rene Levesque from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2631	136	Rene Levesque
27	var512	Rate Newfoundland's Premier Smallwood from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2682	85	Newfoundland's Premier Joey Smallwood
28	var513	Rate Diefenbaker from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2699	68	John G. Diefenbaker
29	var514	Rate Daniel Johnson from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2601	166	Quebec's Premier Daniel Johnson
30	var515	Rate Thatcher from 0 to 100	discrete	numeric-2.0	2675	92	Saskatchewan's Premier Thatcher

Group Debate

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var395	Did you watch TV debate between leaders	discrete	numeric-1.0	2695	72	First, did you watch the TV "debate" among the leaders before the election?
2	var396	Who gained in your eyes because of debate	discrete	numeric-1.0	1474	1293	Who gained most in your eyes as a result of the debate?
3	var397	Whom did you like least	discrete	numeric-1.0	1299	1468	Whom did you like least?

Group Demographics

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var323	What is your marital status	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	Are you married, widowed, separated, divorced, or are you single?
2	var324	What is your occupation	discrete	numeric-1.0	1681	1086	What is your occupation?
3	var325	What kind of work do you actually do	discrete	numeric-1.0	2763	4	-
4	var326	In what type of business do you work	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	In what type of business do you work?
5	var327	What do you do there	discrete	numeric-1.0	1613	1154	-
6	var328	Who is your family main wage earner	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	Who usually is your family's main wage earner?
7	var329	Main wage earner's occupation	discrete	numeric-1.0	1070	1697	What is the main earner's occupation.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
8	var330	What kind of work does he actually do	discrete	numeric-1.0	2756	11	-
9	var331	In what type of business does he work	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	In what type of business does (he/she) work?
10	var332	What does he do there	discrete	numeric-1.0	430	2337	-
11	var333	How many years of school did you attend	continuous	numeric-2.0	2743	24	How many years of school did you attend?
12	var334	What is the highest grade you reached	discrete	numeric-2.0	2764	3	What is the highest grade of school you reached?
13	var335	Was any of your education in a separate school	discrete	numeric-1.0	2653	114	Did you take any of your primary or secondary education in a church-affiliated or "separate" school?
14	var336	What language did you study at college	discrete	numeric-1.0	2744	23	Did you ever attend University or College?
15	var337	How many years did father attend school	discrete	numeric-2.0	2426	341	How many years of school did your father attend? Your best guess will do.
16	var338	Which social class are you in	discrete	numeric-1.0	2766	1	Do you ever think of yourself as belonging to a social class?
17	var339	If you were to choose which class are in	discrete	numeric-1.0	2689	78	var339 question details
18	var340	What is your religion	discrete	numeric-2.0	2763	4	What is your religion?
19	var341	How often do you attend church	discrete	numeric-1.0	2760	7	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?
20	var342	Which other language do you speak at home	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	Which one?
21	var343	What other language do you speak at work	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	Which one?
22	var344	What language do you speak with your friends	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	What language do you usually speak with your friends?
23	var345	What is the religion of your spouse	discrete	numeric-2.0	2765	2	What is your husband's (wife's) religion?
24	var346	How often does your spouse attend church	discrete	numeric-1.0	2735	32	How often does he (she) attend church (synagogue)?
25	var347	Your mother's religion in your youth	discrete	numeric-2.0	2765	2	What was your mother's religion when you were growing up?
26	var348	Your father's religion in your youth	discrete	numeric-2.0	2765	2	What was your father's religion when you were growing up?
27	var349	Mother's interest in her religion	discrete	numeric-1.0	2684	83	Do you remember whether she was very much interested in her religion, somewhat interested, or didn't pay much attention to it?
28	var350	Father's interest in his religion	discrete	numeric-1.0	2598	169	Do you remember whether he was very much interested in his religion, somewhat interested, or didn't pay much attention to it?
29	var351	Proportion of your friends of your religion	discrete	numeric-1.0	2497	270	What proportion of your friends have the same religion as you?
30	var352	In what country were you born	discrete	numeric-2.0	2766	1	In what county were you born?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
31	var353	In what year did you move to Canada	continuous	numeric-2.0	2725	42	In what year did you come to live in Canada?
32	var354	Approximation of year moved to Canada	discrete	numeric-1.0	2763	4	Was it between 1960 and 1968? Between 1946 and 1960? between 1939 and 1945? Or before 1939?
33	var355	Country from which most ancestors came	discrete	numeric-2.0	2756	11	Please tell me from what country most of your ancestors came.
34	var356	Before North America where did ancestors come from	discrete	numeric-2.0	675	2092	And before that, where did most of your ancestors come from?
35	var357	Language most often spoken at home	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	What language do you speak most often at home
36	var358	Which other language is spoken at home	discrete	numeric-1.0	2639	128	Do you speak any other language at home?
37	var359	Which language do you speak most at work	discrete	numeric-1.0	2217	550	Which language do you speak most at work?
38	var360	Do you speak any other language at work	discrete	numeric-1.0	2162	605	Do you speak any other language at work?
39	var361	What language do you speak with friends	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	What language do you usually speak with your friends?
40	var362	During schooling where did you live	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	24	During most of your school years, where did you live - mostly in a city or suburb, mostly in a village or small town, or mostly on a farm?

Group Demographics II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var401	Sex of respondent	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
2	var402	Language respondent answered in	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
3	var403	What is your age	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	Estimated age
4	var404	Income group of your family last year	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	Into which of the following groups did the total income for your family fall last year (before taxes)?
5	var405	Income group of your family last year	discrete	numeric-1.0	2758	9	-
6	var406	-	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-

Group Election Results

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var005	Surprise at election results	discrete	numeric-1.0	2673	94	Were you surprised by the results of last June's election?
2	var006	Pleased or upset by outcome	discrete	numeric-1.0	2766	1	-

Group Financial State

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var112	Satisfaction with your financial state	discrete	numeric-1.0	2754	13	One of the things in which we are also interested is to find out how people are getting along financially these days. As far as you and your family

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							are concerned, would you say that you are pretty well satisfied, more or less satisfied, or not at all satisfied?
2	var113	Financial state as compared with last year	discrete	numeric-1.0	2745	22	Would you say that you and your family are better off, or worse off financially than you were a year ago?
3	var114	Predict your financial state next year	discrete	numeric-1.0	2489	278	Do you think that a year from now you and your family will be better off or worse off financially, or just about the same as you are now?
4	var115	Effect of election result on how well off you are	discrete	numeric-1.0	2319	448	Do you think that the way the election turned out will make any difference in how well off you are?
5	var116	Last three years any unemployment in family	discrete	numeric-1.0	2752	15	During the last three years, have you or any member of your family been unemployed and looking for permanent work?

Group Importance of Institutions

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var516	Importance of Members of Parliament in Ottawa	discrete	numeric-2.0	2706	61	Members of Parliament In Ottawa
2	var517	Importance of Provincial Legislatures	discrete	numeric-2.0	2704	63	Members of Provincial Legislatures
3	var518	Importance of the Prime Minister of Canada	discrete	numeric-2.0	2712	55	The Prime Minister of Canada
4	var519	Importance of Provincial Premiers	discrete	numeric-2.0	2703	64	Provincial Premiers
5	var520	Importance of Cabinet Ministers in federal government	discrete	numeric-2.0	2694	73	Federal Cabinet Ministers
6	var521	Importance of provincial Cabinet Ministers	discrete	numeric-2.0	2690	77	Provincial Cabinet Ministers
7	var522	Importance of the Queen	discrete	numeric-2.0	2672	95	The Queen
8	var523	Importance of the Governor General	discrete	numeric-2.0	2676	91	The Governor General
9	var524	Importance of your local mayor	discrete	numeric-2.0	2679	88	Your Local Mayor
10	var525	Importance of federal civil servants	discrete	numeric-2.0	2686	81	Federal Civil Servants
11	var526	Importance of judges	discrete	numeric-2.0	2701	66	Judges
12	var527	Importance of the armed forces	discrete	numeric-2.0	2694	73	Armed Forces
13	var528	Importance of the police	discrete	numeric-2.0	2712	55	The Police
14	var529	Importance of the Supreme Court	discrete	numeric-2.0	2690	77	The Supreme Court

Group Interest in Election

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var085	Amount of interest in last June's election	discrete	numeric-1.0	2759	8	Some people don't pay much attention to elections. How about you - would you

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested or not much interested in last June's election?

Group Issues

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var011	Importance of problem of Medicare	discrete	numeric-1.0	2742	25	-
2	var012	Importance of problem of welfare and child welfare	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
3	var013	Importance of problem of unemployment	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
4	var014	Importance of problem of housing	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
5	var015	Importance of problem of inflation/ cost of living	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
6	var016	Importance of problem of regional inequality	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
7	var017	Importance of problem of wheat sales	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
8	var018	Importance of problem of youth	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
9	var019	Importance of problem of Quebec Confederation, including separatism	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
10	var020	Importance of problem of foreign policy	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
11	var021	Importance of problem of taxes	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
12	var022	Importance of problem of education	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
13	var023	Importance of problem of with political systems, including majority government	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
14	var024	Importance of problem of labour	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
15	var025	Importance of problem of other economic problems, including poverty	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
16	var026	Importance of problem of minority groups other than French Canadians	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
17	var027	Importance of problem of other social policy	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
18	var028	Importance of farm problems	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
19	var029	Importance of other problems	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
20	var030	Don't know importance of problems	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
21	var031	Most important problem	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
22	var032	Next most important problem	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
23	var033	Degree of worry over problem	discrete	numeric-1.0	2755	12	Just how strongly would you say you feel about (NAME PROBLEM): are you extremely worried, fairly worried or just concerned about it?
24	var034	What government should do about it	discrete	numeric-2.0	702	2065	-
25	var035	Which if any party could accomplish this	discrete	numeric-1.0	2658	109	-
26	var036	Degree of worry over problem	discrete	numeric-1.0	2743	24	-
27	var037	What government should do about it	discrete	numeric-2.0	603	2164	-
28	var038	Which if any party could accomplish this	discrete	numeric-1.0	2637	130	-
29	var039	Level of government handling Canada's most important problems	discrete	numeric-1.0	2418	349	Not all of Canada's problems are, as you know, handled by the Federal Government in Ottawa. Which government would you say handles the most important problems facing Canada today: the Federal Government in Ottawa, the Provincial Governments or the local authorities here in _____ ?
30	var040	Government most important as affects you and your family	discrete	numeric-1.0	2506	261	As far as you are concerned personally, which government is most important in affecting how you and your family get on: the one in Ottawa, the one in this province or your local government?

Group Issues II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var289	Canada should abolish the monarchy	discrete	numeric-1.0	2436	331	Canada should abolish the monarchy
2	var290	Canada's constitution should be changed	discrete	numeric-1.0	2202	565	Canada's constitution should be changed
3	var291	Homosexuals should be imprisoned	discrete	numeric-1.0	2380	387	Homosexuals should be imprisoned
4	var292	Canada should with draw its troops from Europe	discrete	numeric-1.0	2238	529	Canada should withdraw its troops from Europe
5	var293	Too much money is spent on churches	discrete	numeric-1.0	2376	391	Too much money is being spent on churches in Canada
6	var294	Canada and US should join together as one	discrete	numeric-1.0	2556	211	Canada and the United States should join together as one country
7	var295	Communists should be outlawed	discrete	numeric-1.0	2498	269	Communists should be outlawed
8	var296	Good idea to try to abolish death penalty	discrete	numeric-1.0	2508	259	It was a good idea to try to abolish the death penalty
9	var297	Illegal strikes should be broken by police	discrete	numeric-1.0	2529	238	Illegal strikes should be broken up by the police
10	var298	Canada needs less severe divorce laws	discrete	numeric-1.0	2490	277	Canada needs less severe divorce laws
11	var299	Canada would be better if all were same religion	discrete	numeric-1.0	2507	260	Canada would be a better place if all people had the same religion

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
12	var300	Canada would be better if all had one national origin	discrete	numeric-1.0	2486	281	Canada would be a better place if all people had the same national origin
13	var301	Good idea to unify the armed forces	discrete	numeric-1.0	2178	589	It was a good idea to unify the armed forces
14	var302	Provincial governments shoud participate in international educational conferences	discrete	numeric-1.0	2258	509	Provincial governments should participate at international educational conferences
15	var303	Maintain peace keeping forces overseas	discrete	numeric-1.0	2446	321	Canada should continue providing peacekeeping forces overseas
16	var304	Non-involved in problems of other countries	discrete	numeric-1.0	2482	285	Canada should not get involved in the problems of other countries
17	var305	How many of every 100 speak only French	discrete	numeric-2.0	2477	290	Thinking now of the total population in Canada, how many out of every 100 Canadaians would you guess are able to speak only French?
18	var306	How do you feel about Quebec separating	discrete	numeric-1.0	2734	33	Are you in favour of separation or opposed to it? Please tell me whether you are in favour of separation, slightly in favour, undecided, slightly opposed, or strongly opposed to separation.
19	var307	Do you think Quebec will separate in future	discrete	numeric-1.0	2163	604	Do you think that Quebec will separate some time in the future?
20	var308	Per cent of Quebcois vote for separation	discrete	numeric-2.0	2506	261	Suppose a vote were taken in Quebec tomorrow on the question of separation, about what percentage of the voters in Quebec do you think would vote for separation?
21	var309	Job of federal government if Quebec voted to separate	discrete	numeric-2.0	2102	665	-
22	var310	Job of federal government if Quebec voted to separate	discrete	numeric-2.0	111	2656	-
23	var311	Which is most dangerous to Canada's survival	discrete	numeric-1.0	2585	182	Which of the following is the most dangerous to the survival of Canada:
24	var312	Which is least dangerous to Canada's survival	discrete	numeric-1.0	2394	373	Which, of the remaining four, is the least dangerous to Canada?
25	var313	What is your interest in foreign affairs	discrete	numeric-1.0	2665	102	Are you extremely interested, very interested, fairly interestd, or not too interested in foreign affairs?
26	var314	Canada should become more involved in Latin America	discrete	numeric-1.0	2560	207	Canada should become more involved in Latin America.
27	var315	Level of military forces not necessary	discrete	numeric-1.0	2677	90	Canada does not need to maintain its present level of military forces.
28	var316	Canada and Communist China should establish closer relations	discrete	numeric-1.0	2629	138	Canada should establish closer relations with Communist China.
29	var317	Canada should reduce its foreign aid	discrete	numeric-1.0	2603	164	Canada should reduce its foreign aid.
30	var318	Canada should send forces to Vietnam to help US	discrete	numeric-1.0	2683	84	Canada should send militiry forces to help the United States in Vietnam.
31	var319	US continue to use Canadian bases and air space	discrete	numeric-1.0	2296	471	Canada should continue to give the United States the use of Canadian bases and air space.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
32	var320	Canada's foreign policy should be more independent of US	discrete	numeric-1.0	2663	104	Canada's foreign policy should be more independent of the United States.
33	var321	Increase number of immigrants from Asia and Africa	discrete	numeric-1.0	2637	130	Canada should encourage an increase in the number of immigrants from Asia and Africa.
34	var322	Party closest to views on foreign policy	discrete	numeric-2.0	2748	19	Taking foreign policy as a whole, which party is closest to your views?

Group Issues and Government Involvement

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var041	Importance of Medicare in affecting your vote	discrete	numeric-1.0	2702	65	In deciding what to do about voting, in this election, was Medicare extremely important to you, very important, fairly important or not too important?
2	var042	When if ever should Medicare be started	discrete	numeric-1.0	972	1795	-
3	var043	Party closest to your views on Medicare	discrete	numeric-2.0	688	2079	Which party comes closest to your views on Medicare?
4	var044	Party you most disagree with on Medicare	discrete	numeric-2.0	434	2333	With which party do you disagree most on Medicare?
5	var045	Importance of social welfare as election issue	discrete	numeric-1.0	2700	67	Would you say that in thinking about the election the issue of social welfare in general was extemely important to you, very important, fairly important, or not too important?
6	var046	Assess amount of work done in welfare	discrete	numeric-1.0	1112	1655	-
7	var047	Party closest to your views on welfare	discrete	numeric-2.0	783	1984	Which of the political parties comes closest to your views on welfare in general?
8	var048	Party you most disagree with on welfare	discrete	numeric-2.0	516	2251	With which party do you disagree most on welfare?
9	var049	Influence of economic issues in your vote	discrete	numeric-1.0	2679	88	Were economic issues extremely important, very important, fairly important, not too important to you in making up your mind about your vote in this election?
10	var050	Amount done by government to help economy recently	discrete	numeric-2.0	1579	1188	-
11	var051	Party closest to best handling of economy	continuous	numeric-2.0	1278	1489	Which of the political parties comes closest to your views on the best way to handle the whole economy?
12	var065	Importance of unemployment in voting choice	discrete	numeric-1.0	2745	22	Firstly, could you tell me whether you think each of these problems was extremely important, very important, fairly: important or not too important to you in making up you mind about the election? Let's start with unemployment. How important was it to your decision about this election?
13	var066	Importance of housing in voting choice	discrete	numeric-1.0	2740	27	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
14	var067	Importance of cost of living in voting choice	discrete	numeric-1.0	2757	10	-
15	var068	Importance of inequality between Canadian regions in voting choice	discrete	numeric-1.0	2632	135	-
16	var069	Importance of wheat sale drop in voting choice	discrete	numeric-1.0	2572	195	-
17	var070	Amount done by government to solve unemployment	discrete	numeric-1.0	2707	60	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
18	var071	Amount done by government to solve housing problem	discrete	numeric-1.0	2715	52	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
19	var072	Amount done by government to remedy cost of living	discrete	numeric-1.0	2717	50	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
20	var073	Amount done by government about inequality between regions	discrete	numeric-1.0	2685	82	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
21	var074	Amount done by government about drop in wheat sales	discrete	numeric-1.0	2680	87	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
22	var075	Party closest to views on unemployment	discrete	numeric-2.0	786	1981	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
23	var076	Party closest to views on housing	discrete	numeric-2.0	781	1986	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
24	var077	Party closest to views on cost of living	discrete	numeric-2.0	1045	1722	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
25	var078	Party closest to views on regional inequality	discrete	numeric-2.0	515	2252	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
26	var079	Party closest to view on wheat sale drop	discrete	numeric-2.0	503	2264	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
27	var080	Importance of majority government to you before election	discrete	numeric-1.0	2661	106	Before the election last June, how important to you was the issue of whether Canada should have a majority government i.e. whether one party would have more seats in Parliament than all the others combined? Was this extremely important, very important, fairly important, or not too important?
28	var081	How should Quebec be treated	discrete	numeric-1.0	2657	110	-
29	var082	Imptortance of Quebec issue to you in June election	discrete	numeric-1.0	2675	92	How important was this issue to you in the June election? Would you say it was:
30	var083	Party closest to you on Quebec question	discrete	numeric-2.0	1022	1745	Which party is closest to you on this question?
31	var084	Party you disagree with most on Quebec question	discrete	numeric-2.0	791	1976	With which party do you disagree most on it.

Group Opposition of Bills

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var101	Measure you could take against unfair bill - 1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2523	244	-
2	var102	Measure you could take against unfair bill - 2	discrete	numeric-1.0	639	2128	-
3	var103	What you have done to influence act of Parliament	discrete	numeric-2.0	2761	6	-
4	var104	Member of organization through which could oppose a law	discrete	numeric-2.0	2733	34	What organization do you belong to through which you could oppose a bill in Parliament?
5	var117	Amount of difference which federal political party is in power	discrete	numeric-1.0	2663	104	In your opinion, do you think it makes a great deal of difference, some difference, or no difference which political party is in power in Ottawa?
6	var118	Amount of difference which provincial political party is in power	discrete	numeric-1.0	2570	197	Do you think it makes a great deal of difference, some difference, or no difference which party holds office your provincial legislature?
7	var119	Measure you could take against unfair bil	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
8	var120	Measure you could take against unfair bil	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
9	var121	What organization member of to oppose bill	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-

Group Organization Activity

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var363	As member activity in trade union	discrete	numeric-1.0	2754	13	-
2	var364	Activity in business or professional association	discrete	numeric-1.0	2761	6	-
3	var365	Activity in other occupational group	discrete	numeric-1.0	2747	20	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
4	var366	Activity in fraternal organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2749	18	-
5	var367	Activity in a service club	discrete	numeric-1.0	2757	10	-
6	var368	Activity in a charitable organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2754	13	-
7	var369	Activity in a national organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2742	25	-
8	var370	Activity in a sport and social organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2754	13	-
9	var371	Activity in an entertainment organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2747	20	-
10	var372	Activity in a religious organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2749	18	-
11	var373	Activity in a church organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2755	12	-
12	var374	Activity in Boy Scouts or Girl Guides	discrete	numeric-1.0	2732	35	-
13	var375	Activity in a credit union or co-op	discrete	numeric-1.0	2763	4	-
14	var376	Activity in a regimental or veterans' group	discrete	numeric-1.0	2763	4	-
15	var377	Activity in all other organizations	discrete	numeric-1.0	2763	4	-
16	var378	Total number organizations for respondent	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
17	var379	Activity of spouse in trade union	discrete	numeric-1.0	2685	82	-
18	var380	Activity of spouse in business or professional association	discrete	numeric-1.0	2732	35	-
19	var381	Activity of spouse in other occupational group	discrete	numeric-1.0	2723	44	-
20	var382	Activity of spouse in fraternal organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2719	48	-
21	var383	Activity of spouse in service club	discrete	numeric-1.0	2730	37	-
22	var384	Activity of spouse in charitable organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2729	38	-
23	var385	Activity of spouse in national organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2720	47	-
24	var386	Activity of spouse in sport and social organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2737	30	-
25	var387	Activity of spouse in entertainment organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2721	46	-
26	var388	Activity of spouse in religious organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2724	43	-
27	var389	Activity of spouse in church organization	discrete	numeric-1.0	2730	37	-
28	var390	Activity of spouse in Boy Scouts/ Girl Guides	discrete	numeric-1.0	2707	60	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
29	var391	Activity of spouse in credit union, co-op	discrete	numeric-1.0	2740	27	-
30	var392	Activity of spouse in regimental or veteran's group	discrete	numeric-1.0	2740	27	-
31	var393	Activity of spouse in all other organizations	discrete	numeric-1.0	2741	26	-
32	var394	Total number of organizations for spouse	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-

Group Party Affilitation- Past and Present

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var122	What is your party affiliation	discrete	numeric-2.0	2712	55	Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Liberal, Conservative, N.D.P, Creditiste, Social Credit, Union Nationale, or what?
2	var123	Degree of strength felt towards chosen party	discrete	numeric-1.0	2746	21	HOW strongly (STATE NAME OF CHOSEN PARTY) do you generally feel - very strongly, fairly strongly, or not very strongly?
3	var124	What other party felt close to before	discrete	numeric-2.0	2230	537	Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as closest to any other party in Canada?
4	var125	When transferred closeness of feeling	discrete	numeric-1.0	677	2090	When changed from feeling closer to one party to feeling closer to another?
5	var126	Why did you change parties	discrete	numeric-2.0	750	2017	Why changed party?
6	var127	Party affiliation in provincial politics	discrete	numeric-2.0	2735	32	When you say you are a (STATE NAME OF CHOSEN PARTY) are you thinking of national politics, politics here in this province, or both?
7	var128	Party affiliation in national politics	discrete	numeric-2.0	2754	13	Well, how about politics here in (NAME YOUR OWN PROVINCE)? How do you think them of yourself? (q32b) / Well, how about in national politics? How do you think of yourself? (q32c)
8	var129	Strength of party affiliation	discrete	numeric-1.0	2765	2	How strongly (STATE NAME OF CHOSEN PARTY) do you generally feel - very strongly, fairly strongly, or not very strongly?
9	var130	Which other party have previously felt closest	discrete	numeric-2.0	2765	2	Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as closest to any other party in Canada?
10	var131	When transferred closeness of feeling	discrete	numeric-1.0	0	2767	When did you change from that party to your present one?
11	var132	Why did you change parties	discrete	numeric-2.0	0	2767	What was the main thing that made you change?
12	var133	How do you think of yourself in national politics	discrete	numeric-2.0	2756	11	How do you think of yourself in national politics?
13	var134	Which if any party are you closest	discrete	numeric-2.0	388	2379	Well, do you generally think of yourself as a little closer to one of the parties than the others?
14	var135	Party closest to in provincial politics	discrete	numeric-2.0	2762	5	When you say you feel closer to (NANE PARTY IN Q.34-b), are you thinking of national politics, politics here in the province or both? (q32c)

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
15	var136	Party feel closest to in national politics	discrete	numeric-2.0	2763	4	When you say you feel closer to (NANE PARTY IN Q.34-b), are you thinking of national politics, politics here in the province or both? (q32c)
16	var137	Which party felt closer to at other time	discrete	numeric-2.0	2753	14	Was there ever a time when you felt closer to any other party?
17	var138	When transferred closeness of feeling	discrete	numeric-1.0	57	2710	When did you change from feeling closer to that party?
18	var139	Why did you change parties	discrete	numeric-2.0	69	2698	What was the main thing that made you change?
19	var140	Which party might ever felt close to	discrete	numeric-2.0	219	2548	Was there ever a time when you did think of yourself as closer to one of the parties?
20	var141	When transferred closeness of feeling	discrete	numeric-1.0	50	2717	When did you move away from that party?
21	var142	Why did you change parties	discrete	numeric-2.0	63	2704	What was the main thing that made you move away from that party?

Group Party Leaders

Subgroup(s)	Knowledge Of , Winning Candidate , Ratings , Perception Of , Mentions , Traits

Group Personal Satisfaction

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var007	Satisfaction with life so far	discrete	numeric-1.0	2739	28	Your life so far?
2	var008	Satisfaction with own chance for education	discrete	numeric-1.0	2722	45	And what about the educational opportunities you have had? Would you say that in general you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, a little dissatisfied or quite dissatisfied with them?
3	var009	Satisfaction with way Canada is run	discrete	numeric-1.0	2615	152	What about the way Canada is run?
4	var010	Satisfaction with own future prospects	discrete	numeric-1.0	2564	203	And what about your prospects for the future?

Group Political Efficacy and Cynicism

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var086	Vote is the only way to have a say in how government runs things	discrete	numeric-1.0	2673	94	Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things. Do you agree or disagree?
2	var087	Government does not care what people like me think	discrete	numeric-1.0	2570	197	I don't think that the government cares much what people like me think.
3	var088	Politics and government above my level of understanding	discrete	numeric-1.0	2650	117	Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
4	var089	Have no say about what government does	discrete	numeric-1.0	2635	132	People like me don't have any say about what the government does.
5	var090	Elected representative soon lose touch with the people	discrete	numeric-1.0	2550	217	Generally, those elected to Parliament soon lose touch with the people.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
6	var091	University graduates monopolize government positions	discrete	numeric-1.0	2419	348	People with University degrees take up too large a position in our governments.
7	var092	Difference makes to people what government in Ottawa does	discrete	numeric-1.0	2647	120	How much difference do you think it makes to people like you what the government in Ottawa does: a good deal, some or not much?
8	var093	Correlation between elections and government paying attention to what people think	discrete	numeric-1.0	2663	104	How much do you feel that having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think: a good deal, some or not very much?
9	var094	Punish person who breaks law if against religious principles	discrete	numeric-1.0	2547	220	Should a person who breaks the law be punished? (If law is against his religious principles)
10	var095	Punish person who breaks law if against own fundamental principles	discrete	numeric-1.0	2522	245	Should a person who breaks the law be punished? (If law is against other fundamental principles of his)
11	var096	Quantity of crooks in the government	discrete	numeric-1.0	2500	267	Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are a little crooked, not very many are crooked, do you think hardly any of them are crooked?
12	var097	How much of the tax money is wasted	discrete	numeric-1.0	2611	156	Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?
13	var098	Break given to people by those high in government	discrete	numeric-1.0	2581	186	Do you think that all people who are high in government give everyone a fair break - big shots and ordinary people alike - or do you think some of them pay more attention to what the big interests want?
14	var099	Government people usually know what they are doing	discrete	numeric-1.0	2579	188	Do you feel that almost all of the people running the government are smart people who usually know what they are doing, or do you think that quite a few of then don't seem to know what they are doing?
15	var100	How much of time can trust government to do what is right	discrete	numeric-1.0	2624	143	How much of the time do you think you can trust the government to do what is right- just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?

Group Political Parties

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var223	Rating of Liberal party taken as a whole	discrete	numeric-2.0	2602	165	How would you rate the Liberal party, taken as a whole?
2	var224	Rating of Conservative party taken as a whole	discrete	numeric-2.0	2536	231	-
3	var225	Rating of NDP party taken as a whole	discrete	numeric-2.0	2217	550	-
4	var226	Rating of Creditiste party taken as a whole	discrete	numeric-2.0	527	2240	-
5	var227	Rating of Social Credit party taken as a whole	discrete	numeric-2.0	228	2539	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
6	var228	Rating of Liberal national campaign before election	discrete	numeric-2.0	2476	291	And, finally, what about the Liberals' national campaign before the last election?
7	var229	Rating of Conservative national campaign before election	discrete	numeric-2.0	2409	358	-
8	var230	Rating of NDP national campaign before election	discrete	numeric-2.0	2106	661	-
9	var231	Rating of Creditiste national campaign before election	discrete	numeric-2.0	491	2276	-
10	var232	Rating of Social Credit national campaign before election	discrete	numeric-2.0	223	2544	-

Group Sampling and Study Procedures

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var001	Province	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
2	var002	Community size	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
3	var003	Respondent identification number	continuous	numeric-4.0	2767	0	-
4	var004	Constituency	continuous	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
5	var064	Date of interview	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
6	var256	Question order for q59a2q-q59a14a	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
7	var288	Question order for q65b - q65q	discrete	numeric-3.0	2767	0	-
8	var484	Presentation order of q60a1a - q60a19a	discrete	numeric-3.0	2767	0	-
9	var504	Presentation order of q61a1a - q61a11a	discrete	numeric-3.0	2767	0	-
10	age	Age	continuous	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
11	income	Income	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
12	incom2	Income2	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-

Group Self-Identification

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var282	How do you view Canada	discrete	numeric-1.0	2708	59	Which of these fits your idea of Canada?
2	var283	How do you think of yourself	discrete	numeric-1.0	2730	37	How do you think of yourself?
3	var284	Who has more in common - 1	discrete	numeric-1.0	2284	483	Who would you say have more in common: French Canadians and French people from France; or French Canadians and English Canadians, that is to say English-speaking people of British ancestry?
4	var285	Who has more in common - 2	discrete	numeric-1.0	2267	500	Who has more in common: English Canadians and French Canadians or English Canadians and Americans? Here again English refers to English-speaking people of British ancestry.

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
5	var286	Who has more in common - 3	discrete	numeric-1.0	2267	500	And what about English Canadians and French Canadians or English Canadians and British people-who has more in common?
6	var287	How do you think of yourself	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	How do you think of yourself?

Group Treatment by Institutions

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var105	Different groups or individuals treated differently by courts - 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	2059	708	Different groups or individuals treated differently by the courts?
2	var106	Different groups or individuals treated differently by courts - 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	381	2386	Different groups or individuals treated differently by the courts?
3	var107	How are they treated differently	discrete	numeric-1.0	2466	301	How are they treated differently?
4	var530	How are they treated differently	discrete	numeric-1.0	2701	66	How are they treated differently?
5	var108	Different people treated differently by police	discrete	numeric-2.0	2074	693	-
6	var109	Different people treated differently by police	discrete	numeric-2.0	259	2508	-
7	var110	How are they treated differently	discrete	numeric-1.0	2545	222	How treated differently
8	var111	How are they treated differently	discrete	numeric-1.0	2734	33	How treated differently

Group The Vote

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var233	Most important in voting decision	discrete	numeric-1.0	2625	142	In deciding what you would do in this recent election, which was most important to you: the leaders, the work of the MP's, your local candidate, or the parties as a whole?
2	var234	Next most important in voting decision	discrete	numeric-1.0	2473	294	Which was next most important to you?
3	var235	Least important in voting decision	discrete	numeric-1.0	1989	778	Which would you say was least important?
4	var236	Action if favourite party ran unfavourable candidate	discrete	numeric-1.0	2602	165	What would you be most likely to do? Vote for the candiate anyway? Consider another party's candidate? Or would you probably not vote at all?
5	var237	Action if favourite party had policy unfavourable to you	discrete	numeric-1.0	2532	235	What would you be most likely to do? Vote for the party's candidate anyway? Consider another party's candidate? Or would you probably not vote?
6	var238	Action if favourite party had unfavourable leader	discrete	numeric-1.0	2524	243	What would you do? Vote for that party's candidate anyway? Consider another party's candidate? Or would you probably not vote?
7	var239	Degree of difference between federal political parties	discrete	numeric-1.0	2566	201	Considering everything the parties stand for, would you say that there is

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
							a good deal of difference between the parties, some difference, or not much difference?

Group The Vote II

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var398	What happened in Montreal the night before election	discrete	numeric-2.0	1556	1211	-
2	var399	How did riot influence your vote	discrete	numeric-2.0	1500	1267	How events in Montreal influenced vote?
3	var400	Elections result show French Canadians support Trudeau's ideas on constitution	discrete	numeric-1.0	2032	735	Do you think that the election result shows that French Canadians in Quebec largely support Mr. Trudeau's ideas on the constitution?

Group Voting Behaviour

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var173	Voted in how many federal elections	discrete	numeric-1.0	2758	9	In federal elections since you have been old enough to vote in Canada,including the one held this June, would you say that you have voted in all of them, most of them, some of them, or none of them?
2	var174	What federal party have you always voted for	discrete	numeric-1.0	2617	150	Have you always voted for the same party in federal elections, or have you voted for different parties?
3	var175	Voted in how many provincial elections	discrete	numeric-1.0	2737	30	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?
4	var176	What provincial party have you always voted for	discrete	numeric-1.0	2485	282	In provincial elections, have you always voted for the same party, or have you voted for different parties?
5	var177	Why did you vote for different parties	discrete	numeric-1.0	2723	44	Did you vote for different parties out of choice or because some parties did not contest the election in your province or constituency?
6	var178	Party voted for in last provincial election	discrete	numeric-1.0	2370	397	If you voted, for which party did you happen to vote in the last provincial election?
7	var179	Did you vote in the last election	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	How about you? Did you vote this time or did something keep you from voting?
8	var180	Which party did you vote for	discrete	numeric-1.0	2287	480	For which party did you vote?
9	var181	Was there a particular reason for not voting	discrete	numeric-1.0	392	2375	Was there any particular reason why you didn't vote in the June election?
10	var182	Who would you have voted for	discrete	numeric-1.0	372	2395	Who would you have voted for?
11	var183	Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - first mention	discrete	numeric-2.0	2340	427	Why voted as did in June 1968?
12	var184	Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - second mention	discrete	numeric-2.0	508	2259	Why voted as did in June 1968?

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
13	var185	Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - third mention	discrete	numeric-2.0	83	2684	Why voted as did in June 1968?
14	var186	When did you decide to vote	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	When did you decide to vote?
15	var187	Was decision to vote related to incident	discrete	numeric-1.0	472	2295	When did you decide to vote?
16	var188	Why was the decision to vote not easy - first mention	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	Why not an easy decision?
17	var189	Why was the decision to vote not easy - second mention	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	Why not an easy decision?
18	var190	Which party would be your second choice	discrete	numeric-1.0	2045	722	If at this time you had to vote for one of the other federal parties, which party would you pick?
19	var191	Which party would you least want to vote	discrete	numeric-1.0	2038	729	Which of the federal parties today would you least want to vote for?
20	var192	Which party did you vote for in 1965	discrete	numeric-1.0	2473	294	The last federal election before the one in June was in 1965. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in that election?
21	var193	Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Liberal	discrete	numeric-1.0	152	2615	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
22	var194	Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Conservative	discrete	numeric-1.0	88	2679	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
23	var195	Reasons fro changing vote 1965-1968 NDP	discrete	numeric-1.0	55	2712	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
24	var196	Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Social Credit	discrete	numeric-1.0	25	2742	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
25	var197	Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 other party	discrete	numeric-1.0	0	2767	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
26	var198	Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 other	discrete	numeric-1.0	78	2689	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
27	var199	How did you vote in 1958	discrete	numeric-1.0	2409	358	Were you able to vote in the 1958 election, the one in which Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Pearson opposed one another for the first time?

Group Weights

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	caswgt	Weight	discrete	numeric-6.4	2767	0	-

Group Knowledge Of

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var162	Total known names of candidates	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
2	var163	Total known names with party affiliation	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
3	var164	Total of those candidates heard about	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
4	var165	Total known occupations of candidates	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
5	var166	Total known religions of candidates	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
6	var167	What known of Liberal candidate	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
7	var168	What known of Conservative candidate	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
8	var169	What known of NDP candidate	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
9	var170	What known of Creditiste candidate	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
10	var171	What known of Social Credit candidate	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-
11	var172	What known of other candidates	discrete	numeric-2.0	2767	0	-

Group Winning Candidate

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var143	Name of elected candidate in this riding	discrete	numeric-1.0	2534	233	Do you happen to remember the name of the candidate who was elected to Parliament for this riding in the June 25th election? What is it?
2	var144	What is party	discrete	numeric-1.0	2588	179	Do you happen to know his (her) party? What is it?
3	var145	Have heard or read about winning candididate	discrete	numeric-1.0	1804	963	What have you read or heard about the successful candidate in your riding?
4	var146	Have heard or read about winning candididate	discrete	numeric-1.0	2369	398	What have you read or heard about the successful candidate in your riding?
5	var147	What have you heard or read about them	discrete	numeric-2.0	1085	1682	What heard
6	var148	What have you heard or read about them	discrete	numeric-2.0	474	2293	What heard
7	var149	Was winning candidate already an Member of Parliament before election	discrete	numeric-1.0	2594	173	Has winning candidate in riding been in Parliament before?
8	var150	What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 1	discrete	numeric-2.0	284	2483	-
9	var151	What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 2	discrete	numeric-2.0	58	2709	-
10	var152	What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 3	discrete	numeric-2.0	6	2761	-
11	var153	What has candidate ever done for you or your family	discrete	numeric-2.0	49	2718	What did the member do for you, if in Parliament before?

Group Ratings

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var208	Rating of Trudeau on thermometer	discrete	numeric-2.0	2659	108	How much do you like their leader, Mr. Trudeau? where would you place him on the thermometer?
2	var209	Rating of Stanfield on thermometer	discrete	numeric-2.0	2617	150	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
3	var210	Rating of Douglas on thermometer	discrete	numeric-2.0	2348	419	-
4	var211	Rating of Caouette on thermometer	discrete	numeric-2.0	582	2185	-
5	var212	Rating of Patterson on thermometer	discrete	numeric-2.0	213	2554	-
6	var213	Rating of work in last Parliament of Liberal Members	discrete	numeric-2.0	2534	233	And what about the work of the Liberal Members in the last Parliament? How did you like what they did, taken as a whole?
7	var214	Rating of work in last Parliament of Conservative Members	discrete	numeric-2.0	2498	269	-
8	var215	Rating of work in last Parliament of NDP Members	discrete	numeric-2.0	2153	614	-
9	var216	Rating of work in last Parliament of Creditiste Members	discrete	numeric-2.0	524	2243	-
10	var217	Rating of work in last Parliament of Social Credit Members	discrete	numeric-2.0	224	2543	-
11	var218	Rating of local Liberal candidate in 1968 election	discrete	numeric-2.0	2339	428	How much did you like your local Liberal candidate in the 1968 election?
12	var219	Rating of local Conservative candidate in 1968 election	discrete	numeric-2.0	2223	544	-
13	var220	Rating of local NDP candidate in 1968 election	discrete	numeric-2.0	1839	928	-
14	var221	Rating of local Credisiste candidate in 1968 election	discrete	numeric-2.0	393	2374	-
15	var222	Rating of local Social Credit candidate in 1968 election	discrete	numeric-2.0	201	2566	-

Group Perception Of

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var257	Trudeau is highly intelligent	discrete	numeric-1.0	2549	218	Mr. Trudeau is highly intelligent.
2	var258	Trudeau is tough minded	discrete	numeric-1.0	2255	512	He is tough-minded
3	var259	Trudeau is arrogant	discrete	numeric-1.0	2154	613	He is arrogant
4	var260	Trudeau is able in solving English-French problems	discrete	numeric-1.0	2099	668	He is capable of solving English- French problems in Canada
5	var261	Trudeau is too rigid	discrete	numeric-1.0	2047	720	He is too rigid
6	var262	Trudeau is charming	discrete	numeric-1.0	2376	391	He is charming
7	var263	Trudeau is pro communist	discrete	numeric-1.0	1778	989	He is pro-communist
8	var264	Trudeau has conservative views	discrete	numeric-1.0	2042	725	His views are conservative
9	var265	Trudeau is fair minded	discrete	numeric-1.0	2171	596	He is fair-minded
10	var266	Trudeau is honest	discrete	numeric-1.0	2022	745	He is honest
11	var267	He has inadequate concern for public moral standards	discrete	numeric-1.0	1944	823	He has an inadequate concern for public moral standards

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
12	var268	Trudeau is able to stand up to Quebec	discrete	numeric-1.0	2186	581	He is able to stand up to Quebec
13	var269	Trudeau is progressive	discrete	numeric-1.0	2340	427	He is progressive
14	var270	Stanfield is a man of great integrity	discrete	numeric-1.0	2125	642	Mr. Stanfield is a man of great integrity
15	var271	Stanfield is highly intelligent	discrete	numeric-1.0	2305	462	He is highly intelligent
16	var272	Stanfield has a too slow manner	discrete	numeric-1.0	2244	523	His manner is too slow
17	var273	Stanfield is able in solving English-French problems	discrete	numeric-1.0	1738	1029	He is capable of solving English- French problems in Canada
18	var274	Stanfield is fair minded	discrete	numeric-1.0	2229	538	He is fair-minded
19	var275	Stanfield is too soft on French Canada	discrete	numeric-1.0	1608	1159	He is too soft on French Canada
20	var276	Stanfield has conservative views	discrete	numeric-1.0	2145	622	His views are conservative
21	var277	Stanfield is too quick to make promises	discrete	numeric-1.0	1930	837	He is too quick to make promises
22	var278	Stanfield is honest	discrete	numeric-1.0	2206	561	He is honest
23	var279	Stanfield is under Camp's influence	discrete	numeric-1.0	1273	1494	He is under Dalton Camp's influence
24	var280	Stanfield is better suited for provincial politics	discrete	numeric-1.0	1800	967	He is better suited for provincial than for federal politics
25	var281	Stanfield is progressive	discrete	numeric-1.0	2049	718	He is progressive

Group Mentions

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var052	Total favourable mentions to Trudeau	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
2	var053	Total mentions unfavourable to Trudeau	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
3	var054	Total neutral mentions of Trudeau	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
4	var055	Total positive mentions of Trudeau with policy, party, etc	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
5	var056	Total negative party-policy mentions of Trudeau	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
6	var057	Total neutral party-policy mentions of Trudeau	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
7	var058	Total favourable mentions of Stanfield	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
8	var059	Total unfavourable mentions of Stanfield	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
9	var060	Total neutral mentions of Stanfield	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
10	var061	Total positive mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
11	var062	Total negative mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-
12	var063	Total neutral mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc	discrete	numeric-1.0	2767	0	-

Group Traits

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	var154	What do you like best about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	111	2656	-
2	var155	What do you like best about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	27	2740	-
3	var156	What do you like least about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	12	2755	-
4	var157	What do you like least about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	3	2764	-
5	var158	What do you like best about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	45	2722	-
6	var159	What do you like best about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	2	2765	-
7	var160	What do you like least about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	19	2748	-
8	var161	What do you like least about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	2	2765	-
9	var200	What do you like best about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	498	2269	-
10	var201	What do you like best about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	158	2609	-
11	var202	What do you like least about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	37	2730	-
12	var203	What do you like least about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	4	2763	-
13	var204	What do you like most about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	110	2657	-
14	var205	What do you like most about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	14	2753	-
15	var206	What do you like least about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	58	2709	-
16	var207	What do you like least about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	10	2757	-
17	var240	What do you like best about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	2509	258	-
18	var241	What do you like best about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	1205	1562	-
19	var242	What do you like least about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	2219	548	-
20	var243	What do you like least about Trudeau	discrete	numeric-2.0	264	2503	-

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
21	var244	What do you like most about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	2185	582	-
22	var245	What do you like most about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	538	2229	-
23	var246	What do you like least about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	2075	692	-
24	var247	What do you like least about Stanfield	discrete	numeric-2.0	367	2400	-
25	var248	What do you like best about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	2049	718	-
26	var249	What do you like best about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	562	2205	-
27	var250	What do you like least about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	1806	961	-
28	var251	What do you like least about Douglas	discrete	numeric-2.0	143	2624	-
29	var252	What do you like best about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	1637	1130	-
30	var253	What do you like best about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	280	2487	-
31	var254	What do you like least about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	1618	1149	-
32	var255	What do you like least about Caouette	discrete	numeric-2.0	171	2596	-

Variables Description

Dataset contains 457 variable(s)

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

caswgt: Weight

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		2767	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.

var001: Province

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NEWFOUNDLAND	48	48.0	1.7%
1	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	17	17.0	0.6%
2	NOVA SCOTIA	116	116.0	4.2%
3	NEW BRUNSWICK	99	99.0	3.6%
4	QUEBEC	754	754.0	27.2%
5	ONTARIO	970	970.0	35.1%
6	MANITOBA	139	139.0	5.0%
7	SASKATCHEWAN	139	139.0	5.0%
8	ALBERTA	235	235.0	8.5%
9	BRITISH COLUMBIA	250	250.0	9.0%

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.

var002: Community size

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CITY CORE	360	360.0	13.0%
2	ADJACENT SUBURB	337	337.0	12.2%
3	DISTANT SUBURB	130	130.0	4.7%
4	100-500M	465	465.0	16.8%
5	30-99M	264	264.0	9.5%
6	10-29M	107	107.0	3.9%
7	1-09M	388	388.0	14.0%
8	RURAL NON-FARM	490	490.0	17.7%
9	FARM	226	226.0	8.2%

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.

var003: Respondent identification number

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4195] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	NEWFOUNDLAND	0	
1	PRINCE EDWARD ISL.	1	20.0%
2	NOVA SCOTIA	0	
3	NEW BRUNSWICK	0	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var003: Respondent identification number

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	QUEBEC	0	
5	ONTARIO	1	20.0%
6	MANITOBA	1	20.0%
7	SASKATCHEWAN	1	20.0%
8	ALBERTA	1	20.0%
9	BRITISH COLUMBIA	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.

var004: Constituency

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-88] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	OVER 500M	75	75.0	14.6%
2	100M TO 500M	129	129.0	25.0%
3	30M TO 99.9M	77	77.0	15.0%
4	10M TO 29.9M	48	48.0	9.3%
5	1M TO 9.9M	83	83.0	16.1%
6	RURAL	103	103.0	20.0%

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.

var005: Surprise at election results

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2673 / 2673] [Invalid=94 / 94]
Literal question	Were you surprised by the results of last June's election?
Notes	q1 in the documentation. Done by Queens, CARD 1, Column 12.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	YES	775	775.0	29.0%
2	NO	1898	1898.0	71.0%
3	DON'T KNOW	92	92.0	
4	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var006: Pleased or upset by outcome

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2766 / 2766] [Invalid=1 / 1]
Notes	q2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	PLEASED	1494	1494.0	54.0%
2	PLEASED WITH RESERV	340	340.0	12.3%
3	UPSET	451	451.0	16.3%
4	UPSET WITH QUALIFICN	119	119.0	4.3%
5	DON'T KNOW	229	229.0	8.3%
6	INDIFFERENT	115	115.0	4.2%
7	EXTREMELY PLEASED	11	11.0	0.4%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var006: Pleased or upset by outcome

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8	EXTREMELY DISPLEASED	7	7.0	0.3%
0	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	
9	REFUSED TO ANSWER	0	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.

var007: Satisfaction with life so far

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/6/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2739 / 2739] [Invalid=28 / 28]
Pre-question	Leaving the election aside for a minute, would you say that in general you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, a little dissatisfied, or quite dissatisfied with:
Literal question	Your life so far?
Notes	q3a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VERY SATISFIED	1068	1068.0	39.0%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	1297	1297.0	47.4%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	274	274.0	10.0%
4	QUITE DISSATISFIED	100	100.0	3.7%
5	NO OPINION	27	27.0	
6	NO AN	1	1.0	

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.

var008: Satisfaction with own chance for education

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2722 / 2722] [Invalid=45 / 45]
Literal question	And what about the educational opportunities you have had? Would you say that in general you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, a little dissatisfied or quite dissatisfied with them?
Notes	q3b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VERY SATISFIED	620	620.0	22.8%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	1014	1014.0	37.3%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	666	666.0	24.5%
4	QUITE DISSATISFIED	422	422.0	15.5%
5	NO OPINION	45	45.0	
6	NO AN	0	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.

var009: Satisfaction with way Canada is run

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2615 / 2615] [Invalid=152 / 152]
Literal question	What about the way Canada is run?
Notes	q3c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VERY SATISFIED	255	255.0	9.8%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	1119	1119.0	42.8%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var009: Satisfaction with way Canada is run

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	869	869.0	33.2%
4	QUITE DISSATISFIED	372	372.0	14.2%
5	NO OPINION	148	148.0	
6	NO AN	4	4.0	

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.

var010: Satisfaction with own future prospects

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2564 / 2564] [Invalid=203 / 203]
Literal question	And what about your prospects for the future?
Notes	q3d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VERY SATISFIED	688	688.0	26.8%
2	FAIRLY SATISFIED	1311	1311.0	51.1%
3	LITTLE DISSATISFIED	399	399.0	15.6%
4	QUITE DISSATISFIED	166	166.0	6.5%
5	NO OPINION	200	200.0	
6	NO AN	3	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.

var011: Importance of problem of Medicare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*/2]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2742 / 2742] [Invalid=25 / 25]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 17.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	2241	2241.0	81.7%
1	NO PART PROBLEM	207	207.0	7.5%
3	MEDICARE INCL HOSP	294	294.0	10.7%
2	REFUSED TO ANSWER	25	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.

var012: Importance of problem of welfare and child welfare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 18.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	2275	2275.0	82.2%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var012: Importance of problem of welfare and child welfare

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	MENTIONED	472	472.0	17.1%
2	MOST IMPT	20	20.0	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.

var013: Importance of problem of unemployment

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a3a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 19.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	2137	2137.0	77.2%
1	MENTIONED	623	623.0	22.5%
2	MOST IMPT	7	7.0	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.

var014: Importance of problem of housing

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a4a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 20.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	2049	2049.0	74.1%
1	MENTIONED	711	711.0	25.7%
2	MOST IMPT	6	6.0	0.2%
3		1	1.0	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.

var015: Importance of problem of inflation/ cost of living

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a5a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 21.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	1848	1848.0	66.8%
1	MENTIONED	910	910.0	32.9%
2	MOST IMPT	9	9.0	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.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var016: Importance of problem of regional inequality

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a6a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 22.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2630	2630.0		95.0%
1	MENTIONED	136	136.0	4.9%	
2	MOST IMPT	1	1.0	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.

var017: Importance of problem of wheat sales

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a7a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 23.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2660	2660.0		96.1%
1	MENTIONED	106	106.0	3.8%	
2	MOST IMPT	1	1.0	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.

var018: Importance of problem of youth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a8a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 24.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2691	2691.0		97.3%
1	MENTIONED	75	75.0	2.7%	
2	MOST IMPT	1	1.0	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.

var019: Importance of problem of Quebec Confederation, including separatism

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var019: Importance of problem of Quebec Confederation, including separatism

Notes	q4a9a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 25.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2332	2332.0		84.3%
1	MENTIONED	428	428.0		15.5%
2	MOST IMPT	7	7.0	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.

var020: Importance of problem of foreign policy

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a10a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 26.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2601	2601.0		94.0%
1	MENTIONED	157	157.0	5.7%	
2	MOST IMPT	9	9.0	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.

var021: Importance of problem of taxes

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a11a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 27.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2438	2438.0		88.1%
1	MENTIONED	318	318.0		11.5%
2	MOST IMPT	11	11.0	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.

var022: Importance of problem of education

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a12a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 28.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2485	2485.0		89.8%
1	MENTIONED	280	280.0		10.1%
2	MOST IMPT	2	2.0	0.1%	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var022: Importance of problem of education

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

var023: Importance of problem of with political systems, including majority government

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a13a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 29.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2625	2625.0		94.9%
1	MENTIONED	129	129.0	4.7%	
2	MOST IMPT	11	11.0	0.4%	
3		2	2.0	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.

var024: Importance of problem of labour

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a14a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 30.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2509	2509.0		90.7%
1	MENTIONED	254	254.0	9.2%	
2	MOST IMPT	4	4.0	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.

var025: Importance of problem of other economic problems, including poverty

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a15a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 31.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2409	2409.0		87.1%
1	MENTIONED	324	324.0	11.7%	
2	MOST IMPT	32	32.0	1.2%	
3		2	2.0	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.

var026: Importance of problem of minority groups other than French Canadians

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var026: Importance of problem of minority groups other than French Canadians

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a16a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 32.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2674	2674.0		96.6%
1	MENTIONED	91	91.0	3.3%	
2	MOST IMPT	2	2.0	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.

var027: Importance of problem of other social policy

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a17a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 33.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2657	2657.0		96.0%
1	MENTIONED	103	103.0	3.7%	
2	MOST IMPT	6	6.0	0.2%	
3		1	1.0	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.

var028: Importance of farm problems

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a18a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 26.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NOT MENTIONED	2675	2675.0		96.7%
1	MENTIONED	85	85.0	3.1%	
2	MOST IMPT	7	7.0	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.

var029: Importance of other problems

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var029: Importance of other problems

Notes	q4a19a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 35.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	2539	2539.0	91.8%
1	MENTIONED	208	208.0	7.5%
2	MOST IMPT	20	20.0	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.

var030: Don't know importance of problems

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	If respondent mentions two problems falling within the same category, mark 2 in the appropriate column instead of 1. e.g. respondent mentions two "other social problems": them mark col. 33-2. Code similarly for cases of more than two mentions. None of this can be done in the case of Medicare, because extra numbered codes have already been used in col. 17, but there is not likely to be more than one mention of this.
Notes	q4a20a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 36.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NOT MENTIONED	2760	2760.0	99.7%
1	MENTIONED	7	7.0	0.3%
2	MOST IMPT	0	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.

var031: Most important problem

| Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-19] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q4b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, cols. 37 - 38 most important.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		239	239.0	8.6%
1	MEDICARE	93	93.0	3.4%
2	OTHER WEL INCL CHILD	192	192.0	6.9%
3	UNEMPLOYMENT	291	291.0	10.5%
4	HOUSING	287	287.0	10.4%
5	INFLA COST OF LIVING	515	515.0	18.6%
6	REGIONAL INEQUALITY	53	53.0	1.9%
7	WHEAT SALES	54	54.0	2.0%
8	YOUTH	30	30.0	1.1%
9	QUEBEC IN CONFED	202	202.0	7.3%
10	FOREIGN POLIC Y	47	47.0	1.7%
11	TAXES	132	132.0	4.8%
12	EDUCATION	116	116.0	4.2%
13	PROB SYS INC MAJ GV	50	50.0	1.8%
14	LABOUR	127	127.0	4.6%
15	EC PROB INC POVERTY	161	161.0	5.8%
16	MINORTY GRPS	25	25.0	0.9%
17	OTHER SOC POLICY	30	30.0	1.1%
18	FARM PROBL	49	49.0	1.8%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var031: Most important problem

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
19	OTHER	74	74.0	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.

var032: Next most important problem

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-19] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q4c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, cols. 39 - 40 next most important.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		688	688.0	24.9%
1	MEDICARE	113	113.0	4.1%
2	OTHER WEL INCL CHILD	190	190.0	6.9%
3	UNEMPLOYMENT	219	219.0	7.9%
4	HOUSING	257	257.0	9.3%
5	INFLA COST OF LIVING	306	306.0	11.1%
6	REGIONAL INEQUALITY	52	52.0	1.9%
7	WHEAT SALES	33	33.0	1.2%
8	YOUTH	27	27.0	1.0%
9	QUEBEC IN CONFED	146	146.0	5.3%
10	FOREIGN POLIC Y	61	61.0	2.2%
11	TAXES	130	130.0	4.7%
12	EDUCATION	91	91.0	3.3%
13	PROB SYS INC MAJ GV	46	46.0	1.7%
14	LABOUR	83	83.0	3.0%
15	EC PROB INC POVERTY	126	126.0	4.6%
16	MINORTY GRPS	41	41.0	1.5%
17	OTHER SOC POLICY	44	44.0	1.6%
18	FARM PROBL	33	33.0	1.2%
19	OTHER	81	81.0	2.9%

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.

var033: Degree of worry over problem

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2755 / 2755] [Invalid=12 / 12]
Literal question	Just how strongly would you say you feel about (NAME PROBLEM): are you extremely worried, fairly worried or just concerned about it?
Notes	q4d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2003	2003.0	72.7%
1	EXTREMELY WORRIED	225	225.0	8.2%
2	FAIRLY WORRIED	240	240.0	8.7%
3	JUST CONCERNED	287	287.0	10.4%
4	DONT KNOW	7	7.0	
5	NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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

var034: What government should do about it

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-47] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=702 / 702] [Invalid=2065 / 2065]
Notes	q4e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 1, cols. 42 - 43.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	TAX-RED GOV EXPEND	10	10.0	1.4%
3	-IMPROVE EC COND	1	1.0	0.1%
4	-CHANGE REVISE CODE	55	55.0	7.8%
6	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	61	61.0	8.7%
8	LABOUR REG UNION LDR	11	11.0	1.6%
9	GOV CONTR LABR SIT'N	50	50.0	7.1%
10	OTHER ANTI UNION ST	8	8.0	1.1%
11	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	24	24.0	3.4%
12	GIVE WORKER INCPAY	9	9.0	1.3%
13	OTHER	14	14.0	2.0%
14	OTHER FOC RECOMMEND	54	54.0	7.7%
15	OTHER UNFOC RECOMEN	91	91.0	13.0%
18	ED FAV PUB SEC CONS	1	1.0	0.1%
19	UNFAVORABLE CONLID	1	1.0	0.1%
20	GREATER ACCESS	42	42.0	6.0%
21	REDUCE HIGH EXPEND	2	2.0	0.3%
22	EXPAND SPEC EDUCA'N	7	7.0	1.0%
23	OTHER	39	39.0	5.6%
24	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	15	15.0	2.1%
26	MIN GRP-INTOL RECOM	1	1.0	0.1%
27	TOLERANT RECOMMEND	21	21.0	3.0%
28	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	1	1.0	0.1%
31	FARM-HIGHER PRICES	12	12.0	1.7%
32	INCREASED SUBSIDIES	9	9.0	1.3%
33	OTHER	12	12.0	1.7%
34	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	9	9.0	1.3%
36	SOCIAL OPP 2 GOV ACT	1	1.0	0.1%
37	IN FAVOR OF GOV ACT	12	12.0	1.7%
38	NEUTRAL GOV ACTN	4	4.0	0.6%
39	UNFOCUSED OR OTHER	12	12.0	1.7%
40	POL SYS CHANGE STRUC	7	7.0	1.0%
41	CHANGE BEHAVIOUR	12	12.0	1.7%
42	CHANGE PTY SYSTEM	1	1.0	0.1%
43	OTHER	29	29.0	4.1%
46	OTHER FOCUSED RECOMM	26	26.0	3.7%
47	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	38	38.0	5.4%
0	NO ANSWER	2018	2018.0	
1	DONT KNOW	47	47.0	

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

var035: Which if any party could accomplish this

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2658 / 2658] [Invalid=109 / 109]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2003	2003.0	75.4%
1	NO	334	334.0	12.6%
2	LIBERAL	180	180.0	6.8%
3	PROGRESSIVE CONSER	43	43.0	1.6%
4	NDP	68	68.0	2.6%
5	CREDITISTES	7	7.0	0.3%
6	SOCIAL CREDIT	7	7.0	0.3%
7	OTHER	16	16.0	0.6%
8	DON'T KNOW	105	105.0	
9	NA	4	4.0	

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.

var036: Degree of worry over problem

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 / 2743] [Invalid=24 / 24]
Notes	q4d_2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2092	2092.0	76.3%
1	EXTREMELY WORRIED	147	147.0	5.4%
2	FAIRLY WORRIED	219	219.0	8.0%
3	JUST CONCERNED	285	285.0	10.4%
4	DONT KNOW	9	9.0	
5	NO ANSWER	15	15.0	

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.

var037: What government should do about it

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-47] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=603 / 603] [Invalid=2164 / 2164]
Notes	q4f in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 1, cols. 46 - 47.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	TAX-RED GOV EXPEND	8	8.0	1.3%
3	-IMPROVE EC COND	1	1.0	0.2%
4	-CHANGE REVISE CODE	52	52.0	8.6%
6	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	60	60.0	10.0%
8	LABOUR REG UNION LDR	5	5.0	0.8%
9	GOV CONTR LABR SIT'N	33	33.0	5.5%
10	OTHER ANTI UNION ST	2	2.0	0.3%
11	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	18	18.0	3.0%
12	GIVE WORKER INCPAY	9	9.0	1.5%
13	OTHER	7	7.0	1.2%
14	OTHER FOC RECOMMEND	56	56.0	9.3%

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var037: What government should do about it

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
15	OTHER UNFOC RECOMEN	57	57.0	9.5%
18	ED FAV PUB SEC CONS	0	0.0	
19	UNFAVORABLE CONLID	0	0.0	
20	GREATER ACCESS	32	32.0	5.3%
21	REDUCE HIGH EXPEND	6	6.0	1.0%
22	EXPAND SPEC EDUCA'N	9	9.0	1.5%
23	OTHER	30	30.0	5.0%
24	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	10	10.0	1.7%
26	MIN GRP-INTOL RECOM	1	1.0	0.2%
27	TOLERANT RECOMMEND	26	26.0	4.3%
28	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	5	5.0	0.8%
31	FARM-HIGHER PRICES	6	6.0	1.0%
32	INCREASED SUBSIDIES	7	7.0	1.2%
33	OTHER	10	10.0	1.7%
34	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	5	5.0	0.8%
36	SOCIAL OPP 2 GOV ACT	3	3.0	0.5%
37	IN FAVOR OF GOV ACT	15	15.0	2.5%
38	NEUTRAL GOV ACTN	4	4.0	0.7%
39	UNFOCUSED OR OTHER	16	16.0	2.7%
40	POL SYS CHANGE STRUC	13	13.0	2.2%
41	CHANGE BEHAVIOUR	9	9.0	1.5%
42	CHANGE PTY SYSTEM	0	0.0	
43	OTHER	15	15.0	2.5%
46	OTHER FOCUSED RECOMM	22	22.0	3.6%
47	UNFOCUSED RECOMMEND	51	51.0	8.5%
0	NO ANSWER	2120	2120.0	
1	DONT KNOW	44	44.0	

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.

var038: Which if any party could accomplish this

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2637 / 2637] [Invalid=130 / 130]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2092	2092.0	79.3%
1	NO	261	261.0	9.9%
2	LIBERAL	147	147.0	5.6%
3	PROGRESSIVE CONSER	47	47.0	1.8%
4	NDP	65	65.0	2.5%
5	CREDITISTES	6	6.0	0.2%
6	SOCIAL CREDIT	4	4.0	0.2%
7	OTHER	15	15.0	0.6%
8	DON'T KNOW	109	109.0	
9	NA	21	21.0	

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

var039: Level of government handling Canada's most important problems

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2418 / 2418] [Invalid=349 / 349]
Literal question	Not all of Canada's problems are, as you know, handled by the Federal Government in Ottawa. Which government would you say handles the most important problems facing Canada today: the Federal Government in Ottawa, the Provincial Governments or the local authorities here in _____ ?
Interviewer's instructions	NAME SMALLEST UNIT
Notes	q5 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NA	1	1.0	0.0%
1	FED GOVT	1526	1526.0	63.1%
2	PROV GOVTS	639	639.0	26.4%
3	LOCAL AUTHOR'TYS	184	184.0	7.6%
4	FED AND PROV	31	31.0	1.3%
5	FED AND LOCAL	0	0.0	
6	PROV AND LOCAL	2	2.0	0.1%
7	FED PROV AND LOCAL	35	35.0	1.4%
8	NONE OF THEM	12	12.0	
9	NO OPINION	337	337.0	

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.

var040: Government most important as affects you and your family

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2506 / 2506] [Invalid=261 / 261]
Literal question	As far as you are concerned personally, which government is most important in affecting how you and your family get on: the one in Ottawa, the one in this province or your local government?
Notes	q6 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NA	3	3.0	0.1%
1	FED GOVT	872	872.0	34.8%
2	PROV GOVTS	1095	1095.0	43.7%
3	LOCAL AUTHOR'TYS	429	429.0	17.1%
4	FED AND PROV	40	40.0	1.6%
5	FED AND LOCAL	1	1.0	0.0%
6	PROV AND LOCAL	6	6.0	0.2%
7	FED PROV AND LOCAL	60	60.0	2.4%
8	NONE OF THEM	15	15.0	
9	NO OPINION	246	246.0	

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.

var041: Importance of Medicare in affecting your vote

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2702 / 2702] [Invalid=65 / 65]
Pre-question	As you how, people decide what to do in an election for all sorts of reasons. We shall ask you about several of them, but right now we wouid like to hear your views on some of the issues which have been discussed in Canada in recent years. No one is interested in all issues. If I mention any in which you are not too interested, please say so. It is as important to us to find out what the issues are that people do not care about as the ones they consider very important. Take Medicare for example:

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var041: Importance of Medicare in affecting your vote

Literal question	In deciding what to do about voting, in this election, was Medicare extremely important to you, very important, fairly important or not too important?
Notes	qa7a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	EXTREMELY IMPT	369	369.0		13.7%
2	VERY IMPT	612	612.0		22.6%
3	FAIRLY IMP	594	594.0		22.0%
4	NOT TOO IMPT	1127	1127.0		41.7%
5	NO OPINION	65	65.0		
6	NA	0	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.

var042: When if ever should Medicare be started

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=972 / 972] [Invalid=1795 / 1795]
Notes	qa7b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 1, Col. 52.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LONG AGO	701	701.0		72.1%
2	NOW	191	191.0		19.7%
3	PLENTY OF TIME	19	19.0	2.0%	
4	DON'T NEED IT	39	39.0	4.0%	
5	OTHER APPROVAL	8	8.0	0.8%	
6	OTHER DISAPPROVAL	2	2.0	0.2%	
7	OTHER AMBIVALENT	5	5.0	0.5%	
8	BASED ON NEED	7	7.0	0.7%	
0	NA	1786	1786.0		
9	NO OPINION	9	9.0		

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.

var043: Party closest to your views on Medicare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/30/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=688 / 688] [Invalid=2079 / 2079]
Literal question	Which party comes closest to your views on Medicare?
Notes	qa7c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	347	347.0		50.4%
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSER	116	116.0		16.9%
3	NDP	162	162.0		23.5%
4	CREDITISTES	9	9.0	1.3%	
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	35	35.0	5.1%	
7	UNION NATIONALE	5	5.0	0.7%	
11	LIBERAL AND PC	1	1.0	0.1%	
12	LIBERAL AND NDP	1	1.0	0.1%	
28	ALL EQUAL	3	3.0	0.4%	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var043: Party closest to your views on Medicare

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
29	NONE	9	9.0	1.3%
0	DON'T KNOW	2079	2079.0	
30	REFUSED AN ANSWER	0	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.

var044: Party you most disagree with on Medicare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=434 / 434] [Invalid=2333 / 2333]
Literal question	With which party do you disagree most on Medicare?
Notes	qa7d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIBERAL	114	114.0	26.3%
2	PROG CONS	159	159.0	36.6%
3	NDP	87	87.0	20.0%
4	CREDITISTES	25	25.0	5.8%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	31	31.0	7.1%
7	UNION NATIONALE	4	4.0	0.9%
11	LIBERAL AND PC	3	3.0	0.7%
19	PROV PC'S	2	2.0	0.5%
28	ALL EQUAL	4	4.0	0.9%
29	NONE	5	5.0	1.2%
0	DON'T KNOW	2333	2333.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	0	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.

var045: Importance of social welfare as election issue

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2700 / 2700] [Invalid=67 / 67]
Pre-question	Nbw what about social welfare in general, which also covers things like unemployment insurance, pensions, family allowances, and so on?
Literal question	Would you say that in thinking about the election the issue of social welfare in general was extemely important to you, very important, fairly important, or not too important?
Notes	q8a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	406	406.0	15.0%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	745	745.0	27.6%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	796	796.0	29.5%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	753	753.0	27.9%
5	NO OPINION	66	66.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var046: Assess amount of work done in welfare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1112 / 1112] [Invalid=1655 / 1655]

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var046: Assess amount of work done in welfare

Notes		q8b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 1, Col. 58.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	ENOUGH	275	275.0	24.7%	
2	TOO LITTLE	555	555.0	49.9%	
3	TOO MUCH	102	102.0	9.2%	
4	NEW APPROACH	71	71.0	6.4%	
5	AMBIVALENT	89	89.0	8.0%	
6	CONDITIONLY IN FAVOR	8	8.0	0.7%	
7	OTHER	12	12.0	1.1%	
0	NA	1619	1619.0		
9	NO OPINION	36	36.0		

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.

var047: Party closest to your views on welfare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/30/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=783 / 783] [Invalid=1984 / 1984]
Literal question	Which of the political parties comes closest to your views on welfare in general?
Notes	q8c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	387	387.0	49.4%	
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERV	159	159.0	20.3%	
3	NDP	156	156.0	19.9%	
4	CREDITISTE	15	15.0	1.9%	
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	22	22.0	2.8%	
7	UNION NATIONALE	1	1.0	0.1%	
11	LIBERAL AND PC	5	5.0	0.6%	
20	LIB PC AND NDP	1	1.0	0.1%	
28	ALL THE SAME	8	8.0	1.0%	
29	NONE	29	29.0	3.7%	
0	DON'T KNOW	1984	1984.0		
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	0	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.

var048: Party you most disagree with on welfare

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/30/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=516 / 516] [Invalid=2251 / 2251]
Literal question	With which party do you disagree most on welfare?
Notes	q8d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	114	114.0	22.1%	
2	PROGRESSIVE CONSERV	165	165.0	32.0%	
3	NDP	148	148.0	28.7%	
4	CREDITISTE	21	21.0	4.1%	
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	34	34.0	6.6%	

File : CPS&PES&MBS&WEB_2011_final

var048: Party you most disagree with on welfare

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	LPP COMMUNIST	2	2.0	0.4%
7	UNION NATIONALE	2	2.0	0.4%
11	LIBERAL AND PC	4	4.0	0.8%
15	PC AND SOCIAL CREDIT	1	1.0	0.2%
28	ALL THE SAME	14	14.0	2.7%
29	NONE	11	11.0	2.1%
0	DON'T KNOW	2247	2247.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	4	4.0	

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.

var049: Influence of economic issues in your vote

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2679 / 2679] [Invalid=88 / 88]
Pre-question	How about issues concerning the economy, like unemployment, housing, cost of living, inequality between Canadian regions or the drop in wheat sales?
Literal question	Were economic issues extremely important, very important, fairly important, not too important to you in making up your mind about your vote in this election?
Notes	q9a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	611	611.0	22.8%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	974	974.0	36.4%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	636	636.0	23.7%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	458	458.0	17.1%
5	NO OPINION	87	87.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var050: Amount done by government to help economy recently

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/30/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1579 / 1579] [Invalid=1188 / 1188]
Notes	q9b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 1, Col. 64.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIBERAL	818	818.0	51.8%
2	PC	311	311.0	19.7%
3	NDP	327	327.0	20.7%
4	CREDITISTE	16	16.0	1.0%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	25	25.0	1.6%
7	UNION NATIONALE	0	0.0	
9	NO OPINION	82	82.0	5.2%
10	NO ANSWERVAR051,	0	0.0	
11	LIBERAL AND PC	0	0.0	
12	LIBERAL AND NDP	0	0.0	
13	LIB AND SOC CRED	0	0.0	
14	PC AND NDP	0	0.0	
20	LIB PC AND NDP	0	0.0	
28	ALL THE SAME	0	0.0	
29	NONE	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNOW	1188	1188.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	0	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.

var051: Party closest to best handling of economy

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/8/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1278 / 1278] [Invalid=1489 / 1489]
Literal question	Which of the political parties comes closest to your views on the best way to handle the whole economy?
Notes	q9c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VERY IMPORTANT	725	725.0	62.0%
2	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	285	285.0	24.4%
3	NOT IMPORTANT	159	159.0	13.6%
0	REFUSED	1489	1489.0	
8	DONT KNOW	0	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.

var052: Total favourable mentions to Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In cases where Trudeau is the local candidate, do not count the answers to the questions on page 13 as mentions of Trudeau. Regard these as mentions of the local candidate.
Notes	unda1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 67.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	748	748.0	27.0%
1	ONE	749	749.0	27.1%
2	TWO	566	566.0	20.5%

var052: Total favourable mentions to Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	THREE	329	329.0	11.9%
4	FOUR	185	185.0	6.7%
5	FIVE	99	99.0	3.6%
6	SIX	50	50.0	1.8%
7	SEVEN	22	22.0	0.8%
8	EIGHT	10	10.0	0.4%
9	NINE OR MORE	9	9.0	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.

var053: Total mentions unfavourable to Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In cases where Trudeau is the local candidate, do not count the answers to the questions on page 13 as mentions of Trudeau. Regard these as mentions of the local candidate.
Notes	unda2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 68.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	1439	1439.0	52.0%
1	ONE	915	915.0	33.1%
2	TWO	305	305.0	11.0%
3	THREE	80	80.0	2.9%
4	FOUR	17	17.0	0.6%
5	FIVE	7	7.0	0.3%
6	SIX	2	2.0	0.1%
7	SEVEN	1	1.0	0.0%
8	EIGHT	1	1.0	0.0%
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var054: Total neutral mentions of Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In cases where Trudeau is the local candidate, do not count the answers to the questions on page 13 as mentions of Trudeau. Regard these as mentions of the local candidate.
Notes	unda3a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 69.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	2183	2183.0	78.9%
1	ONE	560	560.0	20.2%
2	TWO	22	22.0	0.8%
3	THREE	2	2.0	0.1%
4	FOUR	0	0.0	
5	FIVE	0	0.0	
6	SIX	0	0.0	
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var055: Total positive mentions of Trudeau with policy, party, etc

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In cases where Trudeau is the local candidate, do not count the answers to the questions on page 13 as mentions of Trudeau. Regard these as mentions of the local candidate.
Notes	unda4a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 70.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NONE	2217	2217.0		80.1%
1	ONE	443	443.0	16.0%	
2	TWO	86	86.0	3.1%	
3	THREE	18	18.0	0.7%	
4	FOUR	3	3.0	0.1%	
5	FIVE	0	0.0		
6	SIX	0	0.0		
7	SEVEN	0	0.0		
8	EIGHT	0	0.0		
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var056: Total negative party-policy mentions of Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In cases where Trudeau is the local candidate, do not count the answers to the questions on page 13 as mentions of Trudeau. Regard these as mentions of the local candidate.
Notes	unda5a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col.71.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NONE	2548	2548.0		92.1%
1	ONE	202	202.0	7.3%	
2	TWO	15	15.0	0.5%	
3	THREE	2	2.0	0.1%	
4	FOUR	0	0.0		
5	FIVE	0	0.0		
6	SIX	0	0.0		
7	SEVEN	0	0.0		
8	EIGHT	0	0.0		
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var057: Total neutral party-policy mentions of Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In cases where Trudeau is the local candidate, do not count the answers to the questions on page 13 as mentions of Trudeau. Regard these as mentions of the local candidate.
Notes	unda6a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 72.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	NONE	2752	2752.0		99.5%
1	ONE	15	15.0	0.5%	

var057: Total neutral party-policy mentions of Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	TWO	0	0.0	
3	THREE	0	0.0	
4	FOUR	0	0.0	
5	FIVE	0	0.0	
6	SIX	0	0.0	
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var058: Total favourable mentions of Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	unda7a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 73.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	1250	1250.0	45.2%
1	ONE	983	983.0	35.5%
2	TWO	377	377.0	13.6%
3	THREE	123	123.0	4.4%
4	FOUR	22	22.0	0.8%
5	FIVE	5	5.0	0.2%
6	SIX	6	6.0	0.2%
7	SEVEN	1	1.0	0.0%
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var059: Total unfavourable mentions of Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	unda8a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 74.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	1387	1387.0	50.1%
1	ONE	959	959.0	34.7%
2	TWO	332	332.0	12.0%
3	THREE	66	66.0	2.4%
4	FOUR	18	18.0	0.7%
5	FIVE	3	3.0	0.1%
6	SIX	2	2.0	0.1%
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var060: Total neutral mentions of Stanfield

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

var060: Total neutral mentions of Stanfield

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]			
Notes	unda9a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 75.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	2754	2754.0	99.5%
1	ONE	13	13.0	0.5%
2	TWO	0	0.0	
3	THREE	0	0.0	
4	FOUR	0	0.0	
5	FIVE	0	0.0	
6	SIX	0	0.0	
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var061: Total positive mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]			
Notes	unda10a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 76.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	2570	2570.0	92.9%
1	ONE	182	182.0	6.6%
2	TWO	15	15.0	0.5%
3	THREE	0	0.0	
4	FOUR	0	0.0	
5	FIVE	0	0.0	
6	SIX	0	0.0	
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var062: Total negative mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]			
Notes	unda11a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 77.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	2543	2543.0	91.9%
1	ONE	215	215.0	7.8%
2	TWO	8	8.0	0.3%
3	THREE	1	1.0	0.0%
4	FOUR	0	0.0	
5	FIVE	0	0.0	
6	SIX	0	0.0	
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	

var062: Total negative mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var063: Total neutral mentions of Stanfied with policy, party, etc

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	unda12a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 1, Col. 78.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	2765	2765.0	99.9%
1	ONE	2	2.0	0.1%
2	TWO	0	0.0	
3	THREE	0	0.0	
4	FOUR	0	0.0	
5	FIVE	0	0.0	
6	SIX	0	0.0	
7	SEVEN	0	0.0	
8	EIGHT	0	0.0	
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var064: Date of interview

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	intdate in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	UP TO INCL AUG 21 68	10	10.0	0.4%
2	AUG22 TO SEPT26 68	1668	1668.0	60.3%
3	SEPT27 T0 END OCT68	874	874.0	31.6%
4	NOV AND DEC 1968	147	147.0	5.3%
5	JANI 69 TO END APR69	1	1.0	0.0%
6	-4NETO SEPT 1969	67	67.0	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.

var065: Importance of unemployment in voting choice

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2745 / 2745] [Invalid=22 / 22]
Pre-question	I'll mention the five particular economic problems again. They are: unemployment, housing, cost of living, the inequality between Canadian regions and the drop in sales of wheat.
Literal question	Firstly, could you tell me whether you think each of these problems was extremely important, very important, fairly: important or not too important to you in making up you mind about the election? Let's start with unemployment. How important was it to your decision about this election?
Post-question	REPEAT FOR EACH ITEM LISTED BELOW - ASK QUESTIONS 10-b) AND -c) ONLY FOR EACH ITEM DESCRIBED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR EACH ITEM LISTED BELOW
Notes	q10a_1 in the documentation.

var065: Importance of unemployment in voting choice

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1182	1182.0	43.1%
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	487	487.0	17.7%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	540	540.0	19.7%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	285	285.0	10.4%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	251	251.0	9.1%
5	NO OPINION	22	22.0	
6	NO ANS	0	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.

var066: Importance of housing in voting choice

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 / 2740] [Invalid=27 / 27]
Notes	q10a_2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1182	1182.0	43.1%
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	464	464.0	16.9%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	577	577.0	21.1%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	317	317.0	11.6%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	200	200.0	7.3%
5	NO OPINION	25	25.0	
6	NO ANS	2	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.

var067: Importance of cost of living in voting choice

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2757 / 2757] [Invalid=10 / 10]
Notes	q10a_3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1182	1182.0	42.9%
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	835	835.0	30.3%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	574	574.0	20.8%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	133	133.0	4.8%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	33	33.0	1.2%
5	NO OPINION	9	9.0	
6	NO ANS	1	1.0	

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.

var068: Importance of inequality between Canadian regions in voting choice

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2632 / 2632] [Invalid=135 / 135]
Notes	q10a_4 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1182	1182.0	44.9%
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	268	268.0	10.2%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	416	416.0	15.8%

var068: Importance of inequality between Canadian regions in voting choice

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	383	383.0	14.6%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	383	383.0	14.6%
5	NO OPINION	131	131.0	
6	NO ANS	4	4.0	

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.

var069: Importance of wheat sale drop in voting choice

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2572 / 2572] [Invalid=195 / 195]
Notes	q10a_5 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1182	1182.0	46.0%
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	274	274.0	10.7%
2	VERY IMPORTANT	412	412.0	16.0%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	330	330.0	12.8%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	374	374.0	14.5%
5	NO OPINION	188	188.0	
6	NO ANS	7	7.0	

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.

var070: Amount done by government to solve unemployment

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2707 / 2707] [Invalid=60 / 60]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
Notes	q10b_1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1740	1740.0	64.3%
1	TOO LITTLE	684	684.0	25.3%
2	RIGHT AMT	231	231.0	8.5%
3	INTERFERED TOO MUCH	48	48.0	1.8%
5	OTHER	4	4.0	0.1%
4	NO OPINION	60	60.0	

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.

var071: Amount done by government to solve housing problem

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2715 / 2715] [Invalid=52 / 52]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
Notes	q10b_2 in the documentation.

var071: Amount done by government to solve housing problem

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1726	1726.0	63.6%
1	TOO LITTLE	784	784.0	28.9%
2	RIGHT AMT	139	139.0	5.1%
3	INTERFERED TOO MUCH	66	66.0	2.4%
5	OTHER	0	0.0	
4	NO OPINION	52	52.0	

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.

var072: Amount done by government to remedy cost of living

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2717 / 2717] [Invalid=50 / 50]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
Notes	q10b_3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1358	1358.0	50.0%
1	TOO LITTLE	1152	1152.0	42.4%
2	RIGHT AMT	138	138.0	5.1%
3	INTERFERED TOO MUCH	69	69.0	2.5%
5	OTHER	0	0.0	
4	NO OPINION	50	50.0	

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.

var073: Amount done by government about inequality between regions

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2685 / 2685] [Invalid=82 / 82]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
Notes	q10b_4 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2083	2083.0	77.6%
1	TOO LITTLE	451	451.0	16.8%
2	RIGHT AMT	110	110.0	4.1%
3	INTERFERED TOO MUCH	41	41.0	1.5%
5	OTHER	0	0.0	
4	NO OPINION	82	82.0	

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.

var074: Amount done by government about drop in wheat sales

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2680 / 2680] [Invalid=87 / 87]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.

var074: Amount done by government about drop in wheat sales

Literal question	Would you tell me whether you think that in the last few years the government has done too little to solve (INSERT PROBLEMS(S) MENTIONED AS EXTREMELY OR VERY IMPORTANT IN Q10a), that it has done just about the right amount, or that it interfered too much?
Notes	q10b_5 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		2081	2081.0		77.6%
1	TOO LITTLE	440	440.0		16.4%
2	RIGHT AMT	114	114.0		4.3%
3	INTERFERED TOO MUCH	45	45.0		1.7%
5	OTHER	0	0.0		
4	NO OPINION	87	87.0		

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.

var075: Party closest to views on unemployment

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=786 / 786] [Invalid=1981 / 1981]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
Notes	q10c_1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	419	419.0		53.3%
2	PC	167	167.0		21.2%
3	NDP	140	140.0		17.8%
4	CREDITISTE	10	10.0		1.3%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	24	24.0		3.1%
7	UNION NATIONALE	0	0.0		
11	LIB AND PC	3	3.0		0.4%
12	LIB AND NDP	1	1.0		0.1%
14	PC AND NDP	0	0.0		
19	PROVINCIAL MP'S	0	0.0		
28	ALL EQUAL	3	3.0		0.4%
29	NONE	19	19.0		2.4%
0	NO OPINION	1979	1979.0		
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	2	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.

var076: Party closest to views on housing

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=781 / 781] [Invalid=1986 / 1986]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
Notes	q10c_2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	399	399.0		51.1%
2	PC	169	169.0		21.6%
3	NDP	149	149.0		19.1%

var076: Party closest to views on housing

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	CREDITISTE	8	8.0	1.0%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	21	21.0	2.7%
7	UNION NATIONALE	0	0.0	
11	LIB AND PC	3	3.0	0.4%
12	LIB AND NDP	1	1.0	0.1%
14	PC AND NDP	0	0.0	
19	PROVINCIAL MP'S	0	0.0	
28	ALL EQUAL	5	5.0	0.6%
29	NONE	26	26.0	3.3%
0	NO OPINION	1984	1984.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	2	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.

var077: Party closest to views on cost of living

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1045 / 1045] [Invalid=1722 / 1722]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
Notes	q10c_3 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIBERAL	541	541.0	51.8%
2	PC	229	229.0	21.9%
3	NDP	183	183.0	17.5%
4	CREDITISTE	16	16.0	1.5%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	28	28.0	2.7%
7	UNION NATIONALE	0	0.0	
11	LIB AND PC	5	5.0	0.5%
12	LIB AND NDP	0	0.0	
14	PC AND NDP	0	0.0	
19	PROVINCIAL MP'S	0	0.0	
28	ALL EQUAL	5	5.0	0.5%
29	NONE	38	38.0	3.6%
0	NO OPINION	1717	1717.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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.

var078: Party closest to views on regional inequality

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=515 / 515] [Invalid=2252 / 2252]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
Notes	q10c_4 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIBERAL	280	280.0	54.4%
2	PC	111	111.0	21.6%

var078: Party closest to views on regional inequality

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	NDP	86	86.0	16.7%
4	CREDITISTE	6	6.0	1.2%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	11	11.0	2.1%
7	UNION NATIONALE	1	1.0	0.2%
11	LIB AND PC	3	3.0	0.6%
12	LIB AND NDP	0	0.0	
14	PC AND NDP	1	1.0	0.2%
19	PROVINCIAL MP'S	0	0.0	
28	ALL EQUAL	3	3.0	0.6%
29	NONE	13	13.0	2.5%
0	NO OPINION	2248	2248.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	4	4.0	

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.

var079: Party closest to view on wheat sale drop

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=503 / 503] [Invalid=2264 / 2264]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "extremely important" or "very important" for each respective issue in q10a.
Literal question	And, which party comes closest to your views on it?
Notes	q10c_5 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIBERAL	226	226.0	44.9%
2	PC	177	177.0	35.2%
3	NDP	71	71.0	14.1%
4	CREDITISTE	1	1.0	0.2%
5	SOCIAL CREDIT	11	11.0	2.2%
7	UNION NATIONALE	0	0.0	
11	LIB AND PC	4	4.0	0.8%
12	LIB AND NDP	0	0.0	
14	PC AND NDP	0	0.0	
19	PROVINCIAL MP'S	0	0.0	
28	ALL EQUAL	4	4.0	0.8%
29	NONE	9	9.0	1.8%
0	NO OPINION	2261	2261.0	
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	3	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.

var080: Importance of majority government to you before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2661 / 2661] [Invalid=106 / 106]
Literal question	Before the election last June, how important to you was the issue of whether Canada should have a majority government i.e. whether one party would have more seats in Parliament than all the others combined? Was this extremely important, very important, fairly important, or not too important?
Notes	q11 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	901	901.0	33.9%

var080: Importance of majority government to you before election

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY IMPT	919	919.0	34.5%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	431	431.0	16.2%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	410	410.0	15.4%
5	NO OPINION	101	101.0	
6	NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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.

var081: How should Quebec be treated

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2657 / 2657] [Invalid=110 / 110]
Notes	q12a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Col. 30.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	SAME AS OTHERS	2208	2208.0	83.1%
2	SPECIAL POSITION	370	370.0	13.9%
3	EXTREME HOST1LE RESP	3	3.0	0.1%
4	OTHER HOSTILE RESP	3	3.0	0.1%
5	OTHER AMBIVALENT	41	41.0	1.5%
6	OTHER SYMPATHETIC	18	18.0	0.7%
7	SEPARATE STATE	6	6.0	0.2%
8	OTHER	8	8.0	0.3%
0	NA	4	4.0	
9	NO OPINION	106	106.0	

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.

var082: Imptortance of Quebec issue to you in June election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/5/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2675 / 2675] [Invalid=92 / 92]
Literal question	How important was this issue to you in the June election? Would you say it was:
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST AND POINT TO SHEET ONE ON WHIE SHEETS
Notes	q12b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	494	494.0	18.5%
2	VERY IMPT	721	721.0	27.0%
3	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	742	742.0	27.7%
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	718	718.0	26.8%
5	DON'T KNOW	91	91.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var083: Party closest to you on Quebec question

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1022 / 1022] [Invalid=1745 / 1745]
Literal question	Which party is closest to you on this question?
Notes	q12c in the documentation.

var083: Party closest to you on Quebec question

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	674	674.0		65.9%
2	PC	210	210.0		20.5%
3	NDP	63	63.0		6.2%
4	CREDITISTE	12	12.0		1.2%
5	SOC CREDIT	20	20.0		2.0%
7	UNION NAT	2	2.0		0.2%
8	RIN	1	1.0		0.1%
9	MSA	2	2.0		0.2%
11	LIB AND PC	3	3.0		0.3%
28	ALL THE SAME	11	11.0		1.1%
29	NONE	24	24.0		2.3%
0	DON'T KNOW	1744	1744.0		
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	1	1.0		

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.

var084: Party you disagree with most on Quebec question

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=791 / 791] [Invalid=1976 / 1976]
Literal question	With which party do you disagree most on it.
Notes	q12d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	LIBERAL	190	190.0		24.0%
2	PC	281	281.0		35.5%
3	NDP	117	117.0		14.8%
4	CREDITISTE	102	102.0		12.9%
5	SOC CREDIT	37	37.0		4.7%
6	LPP COMMUN	1	1.0		0.1%
7	UNION NAT	7	7.0		0.9%
8	RIN	4	4.0		0.5%
9	MSA	1	1.0		0.1%
11	LIB AND PC	6	6.0		0.8%
14	PC AND NDP	3	3.0		0.4%
16	NDP AND CREDITISTE	1	1.0		0.1%
17	CREDITISTE AND SC	3	3.0		0.4%
18	SEPARATISTE	8	8.0		1.0%
28	ALL THE SAME	10	10.0		1.3%
29	NONE	20	20.0		2.5%
0	DON'T KNOW	1975	1975.0		
30	REFUSED NO ANSWER	1	1.0		

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.

var085: Amount of interest in last June's election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/4/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2759 / 2759] [Invalid=8 / 8]
Literal question	Some people don't pay much attention to elections. How about you - would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested or not much interested in last June's election?

var085: Amount of interest in last June's election

Notes	q13 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VERY MUCH INTERESTED	1219	1219.0	44.2%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	972	972.0	35.2%
3	NOT MUCH INTERESTED	568	568.0	20.6%
4	DON'T KNOW	6	6.0	
5	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var086: Vote is the only way to have a say in how government runs things

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2673 / 2673] [Invalid=94 / 94]
Pre-question	Now I'd 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 agrree or disagree.
Literal question	Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things. Do you agree or disagree?
Interviewer's instructions	DO NOT ACCEPT "YES" OR "NO" ANSWERS- ASK FOR EACH IF THE RESPONDENT AGREES OR DISAGREES.
Notes	q14a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	2116	2116.0	79.2%
2	DISAGREE	557	557.0	20.8%
3	DON'T KNOW	93	93.0	
4	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var087: Government does not care what people like me think

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2570 / 2570] [Invalid=197 / 197]
Literal question	I don't think that the government cares much what people like me think.
Notes	q14b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1166	1166.0	45.4%
2	DISAGREE	1404	1404.0	54.6%
3	DON'T KNOW	191	191.0	
4	NO ANSWER	6	6.0	

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.

var088: Politics and government above my level of understanding

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2650 / 2650] [Invalid=117 / 117]
Literal question	Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
Notes	q14c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1919	1919.0	72.4%
2	DISAGREE	731	731.0	27.6%
3	DON'T KNOW	95	95.0	

var088: Politics and government above my level of understanding

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	NO ANSWER	22	22.0	

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.

var089: Have no say about what government does

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2635 / 2635] [Invalid=132 / 132]
Literal question	People like me don't have any say about what the government does.
Notes	q14d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1291	1291.0	49.0%
2	DISAGREE	1344	1344.0	51.0%
3	DON'T KNOW	116	116.0	
4	NO ANSWER	16	16.0	

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.

var090: Elected representative soon lose touch with the people

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2550 / 2550] [Invalid=217 / 217]
Literal question	Generally, those elected to Parliament soon lose touch with the people.
Notes	q14e in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1551	1551.0	60.8%
2	DISAGREE	999	999.0	39.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	212	212.0	
4	NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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.

var091: University graduates monopolize government positions

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2419 / 2419] [Invalid=348 / 348]
Literal question	People with University degrees take up too large a position in our governments.
Notes	q14f in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	843	843.0	34.8%
2	DISAGREE	1576	1576.0	65.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	346	346.0	
4	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var092: Difference makes to people what government in Ottawa does

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2647 / 2647] [Invalid=120 / 120]
Literal question	How much difference do you think it makes to people like you what the government in Ottawa does: a good deal, some or not much?
Notes	q15 in the documentation.

var092: Difference makes to people what government in Ottawa does

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	A GOOD DEAL	1492	1492.0		56.4%
2	SOME	651	651.0		24.6%
3	NOT MUCH	504	504.0		19.0%
4	DON'T KNOW	107	107.0		
5	NO ANSWER	13	13.0		

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.

var093: Correlation between elections and government paying attention to what people think

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2663 / 2663] [Invalid=104 / 104]
Literal question	How much do you feel that having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think: a good deal, some or not very much?
Notes	q16 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	A GOOD DEAL	1304	1304.0		49.0%
2	SOME	815	815.0		30.6%
3	NOT MUCH	544	544.0		20.4%
4	DON'T KNOW	101	101.0		
5	NO ANSWER	3	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.

var094: Punish person who breaks law if against religious principles

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2547 / 2547] [Invalid=220 / 220]
Literal question	Should a person who breaks the law be punished? (If law is against his religious principles)
Notes	q17 in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Col. 45.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	SHOULD	1766	1766.0		69.3%
2	SHOULD NOT	639	639.0		25.1%
3	DEPENDS 0N OFFENSE	76	76.0	3.0%	
4	AMBIVALENT	35	35.0	1.4%	
8	OTHER	31	31.0	1.2%	
0	NA	4	4.0		
9	NO OPINION	216	216.0		

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.

var095: Punish person who breaks law if against own fundamental principles

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2522 / 2522] [Invalid=245 / 245]
Literal question	Should a person who breaks the law be punished? (If law is against other fundamental principles of his)
Notes	q18 in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Col. 46.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	SHOULD	1923	1923.0		76.2%
2	SHOULD NOT	485	485.0		19.2%
3	DEPENDS 0N OFFENSE	69	69.0	2.7%	

var095: Punish person who breaks law if against own fundamental principles

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	AMBIVALENT	21	21.0	0.8%
8	OTHER	24	24.0	1.0%
0	NA	0	0.0	
9	NO OPINION	245	245.0	

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.

var096: Quantity of crooks in the government

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2500 / 2500] [Invalid=267 / 267]
Pre-question	I would now like to ask you a slightly different question: Here are some ideas people have about the government in Ottawa. How do you feel? These opinions do not refer to any political party in particular, but just to the government in general. For example :
Literal question	Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are a little crooked, not very many are crooked, do you think hardly any of them are crooked?
Notes	q19a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	QUITE A FEW	662	662.0	26.5%
2	NOT VERY MANY	1025	1025.0	41.0%
3	HARDLY ANY NONE	813	813.0	32.5%
4	DON'T KNOW	263	263.0	
5	NO ANSWER	4	4.0	

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.

var097: How much of the tax money is wasted

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2611 / 2611] [Invalid=156 / 156]
Literal question	Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?
Notes	q19b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	A LOT	1192	1192.0	45.7%
2	SOME	1187	1187.0	45.5%
3	NOT MUCH NOT ANY	232	232.0	8.9%
4	DON'T KNOW	138	138.0	
5	NO ANSWER	18	18.0	

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.

var098: Break given to people by those high in government

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/4/3]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2581 / 2581] [Invalid=186 / 186]
Literal question	Do you think that all people who are high in government give everyone a fair break - big shots and ordinary people alike - or do you think some of them pay more attention to what the big interests want?
Notes	q19c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	GIVE ALL FAIR BREAK	272	272.0	10.5%
2	BIG SHOTS	2309	2309.0	89.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	182	182.0	

var098: Break given to people by those high in government

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	NA	4	4.0	

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.

var099: Government people usually know what they are doing

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/4/3]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2579 / 2579] [Invalid=188 / 188]
Literal question	Do you feel that almost all of the people running the government are smart people who usually know what they are doing, or do you think that quite a few of then don't seem to know what they are doing?
Notes	q19d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	MOST KNOW	1318	1318.0	51.1%
2	FEW DON'T KNOW	1261	1261.0	48.9%
3	DON'T KNOW	182	182.0	
4	NA	6	6.0	

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.

var100: How much of time can trust government to do what is right

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/4/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2624 / 2624] [Invalid=143 / 143]
Literal question	How much of the time do you think you can trust the government to do what is right- just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?
Notes	q19e in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	ALWAYS	227	227.0	8.7%
2	MOST OF THE TIME	1374	1374.0	52.4%
3	SOME OF THE TIME	1021	1021.0	38.9%
6	NONE OF THE TIME	2	2.0	0.1%
4	DON'T KNOW	108	108.0	
5	NO ANSWER	35	35.0	

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.

var101: Measure you could take against unfair bill - 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2523 / 2523] [Invalid=244 / 244]
Notes	q20a1a in the documentation. Done by Queens, Card 2, Col. 52, first mention.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOTHING	959	959.0	38.0%
2	CONTACT MP	741	741.0	29.4%
3	CONTACT REP	92	92.0	3.6%
4	CONTACT OTHER CITZ	131	131.0	5.2%
5	CONTACT PM	11	11.0	0.4%
6	CONTACT MIN IN CHARG	17	17.0	0.7%
7	CONTACT MASS MEDIA	27	27.0	1.1%
8	PETITION DIRECT ACTN	233	233.0	9.2%
9	OTHER	312	312.0	12.4%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	244	244.0	

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.

var102: Measure you could take against unfair bill - 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=639 / 639] [Invalid=2128 / 2128]
Notes	q20a2a in the documentation. Done by Queens, Card 2, Col. 53, second mention. (Col. 77 third mention, Col. 78, fourth mention)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOTHING	1	1.0	0.2%
2	CONTACT MP	113	113.0	17.7%
3	CONTACT REP	10	10.0	1.6%
4	CONTACT OTHER CITZ	137	137.0	21.4%
5	CONTACT PM	34	34.0	5.3%
6	CONTACT MIN IN CHARG	21	21.0	3.3%
7	CONTACT MASS MEDIA	49	49.0	7.7%
8	PETITION DIRECT ACTN	187	187.0	29.3%
9	OTHER	87	87.0	13.6%

var102: Measure you could take against unfair bill - 2

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2128	2128.0	

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.

var103: What you have done to influence act of Parliament

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-40] [Missing=*/0/40]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 / 2761] [Invalid=6 / 6]
Notes	q20b in the documentation. Done by Queens, Card 2, Cols. 54-55.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOTHING	2519	2519.0	91.2%
2	CONTACT MP	28	28.0	1.0%
3	CONTACT REP	2	2.0	0.1%
4	CONTACT OTHER CITIZN	35	35.0	1.3%
5	CONTACT PM	5	5.0	0.2%
6	CONTACT MIN COMMIT	5	5.0	0.2%
7	CONTACT MASS MEDIA	0	0.0	
8	PETITION DIRECT ACTN	58	58.0	2.1%
9	OTHER OR UNSPECIF'D	73	73.0	2.6%
10	MP PLUS OTHER CITIZN	5	5.0	0.2%
11	MP PLUS PM	2	2.0	0.1%
12	MP AND MINISTER	0	0.0	
13	MP AND MASS MEDIA	0	0.0	
14	MP AND PETITION	3	3.0	0.1%
15	MP AND OTHER	2	2.0	0.1%
16	REP AND OTHER CITN	0	0.0	
17	REP AND PM	0	0.0	
18	REP AND MINISTER	0	0.0	
19	REP AND MEDIA	0	0.0	
20	REP AND DIRECT ACTN	1	1.0	0.0%
21	REP AND OTHER	0	0.0	
22	OTHER CITIZEN AND PM	2	2.0	0.1%
23	OTHER CITZN MINISTER	1	1.0	0.0%
24	OTHER CITIZENMEDIA	0	0.0	
25	OTHER CITZN PETITION	6	6.0	0.2%
26	OTHER CITIZEN OTHER	1	1.0	0.0%
27	PM AND MINISTER	0	0.0	
28	PM AND MEDIA	0	0.0	
29	PM AND PETITION	0	0.0	
30	PM AND OTHER	0	0.0	
31	MINISTER AND MEDIA	0	0.0	
32	MINISTER AND PETIT'N	0	0.0	
33	MINISTER AND OTHER	0	0.0	
34	MEDIA AND PETITION	0	0.0	
35	MEDIA AND OTHER	0	0.0	
36	PETITION AND OTHER	6	6.0	0.2%
37	OTHER AND OTHER	2	2.0	0.1%

var103: What you have done to influence act of Parliament

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
38	THREE MENTIONS	2	2.0	0.1%
39	FOUR MENTION OR MORE	3	3.0	0.1%
0	NO ANSWER	3	3.0	
40	CAN'T REMEMBER	3	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.

var104: Member of organization through which could oppose a law

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-19] [Missing=*/0/2]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2733 / 2733] [Invalid=34 / 34]
Literal question	What organization do you belong to through which you could oppose a bill in Parliament?
Notes	q20c1c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Cols. 56, 57, and also 79 (for the total number of groups mentioned).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO NONE	2276	2276.0	83.3%
3	TRADE UNION	89	89.0	3.3%
4	BUS OR PROF ORGANIZN	84	84.0	3.1%
5	OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	35	35.0	1.3%
6	FRATERNAL GROUP	6	6.0	0.2%
7	SERVICE CLUB	9	9.0	0.3%
8	CHARITABLE OR HEALT	10	10.0	0.4%
9	NATIONAL	18	18.0	0.7%
10	SPORT OR SOCIAL	18	18.0	0.7%
11	ENTERTAINMENT	3	3.0	0.1%
12	RELIGIOUS	10	10.0	0.4%
13	CHURCH GROUPS	42	42.0	1.5%
14	BOY SCOUTS GIRL GUID	0	0.0	
15	CREDIT UNIONS COOPS	2	2.0	0.1%
16	VETERAN'S GROUP	25	25.0	0.9%
17	POLITICAL PARTY	50	50.0	1.8%
18	NON-PARTISAN POL GRP	23	23.0	0.8%
19	OTHER	33	33.0	1.2%
0	NOT SPECIFIED	10	10.0	
2	DON'T KNOW	24	24.0	

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.

var105: Different groups or individuals treated differently by courts - 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-20] [Missing=*/0/19]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2059 / 2059] [Invalid=708 / 708]
Literal question	Different groups or individuals treated differently by the courts?
Notes	q21a1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 2, Cols. 58-59 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	881	881.0	42.8%
2	RICH	474	474.0	23.0%
3	POOR	167	167.0	8.1%
4	DIFFREGN CANADA	13	13.0	0.6%

var105: Different groups or individuals treated differently by courts - 1

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	YOUNG	13	13.0	0.6%
6	MORE MATUR ADULT	1	1.0	0.0%
7	ETHNIC-OR REL GRPS	174	174.0	8.5%
8	POLICE MAG LOCAL DIF	14	14.0	0.7%
9	HIPPIES SOC OUTCASTS	13	13.0	0.6%
10	DRUNKARDS	4	4.0	0.2%
11	IMPT WELL KNOW PEOP	110	110.0	5.3%
12	ORDINARY MAN	16	16.0	0.8%
13	LESS EDUCATED	6	6.0	0.3%
14	MORE EDUCATED	10	10.0	0.5%
15	PEOPLE WITH CONNECTN	28	28.0	1.4%
16	POLITICANS	5	5.0	0.2%
17	FRCANADIANS	10	10.0	0.5%
18	LA PEGRE	34	34.0	1.7%
20	OTHER	86	86.0	4.2%
0	DNK	573	573.0	
19	NOT SPECIFIED	135	135.0	

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.

var106: Different groups or individuals treated differently by courts - 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-20] [Missing=*/0/19]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=381 / 381] [Invalid=2386 / 2386]
Literal question	Different groups or individuals treated differently by the courts?
Notes	q21a2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 2, Cols. 60-61 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	0	0.0	
2	RICH	74	74.0	19.4%
3	POOR	112	112.0	29.4%
4	DIFFREGN CANADA	2	2.0	0.5%
5	YOUNG	8	8.0	2.1%
6	MORE MATUR ADULT	0	0.0	
7	ETHNIC-OR REL GRPS	58	58.0	15.2%
8	POLICE MAG LOCAL DIF	3	3.0	0.8%
9	HIPPIES SOC OUTCASTS	5	5.0	1.3%
10	DRUNKARDS	0	0.0	
11	IMPT WELL KNOW PEOP	31	31.0	8.1%
12	ORDINARY MAN	13	13.0	3.4%
13	LESS EDUCATED	9	9.0	2.4%
14	MORE EDUCATED	12	12.0	3.1%
15	PEOPLE WITH CONNECTN	10	10.0	2.6%
16	POLITICANS	1	1.0	0.3%
17	FRCANADIANS	4	4.0	1.0%
18	LA PEGRE	8	8.0	2.1%
20	OTHER	31	31.0	8.1%
0	DNK	2386	2386.0	

var106: Different groups or individuals treated differently by courts - 2

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
19	NOT SPECIFIED	0	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.

var107: How are they treated differently

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2466 / 2466] [Invalid=301 / 301]
Literal question	How are they treated differently?
Notes	q21a3a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Cols. 62 - 63.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1454	1454.0	59.0%
1	LAW APPLID DIFFERENT	32	32.0	1.3%
2	SENTENCE DIFF IMPACT	57	57.0	2.3%
3	FAVOURED TREATMENT	386	386.0	15.7%
4	HARSHER TREATMENT	176	176.0	7.1%
5	DEFENSE NOT AS GOOD	120	120.0	4.9%
6	D EFENCE BETTER	183	183.0	7.4%
7	OTHER	58	58.0	2.4%
8	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	150	150.0	
9	VAGUE REASON	151	151.0	

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.

var530: How are they treated differently

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2701 / 2701] [Invalid=66 / 66]
Literal question	How are they treated differently?

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2386	2386.0	88.3%
1	LAW APPLID DIFFERENT	5	5.0	0.2%
2	SENTENCE DIFF IMPACT	23	23.0	0.9%
3	FAVOURED TREATMENT	90	90.0	3.3%
4	HARSHER TREATMENT	93	93.0	3.4%
5	DEFENSE NOT AS GOOD	54	54.0	2.0%
6	D EFENCE BETTER	35	35.0	1.3%
7	OTHER	15	15.0	0.6%
8	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	26	26.0	
9	VAGUE REASON	40	40.0	

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.

var108: Different people treated differently by police

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-20] [Missing=*/0/19]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2074 / 2074] [Invalid=693 / 693]
Notes	q21b1b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Cols. 64 - 65 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	1157	1157.0	55.8%
2	RICH	218	218.0	10.5%

var108: Different people treated differently by police

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	POOR	70	70.0	3.4%
4	DIFFREGN CANADA	4	4.0	0.2%
5	YOUNG	66	66.0	3.2%
6	MORE MATUR ADULT	0	0.0	
7	ETHNIC-OR REL GRPS	119	119.0	5.7%
8	POLICE MAG LOCAL DIF	16	16.0	0.8%
9	HIPPIES SOC OUTCASTS	70	70.0	3.4%
10	DRUNKARDS	12	12.0	0.6%
11	IMPT WELL KNOW PEOP	98	98.0	4.7%
12	ORDINARY MAN	21	21.0	1.0%
13	LESS EDUCATED	5	5.0	0.2%
14	MORE EDUCATED	10	10.0	0.5%
15	PEOPLE WITH CONNECTN	81	81.0	3.9%
16	POLITICANS	10	10.0	0.5%
17	FRCANADIANS	2	2.0	0.1%
18	LA PEGRE	10	10.0	0.5%
20	OTHER	105	105.0	5.1%
0	DNK	568	568.0	
19	NOT SPECIFIED	125	125.0	

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.

var109: Different people treated differently by police

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-20] [Missing=*/0/19]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=259 / 259] [Invalid=2508 / 2508]
Notes	q21b2b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Cols. 66 - 67 (second mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	0	0.0	
2	RICH	27	27.0	10.4%
3	POOR	50	50.0	19.3%
4	DIFFREGN CANADA	1	1.0	0.4%
5	YOUNG	18	18.0	6.9%
6	MORE MATUR ADULT	3	3.0	1.2%
7	ETHNIC-OR REL GRPS	31	31.0	12.0%
8	POLICE MAG LOCAL DIF	5	5.0	1.9%
9	HIPPIES SOC OUTCASTS	19	19.0	7.3%
10	DRUNKARDS	4	4.0	1.5%
11	IMPT WELL KNOW PEOP	26	26.0	10.0%
12	ORDINARY MAN	13	13.0	5.0%
13	LESS EDUCATED	1	1.0	0.4%
14	MORE EDUCATED	8	8.0	3.1%
15	PEOPLE WITH CONNECTN	18	18.0	6.9%
16	POLITICANS	3	3.0	1.2%
17	FRCANADIANS	3	3.0	1.2%
18	LA PEGRE	2	2.0	0.8%
20	OTHER	27	27.0	10.4%

var109: Different people treated differently by police

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	DNK	2508	2508.0	
19	NOT SPECIFIED	0	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.

var110: How are they treated differently

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2545 / 2545] [Invalid=222 / 222]
Literal question	How treated differently
Notes	q21b3b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Col. 68 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1725	1725.0	67.8%
1	LAW APPLID DIFF	22	22.0	0.9%
2	SENTENCE DIFF IMPACT	29	29.0	1.1%
3	FAVORED TREATMENT	328	328.0	12.9%
4	HARSHER TREATMENT	313	313.0	12.3%
5	DEFENSE NOT AS GOOD	20	20.0	0.8%
6	DEFENCE BETTER	45	45.0	1.8%
7	OTHER	63	63.0	2.5%
8	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	140	140.0	
9	VAGUE REASON	82	82.0	

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.

var111: How are they treated differently

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2734 / 2734] [Invalid=33 / 33]
Literal question	How treated differently
Notes	q21b4b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 2, Col. 69 (second mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2508	2508.0	91.7%
1	LAW APPLID DIFF	4	4.0	0.1%
2	SENTENCE DIFF IMPACT	10	10.0	0.4%
3	FAVORED TREATMENT	68	68.0	2.5%
4	HARSHER TREATMENT	105	105.0	3.8%
5	DEFENSE NOT AS GOOD	12	12.0	0.4%
6	DEFENCE BETTER	5	5.0	0.2%
7	OTHER	22	22.0	0.8%
8	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	14	14.0	
9	VAGUE REASON	19	19.0	

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.

var112: Satisfaction with your financial state

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2754 / 2754] [Invalid=13 / 13]
Literal question	One of the things in which we are also interested is to find out how people are getting along financially these days. As far as you and your family are concerned, would you say that you are pretty well satisfied, more or less satisfied, or not at all satisfied?

var112: Satisfaction with your financial state

Notes	q22 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	PRETTY WELL SATISFID	1146	1146.0		41.6%
2	MORE OR LESS SATISED	1173	1173.0		42.6%
3	NOT AT ALL SATISFIED	435	435.0	15.8%	
4	DON'T KNOW	13	13.0		
5	NO ANSWER	0	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.

var113: Financial state as compared with last year

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2745 / 2745] [Invalid=22 / 22]
Literal question	Would you say that you and your family are better off, or worse off financially than you were a year ago?
Notes	q23 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	BETTER OFF	955	955.0		34.8%
2	WORSE OFF	472	472.0	17.2%	
3	ABOUT THE SAME	1318	1318.0		48.0%
4	DON'T KNOW	17	17.0		
5	NO ANSWER	5	5.0		

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.

var114: Predict your financial state next year

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/4/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2489 / 2489] [Invalid=278 / 278]
Literal question	Do you think that a year from now you and your family will be better off or worse off financially, or just about the same as you are now?
Notes	q24 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	BETTER OFF	721	721.0		29.0%
2	WORSE OFF	267	267.0	10.7%	
3	ABOUT THE SAME	1501	1501.0		60.3%
4	DON'T KNOW	275	275.0		
5	NO ANSWER	3	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.

var115: Effect of election result on how well off you are

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*/2/3]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2319 / 2319] [Invalid=448 / 448]
Literal question	Do you think that the way the election turned out will make any difference in how well off you are?
Post-question	IF "YES": Will it make things better or worse? (q25b)
Notes	q25a, q25b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NO	1839	1839.0		79.3%
4	BETTER	360	360.0	15.5%	
5	WORSE	120	120.0	5.2%	

var115: Effect of election result on how well off you are

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	DON'T KNOW	358	358.0	
3	NO ANSWER	2	2.0	
6	DON'T KNOW	81	81.0	
7	NO ANSWER	7	7.0	

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.

var116: Last three years any unemployment in family

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2752 / 2752] [Invalid=15 / 15]
Literal question	During the last three years, have you or any member of your family been unemployed and looking for permanent work?
Notes	q26 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	YES	575	575.0	20.9%
2	NO	2177	2177.0	79.1%
3	DON'T KNOW	13	13.0	
4	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var117: Amount of difference which federal political party is in power

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2663 / 2663] [Invalid=104 / 104]
Pre-question	Coming back to the election, we would like to ask some questions about political parties in Canada.
Literal question	In your opinion, do you think it makes a great deal of difference, some difference, or no difference which political party is in power in Ottawa?
Notes	q27 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	GREAT DEAL	819	819.0	30.8%
2	SOME DIFF	1001	1001.0	37.6%
3	NO DIFFERENCE	843	843.0	31.7%
4	DON'T KNOW	101	101.0	
5	NO ANSWER	3	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.

var118: Amount of difference which provincial political party is in power

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2570 / 2570] [Invalid=197 / 197]
Literal question	Do you think it makes a great deal of difference, some difference, or no difference which party holds office your provincial legislature?

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	GREAT DEAL	893	893.0	34.7%
2	SOME DIFF	982	982.0	38.2%
3	NO DIFFERENCE	695	695.0	27.0%
4	DON'T KNOW	182	182.0	
5	NO ANSWER	15	15.0	

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.

var119: Measure you could take against unfair bil

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2630	2630.0		95.0%
1	NOTHING	0	0.0		
2	CONTACT MP	13	13.0	0.5%	
3	CONTACT REP	1	1.0	0.0%	
4	CONTACT OTHER CITZ	27	27.0	1.0%	
5	CONTACT PM	10	10.0	0.4%	
6	CONTACT MIN IN CHARG	5	5.0	0.2%	
7	CONTACT MASS MEDIA	17	17.0	0.6%	
8	PETITION DIRECT ACTN	42	42.0	1.5%	
9	OTHER	22	22.0	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.

var120: Measure you could take against unfair bil

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2742	2742.0		99.1%
1	NOTHING	0	0.0		
2	CONTACT MP	1	1.0	0.0%	
3	CONTACT REP	0	0.0		
4	CONTACT OTHER CITZ	8	8.0	0.3%	
5	CONTACT PM	3	3.0	0.1%	
6	CONTACT MIN IN CHARG	0	0.0		
7	CONTACT MASS MEDIA	4	4.0	0.1%	
8	PETITION DIRECT ACTN	5	5.0	0.2%	
9	OTHER	4	4.0	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.

var121: What organization member of to oppose bill

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/88/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	VERY POORLY	2300	2300.0		83.1%
1		391	391.0	14.1%	
2		50	50.0	1.8%	
3		9	9.0	0.3%	
4		5	5.0	0.2%	
5		1	1.0	0.0%	
6		1	1.0	0.0%	
9		10	10.0	0.4%	
10	VERY WELL	0	0.0		
88	NO OPINION	0	0.0		
99	NA	0	0.0		

var121: What organization member of to oppose bill

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

var122: What is your party affiliation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*/0/13]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2712 / 2712] [Invalid=55 / 55]
Literal question	Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Liberal, Conservative, N.D.P, Creditiste, Social Credit, Union Nationale, or what?
Post-question	IF LIBERAL, PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE, N.D.P., CREDITISTE, SOCIAL CREDIT OR LPP/COMMUNIST MENTIONED, ASK; QUESTIONS 31 AND 32. IF UNION NATIONALE, MOUVEMENT SOUVERAINETE ASSOCIATION (MSA), RASSEMBLEMENT POUR L'INDEPENDENCE NATIONALE (RIN) 0R RALLIEMENT NATIONAL (RN) OR "0THER' MENTIONED, ASK QUESTION 33.
Notes	q30 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIBERAL	1254	1254.0	46.2%
2	PC	641	641.0	23.6%
3	NDP	266	266.0	9.8%
4	CREDITISTE	40	40.0	1.5%
5	SOC CREDIT	78	78.0	2.9%
6	LPP COMM	0	0.0	
7	UNION NATIONALE	38	38.0	1.4%
8	RIN	3	3.0	0.1%
9	MSA	6	6.0	0.2%
10	RAILL NATL	0	0.0	
11	OTHER	1	1.0	0.0%
12	NO PARTY INDEP VOTE	385	385.0	14.2%
0	REFUSED	7	7.0	
13	DON'T KNOW	48	48.0	

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.

var123: Degree of strength felt towards chosen party

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/4/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2746 / 2746] [Invalid=21 / 21]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Liberal, Progressive Conservative, N.D.P., Creditiste, Social Credit, or LLP/ Communist.
Literal question	HOW strongly (STATE NAME OF CHOSEN PARTY) do you generally feel - very strongly, fairly strongly, or not very strongly?
Notes	q31a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		481	481.0	17.5%
1	VERY STRONGLY	669	669.0	24.4%
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	1195	1195.0	43.5%
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	401	401.0	14.6%
4	DON'T KNOW	12	12.0	
5	NO ANSWER	9	9.0	

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.

var124: What other party felt close to before

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-13] [Missing=*/0/2]

var124: What other party felt close to before

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2230 / 2230] [Invalid=537 / 537]			
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Liberal, Progressive Conservative, N.D.P., Creditiste, Social Credit, or LLP/ Communist.			
Literal question	Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as closest to any other party in Canada?			
Post-question	IF "YES" : Which party was that? (q31c)			
Notes	q31b, q31c in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	1433	1433.0	64.3%
3	LIBERAL	236	236.0	10.6%
4	PC	336	336.0	15.1%
5	NDP CCF	158	158.0	7.1%
6	SOC CREDIT	12	12.0	0.5%
7		44	44.0	2.0%
8	UNION NATIONALE	2	2.0	0.1%
9	RIN	2	2.0	0.1%
10	INDEPENDENT	4	4.0	0.2%
11	ZIONIST	1	1.0	0.0%
12	LABOUR PROGRESSIVE	1	1.0	0.0%
13	BLOC POPULAIRE	1	1.0	0.0%
0	NO ANSWER	492	492.0	
2	DON'T KNOW	45	45.0	

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.

var125: When transferred closeness of feeling

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=677 / 677] [Invalid=2090 / 2090]			
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Liberal, Progressive Conservative, N.D.P., Creditiste, Social Credit, or LLP/ Communist.			
Literal question	When changed from feeling closer to one party to feeling closer to another?			
Notes	q31d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Col. 14.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1957 OR EARLIER	108	108.0	16.0%
2	1958-59	63	63.0	9.3%
3	1960-61	25	25.0	3.7%
4	1962-63	48	48.0	7.1%
5	1964-65	91	91.0	13.4%
6	1966-67	67	67.0	9.9%
7	1968	214	214.0	31.6%
8	GENERAL NG AGO	25	25.0	3.7%
9	GENERAL RECENTLY	36	36.0	5.3%
0	NO ANSWER DON'T KNOW	2090	2090.0	

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.

var126: Why did you change parties

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-54] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=750 / 750] [Invalid=2017 / 2017]

var126: Why did you change parties

Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Liberal, Progressive Conservative, N.D.P., Creditiste, Social Credit, or LLP/ Communist.
Literal question	Why changed party?
Notes	q31e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols, 15, 16.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	APPROV LIB LEADER	83	83.0	11.1%
2	D ISAPPROVE LIB L	14	14.0	1.9%
3	APPROVE CONS LEADER	20	20.0	2.7%
4	DISAPPROVE CON LEADR	43	43.0	5.7%
5	APPROVE NDP LEADER	2	2.0	0.3%
6	DISAPPROVE NDP LEADR	4	4.0	0.5%
7	APPROVE OTHER LEADER	4	4.0	0.5%
8	DISAPPROVE OTHER LDR	3	3.0	0.4%
9	APPROVE LIB CANDIDAT	9	9.0	1.2%
10	DISAPPROV LIB CANDID	7	7.0	0.9%
11	APPROVE CONS CANDID	6	6.0	0.8%
12	DISAPPROV CON CANDID	7	7.0	0.9%
13	APPROVE NDP CANDIDAT	10	10.0	1.3%
14	DISAPPOVE NDP CANDID	2	2.0	0.3%
15	APPROVE OTHER CANDID	0	0.0	
16	DISAPPROV OTHER CAND	3	3.0	0.4%
17	APPR OF SPEC LIB POL	10	10.0	1.3%
18	DISAPPR SPEC LIB POL	7	7.0	0.9%
19	APPR SPEC CONS POL	6	6.0	0.8%
20	DISAP SPEC CONS POL	8	8.0	1.1%
21	APPR SPEC NDP POLICY	24	24.0	3.2%
22	DISAP SPEC NDP POL'Y	3	3.0	0.4%
23	APP POL OF OTER PART	1	1.0	0.1%
24	DISAP POL OF OTH PTY	0	0.0	
25	APPROV GEN LIB POL	14	14.0	1.9%
26	DISAPR GEN LIB POL	4	4.0	0.5%
27	APPROV GEN CONS POL	2	2.0	0.3%
28	DISAPR GEN CONS POL	5	5.0	0.7%
29	APPROV GEN NDP POL	11	11.0	1.5%
30	DISAPR GEN NDP POL	11	11.0	1.5%
31	APPR GEN POL OTH PTY	8	8.0	1.1%
32	DISA GEN POL OTH PTY	4	4.0	0.5%
33	+VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	4	4.0	0.5%
34	-VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	6	6.0	0.8%
35	PERSONAL REASONS	37	37.0	4.9%
36	OTHER REASONS	30	30.0	4.0%
37	DON'T KNOW	12	12.0	1.6%
38	NEUT ATTIT PROV FACT	2	2.0	0.3%
40	VAGUE REASONS	71	71.0	9.5%
41	LEADERSHIP UNSPEC	23	23.0	3.1%
42	CANDIDATES UNSPEC	22	22.0	2.9%

var126: Why did you change parties

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
43	THE MAN	19	19.0	2.5%
44	POLICY UNSPECIFIED	27	27.0	3.6%
45	+ ASSSS-LIB PERFORM	21	21.0	2.8%
46	- ASSESS-LIB PERFORM	32	32.0	4.3%
47	+ ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	5	5.0	0.7%
48	- ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	51	51.0	6.8%
49	+ ASSESS-NDP PEFORM	6	6.0	0.8%
50	- ASSESS NDP PERFDRM	33	33.0	4.4%
51	+ ASSESS SC PERFORM	2	2.0	0.3%
52	- ASSESS SC PERFORM	10	10.0	1.3%
53	+ ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
54	- ASSESS OTHER PERFO	2	2.0	0.3%
0	NA	2017	2017.0	

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.

var127: Party affiliation in provincial politics

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99/16]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2735 / 2735] [Invalid=32 / 32]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Liberal, Progressive Conservative, N.D.P., Creditiste, Social Credit, or LLP/ Communist.
Literal question	When you say you are a (STATE NAME OF CHOSEN PARTY) are you thinking of national politics, politics here in this province, or both?
Notes	q32a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		487	487.0	17.8%
1	PROV ONLY	84	84.0	3.1%
2	BOTH	1827	1827.0	66.8%
3	DON'T KNOW	30	30.0	1.1%
4	LIB	17	17.0	0.6%
5	PC	87	87.0	3.2%
6	NDP	29	29.0	1.1%
7	CRED	1	1.0	0.0%
8	SOC CREDIT	81	81.0	3.0%
9	UNION NATIONALE	27	27.0	1.0%
10	RIN	1	1.0	0.0%
11	MSA	2	2.0	0.1%
12	R NATIONALE	0	0.0	
13	INDEP CONS	1	1.0	0.0%
14	BTWN CONS AND NDP	1	1.0	0.0%
15	MANNING SUPPORTER	1	1.0	0.0%
98	NO PARTY	59	59.0	2.2%
16	REFUSED	1	1.0	
99	DON'T KNOW	31	31.0	

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.

var128: Party affiliation in national politics

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2754 / 2754] [Invalid=13 / 13]
Universe	q32b asked only to respondents who selected national politics for q32a. q32c asked only to respondents who selected provincial politics for q32a.
Literal question	Well, how about politics here in (NAME YOUR OWN PROVINCE)? How do you think them of yourself? (q32b) / Well, how about in national politics? How do you think of yourself? (q32c)
Notes	q32b, q32c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		2682	2682.0		97.4%
1	LIB	33	33.0	1.2%	
2	PC	18	18.0	0.7%	
3	NDP	5	5.0	0.2%	
4	CRED	0	0.0		
5	SOC CREDIT	7	7.0	0.3%	
98	NO PARTY	9	9.0	0.3%	
99	DON'T KNOW	13	13.0		

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.

var129: Strength of party affiliation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2765 / 2765] [Invalid=2 / 2]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Union Nationale, Mouvement Souverainete Association (MSA), Rassemblement pour L'Independence Nationale (RIN), Ralliement National (RN), or "other" for q30.
Literal question	How strongly (STATE NAME OF CHOSEN PARTY) do you generally feel - very strongly, fairly strongly, or not very strongly?
Notes	q33a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		2719	2719.0		98.3%
1	VERY STRONGLY	13	13.0	0.5%	
2	FAIRLY STRONGLY	28	28.0	1.0%	
3	NOT VERY STRONGLY	5	5.0	0.2%	
4	DON'T KNOW	0	0.0		
5	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var130: Which other party have previously felt closest

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/2]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2765 / 2765] [Invalid=2 / 2]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Union Nationale, Mouvement Souverainete Association (MSA), Rassemblement pour L'Independence Nationale (RIN), Ralliement National (RN), or "other" for q30.
Literal question	Was there ever a time when you thought of yourself as closest to any other party in Canada?
Post-question	IF "YES": Which party was that? (q33c)
Notes	q33b, q33c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		2721	2721.0		98.4%
1	NO	28	28.0	1.0%	

var130: Which other party have previously felt closest

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	LIBERAL	12	12.0	0.4%
4	PC	3	3.0	0.1%
5	NDP	0	0.0	
6	CRED	0	0.0	
7	SOC CREDIT	0	0.0	
8	UNION NATIONALE	1	1.0	0.0%
9	RIN	0	0.0	
10	MSA	0	0.0	
11	RN	0	0.0	
2	DON'T KNOW	2	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.

var131: When transferred closeness of feeling

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=0 / 0] [Invalid=2767 / 2767]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Union Nationale, Mouvement Souverainete Association (MSA), Rassemblement pour L'Independence Nationale (RIN), Ralliement National (RN), or "other" for q30.
Literal question	When did you change from that party to your present one?
Notes	q33d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, col. 24. Code as for 31 (d).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1957 OR EARLIER	0	0.0	
2	1958-59	0	0.0	
3	1960261	0	0.0	
4	1962-63	0	0.0	
5	1964-65	0	0.0	
6	1966-67	0	0.0	
7	1968	0	0.0	
8	GENERAL LONG AGO	0	0.0	
9	GENERAL RECENTLY	0	0.0	
0	DONT KNOW NO ANS	2767	2767.0	

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.

var132: Why did you change parties

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-54] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=0 / 0] [Invalid=2767 / 2767]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Union Nationale, Mouvement Souverainete Association (MSA), Rassemblement pour L'Independence Nationale (RIN), Ralliement National (RN), or "other" for q30.
Literal question	What was the main thing that made you change?
Notes	q33e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 25-26. Code as for 31 (e).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	APPROV LIB LEADER	0	0.0	
2	D ISAPPROVE LIB L	0	0.0	
3	APPROVE CONS LEADER	0	0.0	
4	DISAPPROVE CON LEADR	0	0.0	
5	APPROVE NDP LEADER	0	0.0	

var132: Why did you change parties

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	DISAPPROVE NDP LEADR	0	0.0	
7	APPROVE OTHER LEADER	0	0.0	
8	DISAPPROVE OTHER LDR	0	0.0	
9	APPROVE LIB CANDIDAT	0	0.0	
10	DISAPPROV LIB CANDID	0	0.0	
11	APPROVE CONS CANDID	0	0.0	
12	DISAPPROV CON CANDID	0	0.0	
13	APPROVE NDP CANDIDAT	0	0.0	
14	DISAPPOVE NDP CANDID	0	0.0	
15	APPROVE OTHER CANDID	0	0.0	
16	DISAPPROV OTHER CAND	0	0.0	
17	APPR OF SPEC LIB POL	0	0.0	
18	DISAPPR SPEC LIB POL	0	0.0	
19	APPR SPEC CONS POL	0	0.0	
20	DISAP SPEC CONS POL	0	0.0	
21	APPR SPEC NDP POLICY	0	0.0	
22	DISAP SPEC NDP POL'Y	0	0.0	
23	APP POL OF OTER PART	0	0.0	
24	DISAP POL OF OTH PTY	0	0.0	
25	APPROV GEN LIB POL	0	0.0	
26	DISAPR GEN LIB POL	0	0.0	
27	APPROV GEN CONS POL	0	0.0	
28	DISAPR GEN CONS POL	0	0.0	
29	APPROV GEN NDP POL	0	0.0	
30	DISAPR GEN NDP POL	0	0.0	
31	APPR GEN POL OTH PTY	0	0.0	
32	DISA GEN POL OTH PTY	0	0.0	
33	+VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	0	0.0	
34	-VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	0	0.0	
35	PERSONAL REASONS	0	0.0	
36	OTHER REASONS	0	0.0	
37	DON'T KNOW	0	0.0	
38	NEUT ATTIT PROV FACT	0	0.0	
40	VAGUE REASONS	0	0.0	
41	LEADERSHIP UNSPEC	0	0.0	
42	CANDIDATES UNSPEC	0	0.0	
43	THE MAN	0	0.0	
44	POLICY UNSPECIFIED	0	0.0	
45	+ ASSSS-LIB PERFORM	0	0.0	
46	- ASSESS-LIB PERFORM	0	0.0	
47	+ ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	0	0.0	
48	- ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	0	0.0	
49	+ ASSESS-NDP PEFORM	0	0.0	
50	- ASSESS NDP PERFDRM	0	0.0	
51	+ ASSESS SC PERFORM	0	0.0	

var132: Why did you change parties

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
52	- ASSESS SC PERFORM	0	0.0	
53	+ ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
54	- ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
0	NA	2767	2767.0	

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.

var133: How do you think of yourself in national politics

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/98/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2756 / 2756] [Invalid=11 / 11]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected Union Nationale, Mouvement Souverainete Association (MSA), Rassemblement pour L'Independence Nationale (RIN), Ralliement National (RN), or "other" for q30.
Literal question	How do you think of yourself in national politics?
Post-question	Go to q35.
Notes	q33f in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2719	2719.0	98.7%
1	LIB	9	9.0	0.3%
2	PC	19	19.0	0.7%
3	NDP	4	4.0	0.1%
4	CREDITISTE	4	4.0	0.1%
5	SOC CREDIT	0	0.0	
6	UNION NAT	1	1.0	0.0%
98	NO PARTY	7	7.0	
99	DON'T KNOW	4	4.0	

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.

var134: Which if any party are you closest

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-12] [Missing=*/2/0/12]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=388 / 388] [Invalid=2379 / 2379]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who did not identify a party for q30.
Literal question	Well, do you generally think of yourself as a little closer to one of the parties than the others?
Post-question	IF "YES", FEELS CLOSER: Which party is that? (q34b)
Notes	q34a, q34b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	201	201.0	51.8%
3	LIB	102	102.0	26.3%
4	PC	43	43.0	11.1%
5	NDP	28	28.0	7.2%
6	CREDITISTE	4	4.0	1.0%
7	SOC CREDIT	9	9.0	2.3%
8	UNION NAT	1	1.0	0.3%
9	RIN	0	0.0	
10	MSA	0	0.0	
11	RN	0	0.0	
0	NO ANSWER	2336	2336.0	

var134: Which if any party are you closest

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	DON'T KNOW	40	40.0	
12	REFUSED	3	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.

var135: Party closest to in provincial politics

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2762 / 2762] [Invalid=5 / 5]
Literal question	When you say you feel closer to (NANE PARTY IN Q.34-b), are you thinking of national politics, politics here in the province or both? (q32c)
Post-question	IF PROVINCIAL ONLY: Well, how about politics here in (NAME PROVINCE)? To which party do you generally feel closer? (q33e)
Notes	q34e in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2578	2578.0	93.3%
1	PROV ONLY	14	14.0	0.5%
2	BOTH	112	112.0	4.1%
3	DON'T KNOW	7	7.0	0.3%
4	LIB	1	1.0	0.0%
5	PC	14	14.0	0.5%
6	NDP	2	2.0	0.1%
7	CREDITISTE	0	0.0	
8	SOC CREDIT	9	9.0	0.3%
9	UNION NAT	5	5.0	0.2%
10	RIN	0	0.0	
11	MSA	0	0.0	
12	RN	0	0.0	
98	NO PARTY	20	20.0	0.7%
99	DON'T KNOW	5	5.0	

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.

var136: Party feel closest to in national politics

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who selected national politics for q34c.
Literal question	When you say you feel closer to (NANE PARTY IN Q.34-b), are you thinking of national politics, politics here in the province or both? (q32c)
Post-question	IF NATIONAL ONLY: Well, how about politics here in (NAME PROVINCE)? To which party do you generally feel closer? (q33d)
Notes	q34d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2752	2752.0	99.6%
1	LIB	4	4.0	0.1%
2	PC	1	1.0	0.0%
3	NDP	0	0.0	
4	CREDITISTE	0	0.0	
5	SOC CREDIT	0	0.0	

var136: Party feel closest to in national politics

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
98	NO PARTY	6	6.0	0.2%
99	DON'T KNOW	4	4.0	

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.

var137: Which party felt closer to at other time

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/2/10]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2753 / 2753] [Invalid=14 / 14]
Literal question	Was there ever a time when you felt closer to any other party?
Post-question	IF "YES": Which party was that? (q34g)
Notes	q34f, q34g in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2578	2578.0	93.6%
1	NO	104	104.0	3.8%
3	LIB	23	23.0	0.8%
4	PC	27	27.0	1.0%
5	NDP-CCF	16	16.0	0.6%
6	CREDITISTE	1	1.0	0.0%
7	SOC CREDIT	1	1.0	0.0%
8	UNION NAT	2	2.0	0.1%
9	BLOC POPULAIRE	1	1.0	0.0%
2	DON'T KNOW	12	12.0	
10	REFUSO	2	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.

var138: When transferred closeness of feeling

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=57 / 57] [Invalid=2710 / 2710]
Literal question	When did you change from feeling closer to that party?
Notes	q33h in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 38-39, Code as for 31 (e).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1957 OR EARLIER	12	12.0	21.1%
2	1958-59	5	5.0	8.8%
3	1960261	2	2.0	3.5%
4	1962-63	5	5.0	8.8%
5	1964-65	4	4.0	7.0%
6	1966-67	5	5.0	8.8%
7	1968	17	17.0	29.8%
8	GENERAL LONG AGO	1	1.0	1.8%
9	GENERAL RECENTLY	6	6.0	10.5%
0	DONT KNOW NO ANS	2710	2710.0	

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.

var139: Why did you change parties

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-54] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=69 / 69] [Invalid=2698 / 2698]

var139: Why did you change parties

Literal question	What was the main thing that made you change?
Post-question	Go to q35.
Notes	q34i in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Col. 42, Code as for 31 (d).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	APPROV LIB LEADER	4	4.0	5.8%
2	D ISAPPROVE LIB L	5	5.0	7.2%
3	APPROVE CONS LEADER	1	1.0	1.4%
4	DISAPPROVE CON LEADR	4	4.0	5.8%
5	APPROVE NDP LEADER	0	0.0	
6	DISAPPROVE NDP LEADR	0	0.0	
7	APPROVE OTHER LEADER	0	0.0	
8	DISAPPROVE OTHER LDR	0	0.0	
9	APPROVE LIB CANDIDAT	0	0.0	
10	DISAPPROV LIB CANDID	2	2.0	2.9%
11	APPROVE CONS CANDID	1	1.0	1.4%
12	DISAPPROV CON CANDID	2	2.0	2.9%
13	APPROVE NDP CANDIDAT	0	0.0	
14	DISAPPOVE NDP CANDID	0	0.0	
15	APPROVE OTHER CANDID	0	0.0	
16	DISAPPROV OTHER CAND	0	0.0	
17	APPR OF SPEC LIB POL	0	0.0	
18	DISAPPR SPEC LIB POL	0	0.0	
19	APPR SPEC CONS POL	2	2.0	2.9%
20	DISAP SPEC CONS POL	2	2.0	2.9%
21	APPR SPEC NDP POLICY	1	1.0	1.4%
22	DISAP SPEC NDP POL'Y	1	1.0	1.4%
23	APP POL OF OTER PART	0	0.0	
24	DISAP POL OF OTH PTY	0	0.0	
25	APPROV GEN LIB POL	0	0.0	
26	DISAPR GEN LIB POL	2	2.0	2.9%
27	APPROV GEN CONS POL	0	0.0	
28	DISAPR GEN CONS POL	2	2.0	2.9%
29	APPROV GEN NDP POL	2	2.0	2.9%
30	DISAPR GEN NDP POL	0	0.0	
31	APPR GEN POL OTH PTY	0	0.0	
32	DISA GEN POL OTH PTY	0	0.0	
33	+VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	1	1.0	1.4%
34	-VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	1	1.0	1.4%
35	PERSONAL REASONS	2	2.0	2.9%
36	OTHER REASONS	4	4.0	5.8%
37	DON'T KNOW	2	2.0	2.9%
38	NEUT ATTIT PROV FACT	1	1.0	1.4%
40	VAGUE REASONS	3	3.0	4.3%
41	LEADERSHIP UNSPEC	4	4.0	5.8%
42	CANDIDATES UNSPEC	3	3.0	4.3%

var139: Why did you change parties

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
43	THE MAN	2	2.0	2.9%
44	POLICY UNSPECIFIED	1	1.0	1.4%
45	+ ASSSS-LIB PERFORM	3	3.0	4.3%
46	- ASSESS-LIB PERFORM	3	3.0	4.3%
47	+ ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	0	0.0	
48	- ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	3	3.0	4.3%
49	+ ASSESS-NDP PEFORM	0	0.0	
50	- ASSESS NDP PERFDRM	4	4.0	5.8%
51	+ ASSESS SC PERFORM	0	0.0	
52	- ASSESS SC PERFORM	1	1.0	1.4%
53	+ ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
54	- ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
0	NA	2698	2698.0	

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.

var140: Which party might ever felt close to

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/2]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=219 / 219] [Invalid=2548 / 2548]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who didn't feel close to a party in q34a.
Literal question	Was there ever a time when you did think of yourself as closer to one of the parties?
Post-question	IF "YES": Which party was that?
Notes	q34j, q34k in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	153	153.0	69.9%
3	LIB	21	21.0	9.6%
4	PC	35	35.0	16.0%
5	NDP-CCF	5	5.0	2.3%
6	CREDITISTE	0	0.0	
7	SOC CREDIT	3	3.0	1.4%
8	UNION NAT	2	2.0	0.9%
9	RIN	0	0.0	
10	MSA	0	0.0	
11	RN	0	0.0	
0	NO ANSWER	2527	2527.0	
2	DON'T KNOW	21	21.0	

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.

var141: When transferred closeness of feeling

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=50 / 50] [Invalid=2717 / 2717]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for q34j.
Literal question	When did you move away from that party?
Notes	q34l in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Col. 42, Code as for 31 (d).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	1957 OR EARLIER	10	10.0	20.0%

var141: When transferred closeness of feeling

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	1958-59	12	12.0	24.0%
3	1960261	2	2.0	4.0%
4	1962-63	6	6.0	12.0%
5	1964-65	9	9.0	18.0%
6	1966-67	1	1.0	2.0%
7	1968	2	2.0	4.0%
8	GENERAL LONG AGO	5	5.0	10.0%
9	GENERAL RECENTLY	3	3.0	6.0%
0	DONT KNOW NO ANS	2717	2717.0	

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.

var142: Why did you change parties

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-54] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=63 / 63] [Invalid=2704 / 2704]
Literal question	What was the main thing that made you move away from that party?
Notes	q34m in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 43-44, Code as for 31 (e).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	APPROV LIB LEADER	0	0.0	
2	D ISAPPROVE LIB L	3	3.0	4.8%
3	APPROVE CONS LEADER	2	2.0	3.2%
4	DISAPPROVE CON LEADR	8	8.0	12.7%
5	APPROVE NDP LEADER	0	0.0	
6	DISAPPROVE NDP LEADR	0	0.0	
7	APPROVE OTHER LEADER	0	0.0	
8	DISAPPROVE OTHER LDR	0	0.0	
9	APPROVE LIB CANDIDAT	0	0.0	
10	DISAPPROV LIB CANDID	1	1.0	1.6%
11	APPROVE CONS CANDID	1	1.0	1.6%
12	DISAPPROV CON CANDID	0	0.0	
13	APPROVE NDP CANDIDAT	0	0.0	
14	DISAPPOVE NDP CANDID	0	0.0	
15	APPROVE OTHER CANDID	0	0.0	
16	DISAPPROV OTHER CAND	0	0.0	
17	APPR OF SPEC LIB POL	0	0.0	
18	DISAPPR SPEC LIB POL	0	0.0	
19	APPR SPEC CONS POL	0	0.0	
20	DISAP SPEC CONS POL	0	0.0	
21	APPR SPEC NDP POLICY	0	0.0	
22	DISAP SPEC NDP POL'Y	1	1.0	1.6%
23	APP POL OF OTER PART	0	0.0	
24	DISAP POL OF OTH PTY	0	0.0	
25	APPROV GEN LIB POL	0	0.0	
26	DISAPR GEN LIB POL	0	0.0	
27	APPROV GEN CONS POL	0	0.0	
28	DISAPR GEN CONS POL	2	2.0	3.2%

var142: Why did you change parties

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
29	APPROV GEN NDP POL	0	0.0	
30	DISAPR GEN NDP POL	0	0.0	
31	APPR GEN POL OTH PTY	0	0.0	
32	DISA GEN POL OTH PTY	0	0.0	
33	+VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	0	0.0	
34	-VE RES 2 PROV FACTR	0	0.0	
35	PERSONAL REASONS	8	8.0	12.7%
36	OTHER REASONS	3	3.0	4.8%
37	DON'T KNOW	3	3.0	4.8%
38	NEUT ATTIT PROV FACT	0	0.0	
40	VAGUE REASONS	4	4.0	6.3%
41	LEADERSHIP UNSPEC	1	1.0	1.6%
42	CANDIDATES UNSPEC	4	4.0	6.3%
43	THE MAN	6	6.0	9.5%
44	POLICY UNSPECIFIED	3	3.0	4.8%
45	+ ASSSS-LIB PERFORM	2	2.0	3.2%
46	- ASSESS-LIB PERFORM	1	1.0	1.6%
47	+ ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	1	1.0	1.6%
48	- ASSESS-CONS PERFOR	7	7.0	11.1%
49	+ ASSESS-NDP PEFORM	0	0.0	
50	- ASSESS NDP PERFDRM	0	0.0	
51	+ ASSESS SC PERFORM	0	0.0	
52	- ASSESS SC PERFORM	2	2.0	3.2%
53	+ ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
54	- ASSESS OTHER PERFO	0	0.0	
0	NA	2704	2704.0	

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.

var143: Name of elected candidate in this riding

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2534 / 2534] [Invalid=233 / 233]
Literal question	Do you happen to remember the name of the candidate who was elected to Parliament for this riding in the June 25th election? What is it?
Notes	q35 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	YES-CORRECT	1734	1734.0	68.4%
2	YES-INCORRECT	91	91.0	3.6%
3	NO	709	709.0	28.0%
4	NOT SU RE	211	211.0	
5	REFUSED NO ANSWER	22	22.0	

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.

var144: What is party

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2588 / 2588] [Invalid=179 / 179]
Literal question	Do you happen to know his (her) party? What is it?

var144: What is party

	Notes	q36 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	YES-CORRECT	2168	2168.0		83.8%
2	YES-INCORRECT	69	69.0	2.7%	
3	NO	351	351.0	13.6%	
4	NOT SU RE	102	102.0		
5	REFUSED NO ANSWER	77	77.0		

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.

var145: Have heard or read about winning candididate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1804 / 1804] [Invalid=963 / 963]
Literal question	What have you read or heard about the successful candidate in your riding?
Notes	q37g1g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 3, Cols. 47 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	DID NOT HEAR	1285	1285.0		71.2%
1	RADIO	7	7.0	0.4%	
2	TELEVISION	26	26.0	1.4%	
3	NEW SPAPER	89	89.0	4.9%	
4	CAMPAIGN LITERATURE	195	195.0	10.8%	
5	SPEECHES READ OR HD	41	41.0	2.3%	
6	PERSONAL CONTACT	106	106.0	5.9%	
7	CANDID'S OWN ARTICLE	23	23.0	1.3%	
8	OTHER	32	32.0	1.8%	
9	NOT SPECIFIED	963	963.0		

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.

var146: Have heard or read about winning candididate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2369 / 2369] [Invalid=398 / 398]
Literal question	What have you read or heard about the successful candidate in your riding?
Notes	q37g2g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Col. 48 (second mention)

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	DID NOT HEAR	2211	2211.0		93.3%
1	RADIO	6	6.0	0.3%	
2	TELEVISION	20	20.0	0.8%	
3	NEW SPAPER	30	30.0	1.3%	
4	CAMPAIGN LITERATURE	45	45.0	1.9%	
5	SPEECHES READ OR HD	11	11.0	0.5%	
6	PERSONAL CONTACT	33	33.0	1.4%	
7	CANDID'S OWN ARTICLE	2	2.0	0.1%	
8	OTHER	11	11.0	0.5%	
9	NOT SPECIFIED	398	398.0		

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.

var147: What have you heard or read about them

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1085 / 1085] [Invalid=1682 / 1682]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have heard about winning candidate.
Literal question	What heard
Notes	q37g3g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 49-50 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	SPEC PERSON FAVORBLE	144	144.0	13.3%
2	S PEC PERS UNFAVO	8	8.0	0.7%
3	SPEC PERS NEUTRAL	180	180.0	16.6%
4	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	47	47.0	4.3%
5	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	18	18.0	1.7%
6	SPEC POL NEUTRAL	74	74.0	6.8%
7	SPEC UNSPEC FAVORBLE	36	36.0	3.3%
8	SPEC UNSPEC FAVORBLE	5	5.0	0.5%
9	SPEC UNSPEC NEUTRAL	2	2.0	0.2%
11	GEN PERSON FAVORABLE	13	13.0	1.2%
12	GEN PERSON UNFAVORBL	0	0.0	
13	GEN PERSON NEUTRAL	26	26.0	2.4%
14	GEN POL FAVORABLE	19	19.0	1.8%
15	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	3	3.0	0.3%
16	GEN POL NEUTRAL	30	30.0	2.8%
17	GEN UNSPEC FAVORABLE	130	130.0	12.0%
18	GEN UNSPEC UNFAVORBL	10	10.0	0.9%
19	GEN UNSPEC NUTRAL	49	49.0	4.5%
21	BTWN PERSON FAVORABL	21	21.0	1.9%
22	BTWN PERS UNFAVORBLE	0	0.0	
23	BTWN PERS NEUTRAL	45	45.0	4.1%
24	BTWN POL FAVORABLE	91	91.0	8.4%
25	BTWN POL UNFAVORABLE	16	16.0	1.5%
26	BTWN POL NEUTRAL	71	71.0	6.5%
27	BTWN UNSPEC FAVORABL	31	31.0	2.9%
28	BTWN UNSPEC UNFAVOR	5	5.0	0.5%
29	BTWN UNSPEC NEUTRAL	11	11.0	1.0%
0	CAN'T REMEMBER	1441	1441.0	
30	NO RESPONSE	241	241.0	

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.

var148: What have you heard or read about them

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/0/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=474 / 474] [Invalid=2293 / 2293]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who have heard about winning candidate.
Literal question	What heard
Notes	q37g4g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 51 - 52 (second mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	SPEC PERSON FAVORBLE	93	93.0	19.6%

var148: What have you heard or read about them

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	S PEC PERS UNFAVO	8	8.0	1.7%
3	SPEC PERS NEUTRAL	65	65.0	13.7%
4	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	38	38.0	8.0%
5	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	9	9.0	1.9%
6	SPEC POL NEUTRAL	21	21.0	4.4%
7	SPEC UNSPEC FAVORBLE	23	23.0	4.9%
8	SPEC UNSPEC FAVORBLE	4	4.0	0.8%
9	SPEC UNSPEC NEUTRAL	1	1.0	0.2%
11	GEN PERSON FAVORABLE	5	5.0	1.1%
12	GEN PERSON UNFAVORBL	2	2.0	0.4%
13	GEN PERSON NEUTRAL	4	4.0	0.8%
14	GEN POL FAVORABLE	15	15.0	3.2%
15	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
16	GEN POL NEUTRAL	9	9.0	1.9%
17	GEN UNSPEC FAVORABLE	29	29.0	6.1%
18	GEN UNSPEC UNFAVORBL	1	1.0	0.2%
19	GEN UNSPEC NUTRAL	3	3.0	0.6%
21	BTWN PERSON FAVORABL	19	19.0	4.0%
22	BTWN PERS UNFAVORBLE	1	1.0	0.2%
23	BTWN PERS NEUTRAL	16	16.0	3.4%
24	BTWN POL FAVORABLE	50	50.0	10.5%
25	BTWN POL UNFAVORABLE	11	11.0	2.3%
26	BTWN POL NEUTRAL	29	29.0	6.1%
27	BTWN UNSPEC FAVORABL	12	12.0	2.5%
28	BTWN UNSPEC UNFAVOR	3	3.0	0.6%
29	BTWN UNSPEC NEUTRAL	3	3.0	0.6%
0	CAN'T REMEMBER	2217	2217.0	
30	NO RESPONSE	76	76.0	

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.

var149: Was winning candidate already an Member of Parliament before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2594 / 2594] [Invalid=173 / 173]
Literal question	Has winning candidate in riding been in Parliament before?
Notes	q38a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1285	1285.0	49.5%
1	IN PARLIAMENT-YES	737	737.0	28.4%
2	IN PARLIAMENT-NO	66	66.0	2.5%
3	NOT IN PARLIAMENT-NO	447	447.0	17.2%
4	NOT IN PARLAMENT YES	59	59.0	2.3%
5	DON'T KNOW	173	173.0	

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.

var150: What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=284 / 284] [Invalid=2483 / 2483]
Notes	q38c1c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols 54 - 59; Cols. 54 - 55 (first mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	DID NOTHING	33	33.0	11.6%
3	HELPD CERT ETH GRP	3	3.0	1.1%
4	HELPED WITH PUBL WKS	118	118.0	41.5%
5	HELPED INDIVIDUALS	19	19.0	6.7%
6	HELPED THE AREA	28	28.0	9.9%
7	WORKED ON NON-LOC IS	17	17.0	6.0%
8	PROVID LIAS GOV BURY	6	6.0	2.1%
9	WORKD 4 CERT ECON GP	32	32.0	11.3%
10	OTHER	28	28.0	9.9%
0	NO ANSWER	1972	1972.0	
1	DON'T REMEMBER	511	511.0	

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.

var151: What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=58 / 58] [Invalid=2709 / 2709]
Notes	q38c2c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 56 -57 (second mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	DID NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HELPD CERT ETH GRP	1	1.0	1.7%
4	HELPED WITH PUBL WKS	30	30.0	51.7%
5	HELPED INDIVIDUALS	5	5.0	8.6%
6	HELPED THE AREA	9	9.0	15.5%
7	WORKED ON NON-LOC IS	4	4.0	6.9%
8	PROVID LIAS GOV BURY	1	1.0	1.7%
9	WORKD 4 CERT ECON GP	6	6.0	10.3%
10	OTHER	2	2.0	3.4%
0	NO ANSWER	2709	2709.0	

var151: What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 2

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DON'T REMEMBER	0	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.

var152: What candidate did for riding when in Parliament - 3

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6 / 6] [Invalid=2761 / 2761]
Notes	q38c3c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 3, Cols. 58 - 59 (third mention).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	DID NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HELPD CERT ETH GRP	0	0.0	
4	HELPED WITH PUBL WKS	5	5.0	83.3%
5	HELPED INDIVIDUALS	0	0.0	
6	HELPED THE AREA	1	1.0	16.7%
7	WORKED ON NON-LOC IS	0	0.0	
8	PROVID LIAS GOV BURY	0	0.0	
9	WORKD 4 CERT ECON GP	0	0.0	
10	OTHER	0	0.0	
0	NO ANSWER	2761	2761.0	
1	DON'T REMEMBER	0	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.

var153: What has candidate ever done for you or your family

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=49 / 49] [Invalid=2718 / 2718]
Literal question	What did the member do for you, if in Parliament before?
Notes	q38e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 3, cols. 60 - 61.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	XMAS CARD PERS MAIL	3	3.0	6.1%
3	HELPED PERSONALLY	22	22.0	44.9%
4	PROV LIAS GOVT BURCY	18	18.0	36.7%
10	OTHER	6	6.0	12.2%
0	NO ANSWER	1969	1969.0	
1	DID NOTHING	749	749.0	

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.

var154: What do you like best about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=111 / 111] [Invalid=2656 / 2656]
Notes	q58e3e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 25 - 28, Card 3, cols. 62 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	2	2.0	1.8%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	1	1.0	0.9%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	

var154: What do you like best about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	0.9%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	5	5.0	4.5%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	10	10.0	9.0%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	3	3.0	2.7%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	2	2.0	1.8%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	1	1.0	0.9%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	9	9.0	8.1%
18	COURAGE	2	2.0	1.8%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	2	2.0	1.8%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	2	2.0	1.8%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	0.9%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	6	6.0	5.4%
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.9%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	4	4.0	3.6%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	1	1.0	0.9%
34	EDUCATION	4	4.0	3.6%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	4	4.0	3.6%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	3	3.0	2.7%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	2	2.0	1.8%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.9%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	6	6.0	5.4%
51	4 FARMER	1	1.0	0.9%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	0.9%

var154: What do you like best about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	2	2.0	1.8%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	3	3.0	2.7%
59	OTHER PO L	2	2.0	1.8%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	1.0	0.9%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	13	13.0	11.7%
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	2	2.0	1.8%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	7	7.0	6.3%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	0.9%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	1	1.0	0.9%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	3	3.0	2.7%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	1	1.0	0.9%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2656	2656.0	

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.

var155: What do you like best about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=27 / 27] [Invalid=2740 / 2740]
Notes	q58e4e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 25 - 28, Card 3, cols. 62 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	2	2.0	7.4%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	6	6.0	22.2%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	1	1.0	3.7%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	

var155: What do you like best about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	1	1.0	3.7%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	1	1.0	3.7%
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	1.0	3.7%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	3	3.0	11.1%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	0	0.0	
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	1	1.0	3.7%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	2	2.0	7.4%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	3.7%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	3	3.0	11.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	3	3.0	11.1%
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	

var155: What do you like best about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVIOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	1	1.0	3.7%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	3.7%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2740	2740.0	

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.

var156: What do you like least about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=12 / 12] [Invalid=2755 / 2755]
Notes	q58f3f in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 29 - 32, Card 3, cols. 66 - 69.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	1	1.0	8.3%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	1.0	8.3%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	0	0.0	
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	1	1.0	8.3%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
22		1	1.0	8.3%
23	AGE	1	1.0	8.3%

var156: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	8.3%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	0	0.0	
40	IDEAS POLICIES	1	1.0	8.3%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	1	1.0	8.3%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	8.3%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	1	1.0	8.3%
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	8.3%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	1	1.0	8.3%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	

var156: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2755	2755.0	

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.

var157: What do you like least about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=3 / 3] [Invalid=2764 / 2764]
Notes	q58f4f in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 29 - 32, Card 3, cols. 66 - 69.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	0	0.0	
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	0	0.0	
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	

var157: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	0	0.0	
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	1	1.0	33.3%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	1	1.0	33.3%
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	1	1.0	33.3%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2764	2764.0	

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.

var158: What do you like best about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=45 / 45] [Invalid=2722 / 2722]
Notes	q58g3g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 33 - 36, Card 3, cols. 70 - 73.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	1	1.0	2.2%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	2	2.0	4.4%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	1	1.0	2.2%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	3	3.0	6.7%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	3	3.0	6.7%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	3	3.0	6.7%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	2	2.0	4.4%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	2.2%
26	INDEPENDENCE	1	1.0	2.2%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	2	2.0	4.4%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	1	1.0	2.2%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	1	1.0	2.2%
34	EDUCATION	2	2.0	4.4%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	2	2.0	4.4%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	1	1.0	2.2%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	

var158: What do you like best about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	1	1.0	2.2%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	2	2.0	4.4%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	1	1.0	2.2%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	6	6.0	13.3%
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	2.2%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	1	1.0	2.2%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	1	1.0	2.2%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	2.2%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	2	2.0	4.4%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	3	3.0	6.7%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2722	2722.0	

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.

var159: What do you like best about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2 / 2] [Invalid=2765 / 2765]
Notes	q58g4g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 33 - 36, Card 3, cols. 70 - 73.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	

var159: What do you like best about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	0	0.0	
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	0	0.0	
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	50.0%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	0	0.0	
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	1	1.0	50.0%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	

var159: What do you like best about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2765	2765.0	

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.

var160: What do you like least about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=19 / 19] [Invalid=2748 / 2748]
Notes	q58h3h in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 37 - 40, Card 3, cols. 74 - 77.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	1.0	5.3%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	1	1.0	5.3%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	0	0.0	
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	

var160: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	5.3%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	1	1.0	5.3%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	1	1.0	5.3%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	0	0.0	
40	IDEAS POLICIES	3	3.0	15.8%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	2	2.0	10.5%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	4	4.0	21.1%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	1	1.0	5.3%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	2	2.0	10.5%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	5.3%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	5.3%

var160: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2748	2748.0	

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.

var161: What do you like least about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2/2] [Invalid=2765 / 2765]
Notes	q58h4h in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 37 - 40, Card 3, cols. 74 - 77.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	1	1.0	50.0%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	0	0.0	
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	1	1.0	50.0%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	

var161: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	0	0.0	
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	

var161: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2765	2765.0	

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.

var162: Total known names of candidates

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 6-87] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	KNOW 5	0	0.0	
11	NOTHING ABOUT 1	0	0.0	
12	0 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
13	0 OUT OF 3	381	381.0	13.8%
14	0 OUT OF 4	237	237.0	8.6%
15	0 OUT OF 5	127	127.0	4.6%
16	0 OUT OF 6	19	19.0	0.7%
17	0 OUT OF 7	5	5.0	0.2%
21	KNOWS 1	0	0.0	
22	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
23	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 3	426	426.0	15.4%
24	KNOWS 1 OOF 4	264	264.0	9.5%
25	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 5	104	104.0	3.8%
26	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 6	28	28.0	1.0%
27	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 7	7	7.0	0.3%
32	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
33	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 3	406	406.0	14.7%
34	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 4	259	259.0	9.4%
35	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 5	41	41.0	1.5%
36	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 6	10	10.0	0.4%
37	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 7	1	1.0	0.0%
43	OWS 3 OUT OF 3	230	230.0	8.3%
44	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 4	142	142.0	5.1%
45	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 5	30	30.0	1.1%
46	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 6	4	4.0	0.1%
47	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 7	2	2.0	0.1%
54	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 4	39	39.0	1.4%
55	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 5	3	3.0	0.1%
56	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 6	2	2.0	0.1%
57	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
65	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 5	0	0.0	
66	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	

var162: Total known names of candidates

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
67	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
76	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
77	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
87	KNOWS 7 OUT OF 7	0	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.

var163: Total known names with party affiliation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 6-87] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	KNOW 5	0	0.0	
11	NOTHING ABOUT 1	0	0.0	
12	0 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
13	0 OUT OF 3	185	185.0	6.7%
14	0 OUT OF 4	131	131.0	4.7%
15	0 OUT OF 5	63	63.0	2.3%
16	0 OUT OF 6	12	12.0	0.4%
17	0 OUT OF 7	2	2.0	0.1%
21	KNOWS 1	0	0.0	
22	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
23	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 3	462	462.0	16.7%
24	KNOWS 1 OOF 4	302	302.0	10.9%
25	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 5	135	135.0	4.9%
26	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 6	27	27.0	1.0%
27	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 7	8	8.0	0.3%
32	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
33	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 3	415	415.0	15.0%
34	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 4	274	274.0	9.9%
35	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 5	60	60.0	2.2%
36	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 6	17	17.0	0.6%
37	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 7	3	3.0	0.1%
43	OWS 3 OUT OF 3	381	381.0	13.8%
44	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 4	172	172.0	6.2%
45	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 5	35	35.0	1.3%
46	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 6	5	5.0	0.2%
47	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 7	2	2.0	0.1%
54	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 4	62	62.0	2.2%
55	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 5	11	11.0	0.4%
56	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 6	2	2.0	0.1%
57	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
65	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 5	1	1.0	0.0%
66	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
67	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
76	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	

var163: Total known names with party affiliation

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
77	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
87	KNOWS 7 OUT OF 7	0	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.

var164: Total of those candidates heard about

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 6-87] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	KNOW 5	0	0.0	
11	NOTHING ABOUT 1	0	0.0	
12	0 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
13	0 OUT OF 3	461	461.0	16.7%
14	0 OUT OF 4	357	357.0	12.9%
15	0 OUT OF 5	157	157.0	5.7%
16	0 OUT OF 6	27	27.0	1.0%
17	0 OUT OF 7	8	8.0	0.3%
21	KNOWS 1	0	0.0	
22	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
23	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 3	533	533.0	19.3%
24	KNOWS 1 OOF 4	329	329.0	11.9%
25	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 5	104	104.0	3.8%
26	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 6	27	27.0	1.0%
27	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 7	5	5.0	0.2%
32	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
33	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 3	312	312.0	11.3%
34	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 4	167	167.0	6.0%
35	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 5	27	27.0	1.0%
36	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 6	7	7.0	0.3%
37	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 7	2	2.0	0.1%
43	OWS 3 OUT OF 3	137	137.0	5.0%
44	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 4	68	68.0	2.5%
45	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 5	13	13.0	0.5%
46	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 6	2	2.0	0.1%
47	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
54	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 4	20	20.0	0.7%
55	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 5	3	3.0	0.1%
56	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
57	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
65	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 5	1	1.0	0.0%
66	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
67	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
76	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
77	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
87	KNOWS 7 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	

var164: Total of those candidates heard about

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

var165: Total known occupations of candidates

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 6-87] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	KNOW 5	0	0.0	
11	NOTHING ABOUT 1	0	0.0	
12	0 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
13	0 OUT OF 3	650	650.0	23.5%
14	0 OUT OF 4	495	495.0	17.9%
15	0 OUT OF 5	185	185.0	6.7%
16	0 OUT OF 6	42	42.0	1.5%
17	0 OUT OF 7	13	13.0	0.5%
21	KNOWS 1	0	0.0	
22	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
23	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 3	448	448.0	16.2%
24	KNOWS 1 OOF 4	274	274.0	9.9%
25	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 5	88	88.0	3.2%
26	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 6	12	12.0	0.4%
27	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 7	2	2.0	0.1%
32	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
33	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 3	255	255.0	9.2%
34	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 4	123	123.0	4.4%
35	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 5	27	27.0	1.0%
36	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 6	5	5.0	0.2%
37	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
43	OWS 3 OUT OF 3	90	90.0	3.3%
44	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 4	39	39.0	1.4%
45	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 5	5	5.0	0.2%
46	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 6	3	3.0	0.1%
47	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
54	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 4	10	10.0	0.4%
55	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 5	0	0.0	
56	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 6	1	1.0	0.0%
57	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
65	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 5	0	0.0	
66	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
67	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
76	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
77	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
87	KNOWS 7 OUT OF 7	0	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.

var166: Total known religions of candidates

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 6-87] [Missing=*]

var166: Total known religions of candidates

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]			
Notes	q35_40e in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	KNOW 5	0	0.0	
11	NOTHING ABOUT 1	0	0.0	
12	0 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
13	0 OUT OF 3	1066	1066.0	38.5%
14	0 OUT OF 4	577	577.0	20.9%
15	0 OUT OF 5	182	182.0	6.6%
16	0 OUT OF 6	22	22.0	0.8%
17	0 OUT OF 7	9	9.0	0.3%
21	KNOWS 1	0	0.0	
22	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
23	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 3	292	292.0	10.6%
24	KNOWS 1 OOF 4	225	225.0	8.1%
25	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 5	90	90.0	3.3%
26	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 6	26	26.0	0.9%
27	KNOWS 1 OUT OF 7	3	3.0	0.1%
32	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 2	0	0.0	
33	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 3	75	75.0	2.7%
34	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 4	102	102.0	3.7%
35	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 5	24	24.0	0.9%
36	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 6	8	8.0	0.3%
37	KNOWS 2 OUT OF 7	3	3.0	0.1%
43	OWS 3 OUT OF 3	10	10.0	0.4%
44	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 4	35	35.0	1.3%
45	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 5	8	8.0	0.3%
46	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 6	6	6.0	0.2%
47	KNOWS 3 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
54	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 4	2	2.0	0.1%
55	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 5	1	1.0	0.0%
56	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 6	1	1.0	0.0%
57	KNOWS 4 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
65	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 5	0	0.0	
66	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
67	KNOWS 5 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
76	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 6	0	0.0	
77	KNOWS 6 OUT OF 7	0	0.0	
87	KNOWS 7 OUT OF 7	0	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.

var167: What known of Liberal candidate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 10-41] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40f in the documentation.

var167: What known of Liberal candidate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
10	DONT KNOW AT ALL	598	598.0	21.6%
11	NAME	10	10.0	0.4%
12	PARTY	231	231.0	8.3%
13	HEARD OR READ	53	53.0	1.9%
14	RELIGION	17	17.0	0.6%
15	OCCUPATION	16	16.0	0.6%
16	NAME AND PARTY	271	271.0	9.8%
17	NAME AND ND HEARD	6	6.0	0.2%
18		2	2.0	0.1%
19		3	3.0	0.1%
20		121	121.0	4.4%
21	PARTY AND RELIGION	36	36.0	1.3%
22	PARTY AND OCCUPATION	19	19.0	0.7%
23	HEARD AND RELIGION	15	15.0	0.5%
24	HEARD AND OCCUPATION	12	12.0	0.4%
25	RELIGION + OCCUPATIO	5	5.0	0.2%
26	NAME PARTY HEARD	262	262.0	9.5%
27	NAME PARTY RELIGION	82	82.0	3.0%
28	NAME PARTY OCCUPAT'N	88	88.0	3.2%
29	NAME HEARD RELIGION	2	2.0	0.1%
30	NAME HEARD OCCUPAT'N	10	10.0	0.4%
31	NAME RELIG OCCUPAT'N	2	2.0	0.1%
32	PARTY HEARD RELIGION	17	17.0	0.6%
33	PARTY HEARD OCCUPATN	33	33.0	1.2%
34	PARTY RELIG OCCUPATN	11	11.0	0.4%
35	HEARD RELIG OCCUPATN	4	4.0	0.1%
36	NAME PARTY HEARD REL	91	91.0	3.3%
37	NAME PTY HEARD OCC	358	358.0	12.9%
38	NAME PARTY REL OCCUN	136	136.0	4.9%
39	NAME HEARD REL OCCU	3	3.0	0.1%
40	PARTY HEARD REL OCCN	6	6.0	0.2%
41	NAME PTY REL OCC HRD	247	247.0	8.9%

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.

var168: What known of Conservative candidate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 10-41] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40g in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
10	DONT KNOW AT ALL	1264	1264.0	45.7%
11	NAME	16	16.0	0.6%
12	PARTY	131	131.0	4.7%
13	HEARD OR READ	37	37.0	1.3%
14	RELIGION	4	4.0	0.1%
15	OCCUPATION	9	9.0	0.3%

var168: What known of Conservative candidate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
16	NAME AND PARTY	182	182.0	6.6%
17	NAME AND ND HEARD	9	9.0	0.3%
18		4	4.0	0.1%
19		1	1.0	0.0%
20		62	62.0	2.2%
21	PARTY AND RELIGION	6	6.0	0.2%
22	PARTY AND OCCUPATION	16	16.0	0.6%
23	HEARD AND RELIGION	1	1.0	0.0%
24	HEARD AND OCCUPATION	7	7.0	0.3%
25	RELIGION + OCCUPATIO	1	1.0	0.0%
26	NAME PARTY HEARD	239	239.0	8.6%
27	NAME PARTY RELIGION	58	58.0	2.1%
28	NAME PARTY OCCUPAT'N	107	107.0	3.9%
29	NAME HEARD RELIGION	1	1.0	0.0%
30	NAME HEARD OCCUPAT'N	7	7.0	0.3%
31	NAME RELIG OCCUPAT'N	4	4.0	0.1%
32	PARTY HEARD RELIGION	3	3.0	0.1%
33	PARTY HEARD OCCUPATN	15	15.0	0.5%
34	PARTY RELIG OCCUPATN	1	1.0	0.0%
35	HEARD RELIG OCCUPATN	2	2.0	0.1%
36	NAME PARTY HEARD REL	49	49.0	1.8%
37	NAME PTY HEARD OCC	289	289.0	10.4%
38	NAME PARTY REL OCCUN	78	78.0	2.8%
39	NAME HEARD REL OCCU	1	1.0	0.0%
40	PARTY HEARD REL OCCN	2	2.0	0.1%
41	NAME PTY REL OCC HRD	161	161.0	5.8%

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.

var169: What known of NDP candidate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40h in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		20	20.0	0.7%
10	DONT KNOW AT ALL	1809	1809.0	65.4%
11	NAME	13	13.0	0.5%
12	PARTY	176	176.0	6.4%
13	HEARD OR READ	26	26.0	0.9%
14	RELIGION	1	1.0	0.0%
15	OCCUPATION	1	1.0	0.0%
16	NAME AND PARTY	150	150.0	5.4%
17	NAME AND ND HEARD	4	4.0	0.1%
18		1	1.0	0.0%
20		51	51.0	1.8%
21	PARTY AND RELIGION	0	0.0	

var169: What known of NDP candidate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
22	PARTY AND OCCUPATION	10	10.0	0.4%
23	HEARD AND RELIGION	0	0.0	
24	HEARD AND OCCUPATION	3	3.0	0.1%
25	RELIGION + OCCUPATIO	0	0.0	
26	NAME PARTY HEARD	174	174.0	6.3%
27	NAME PARTY RELIGION	10	10.0	0.4%
28	NAME PARTY OCCUPAT'N	38	38.0	1.4%
29	NAME HEARD RELIGION	0	0.0	
30	NAME HEARD OCCUPAT'N	9	9.0	0.3%
31	NAME RELIG OCCUPAT'N	0	0.0	
32	PARTY HEARD RELIGION	3	3.0	0.1%
33	PARTY HEARD OCCUPATN	12	12.0	0.4%
34	PARTY RELIG OCCUPATN	1	1.0	0.0%
35	HEARD RELIG OCCUPATN	1	1.0	0.0%
36	NAME PARTY HEARD REL	10	10.0	0.4%
37	NAME PTY HEARD OCC	153	153.0	5.5%
38	NAME PARTY REL OCCUN	23	23.0	0.8%
39	NAME HEARD REL OCCU	2	2.0	0.1%
40	PARTY HEARD REL OCCN	4	4.0	0.1%
41	NAME PTY REL OCC HRD	62	62.0	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.

var170: What known of Creditiste candidate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40i in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2072	2072.0	74.9%
10	DONT KNOW AT ALL	539	539.0	19.5%
11	NAME	4	4.0	0.1%
12	PARTY	22	22.0	0.8%
13	HEARD OR READ	0	0.0	
14	RELIGION	2	2.0	0.1%
15	OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
16	NAME AND PARTY	29	29.0	1.0%
17	NAME AND ND HEARD	0	0.0	
21	PARTY AND RELIGION	7	7.0	0.3%
22	PARTY AND OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
23	HEARD AND RELIGION	0	0.0	
24	HEARD AND OCCUPATION	1	1.0	0.0%
25	RELIGION + OCCUPATIO	2	2.0	0.1%
26	NAME PARTY HEARD	4	4.0	0.1%
27	NAME PARTY RELIGION	27	27.0	1.0%
28	NAME PARTY OCCUPAT'N	1	1.0	0.0%
29	NAME HEARD RELIGION	0	0.0	

var170: What known of Creditiste candidate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
30	NAME HEARD OCCUPAT'N	0	0.0	
31	NAME RELIG OCCUPAT'N	0	0.0	
32	PARTY HEARD RELIGION	1	1.0	0.0%
33	PARTY HEARD OCCUPATN	0	0.0	
34	PARTY RELIG OCCUPATN	2	2.0	0.1%
35	HEARD RELIG OCCUPATN	0	0.0	
36	NAME PARTY HEARD REL	10	10.0	0.4%
37	NAME PTY HEARD OCC	1	1.0	0.0%
38	NAME PARTY REL OCCUN	19	19.0	0.7%
39	NAME HEARD REL OCCU	0	0.0	
40	PARTY HEARD REL OCCN	1	1.0	0.0%
41	NAME PTY REL OCC HRD	23	23.0	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.

var171: What known of Social Credit candidate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40j in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2468	2468.0	89.2%
10	DONT KNOW AT ALL	222	222.0	8.0%
11	NAME	5	5.0	0.2%
12	PARTY	13	13.0	0.5%
13	HEARD OR READ	0	0.0	
14	RELIGION	0	0.0	
15	OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
16	NAME AND PARTY	5	5.0	0.2%
17	NAME AND ND HEARD	0	0.0	
20		2	2.0	0.1%
21	PARTY AND RELIGION	0	0.0	
22	PARTY AND OCCUPATION	1	1.0	0.0%
23	HEARD AND RELIGION	0	0.0	
24	HEARD AND OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
25	RELIGION + OCCUPATIO	0	0.0	
26	NAME PARTY HEARD	6	6.0	0.2%
27	NAME PARTY RELIGION	0	0.0	
28	NAME PARTY OCCUPAT'N	6	6.0	0.2%
29	NAME HEARD RELIGION	0	0.0	
30	NAME HEARD OCCUPAT'N	0	0.0	
31	NAME RELIG OCCUPAT'N	0	0.0	
32	PARTY HEARD RELIGION	0	0.0	
33	PARTY HEARD OCCUPATN	1	1.0	0.0%
34	PARTY RELIG OCCUPATN	0	0.0	
35	HEARD RELIG OCCUPATN	0	0.0	
36	NAME PARTY HEARD REL	0	0.0	

var171: What known of Social Credit candidate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
37	NAME PTY HEARD OCC	32	32.0	1.2%
38	NAME PARTY REL OCCUN	0	0.0	
39	NAME HEARD REL OCCU	1	1.0	0.0%
40	PARTY HEARD REL OCCN	0	0.0	
41	NAME PTY REL OCC HRD	5	5.0	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.

var172: What known of other candidates

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q35_40k in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2080	2080.0	75.2%
10	DONT KNOW AT ALL	635	635.0	22.9%
11	NAME	1	1.0	0.0%
12	PARTY	3	3.0	0.1%
13	HEARD OR READ	1	1.0	0.0%
14	RELIGION	1	1.0	0.0%
15	OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
16	NAME AND PARTY	8	8.0	0.3%
17	NAME AND ND HEARD	0	0.0	
18		2	2.0	0.1%
21	PARTY AND RELIGION	0	0.0	
22	PARTY AND OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
23	HEARD AND RELIGION	0	0.0	
24	HEARD AND OCCUPATION	0	0.0	
25	RELIGION + OCCUPATIO	0	0.0	
26	NAME PARTY HEARD	4	4.0	0.1%
27	NAME PARTY RELIGION	1	1.0	0.0%
28	NAME PARTY OCCUPAT'N	2	2.0	0.1%
29	NAME HEARD RELIGION	0	0.0	
30	NAME HEARD OCCUPAT'N	2	2.0	0.1%
31	NAME RELIG OCCUPAT'N	0	0.0	
32	PARTY HEARD RELIGION	0	0.0	
33	PARTY HEARD OCCUPATN	3	3.0	0.1%
34	PARTY RELIG OCCUPATN	0	0.0	
35	HEARD RELIG OCCUPATN	0	0.0	
36	NAME PARTY HEARD REL	5	5.0	0.2%
37	NAME PTY HEARD OCC	10	10.0	0.4%
38	NAME PARTY REL OCCUN	1	1.0	0.0%
39	NAME HEARD REL OCCU	0	0.0	
40	PARTY HEARD REL OCCN	0	0.0	
41	NAME PTY REL OCC HRD	8	8.0	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.

var173: Voted in how many federal elections

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2758 / 2758] [Invalid=9 / 9]
Literal question	In federal elections since you have been old enough to vote in Canada,including the one held this June, would you say that you have voted in all of them, most of them, some of them, or none of them?
Notes	q41 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	VOTED IN ALL	1589	1589.0		57.6%
2	VOTED IN MOST	743	743.0		26.9%
3	VOTED IN SOME	320	320.0		11.6%
4	VOTED 1N NONE	106	106.0		3.8%
5	DON'T REMEMBER	9	9.0		
6	NO ANSWER	0	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.

var174: What federal party have you always voted for

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2617 / 2617] [Invalid=150 / 150]
Literal question	Have you always voted for the same party in federal elections, or have you voted for different parties?
Post-question	IF SAME PARTY: Which party is that? (q42b)
Notes	q42a, q42b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	DIFFERENT PARTIES	1326	1326.0		50.7%
2	LIB	764	764.0		29.2%
3	PC	402	402.0		15.4%
4	NDP	98	98.0		3.7%
5	CREDITISTES	10	10.0		0.4%
6	SOC CREDIT	17	17.0		0.6%
0	NO ANSWER	130	130.0		
9	CAN'T REMEMBER	20	20.0		

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.

var175: Voted in how many provincial elections

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2737 / 2737] [Invalid=30 / 30]
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	q43 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	VOTED IN ALL	1421	1421.0		51.9%
2	VOTED IN MOST	707	707.0		25.8%
3	VOTED IN SOME	387	387.0		14.1%
4	VOTED INNONE	222	222.0		8.1%
5	DON'T REMEMBER	30	30.0		
6	NO ANSWER	0	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.

var176: What provincial party have you always voted for

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2485 / 2485] [Invalid=282 / 282]			
Literal question	In provincial elections, have you always voted for the same party, or have you voted for different parties?			
Post-question	IF SAME PARTY: Which party is that? (q44b)			
Notes	q44a, q44b in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DIFFERENT PARTIES	1161	1161.0	46.7%
2	LIB	612	612.0	24.6%
3	PC	403	403.0	16.2%
4	NDP	120	120.0	4.8%
5	SOC CREDIT CREDITIST	139	139.0	5.6%
6	UNION NAT	48	48.0	1.9%
7	LIB AND PC	1	1.0	0.0%
8	INDEPENDENT	1	1.0	0.0%
0	NO ANSWER	271	271.0	
9	CAN'T REMEMBER	11	11.0	

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.

var177: Why did you vote for different parties

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2723 / 2723] [Invalid=44 / 44]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who stated that they have voted for different parties.
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	q44c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1606	1606.0	59.0%
1	OUT OF CHOICE	1077	1077.0	39.6%
2	PARTY NOT RUNNING	40	40.0	1.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	23	23.0	
4	NO ANSWER	21	21.0	

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.

var178: Party voted for in last provincial election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2370 / 2370] [Invalid=397 / 397]
Literal question	If you voted, for which party did you happen to vote in the last provincial election?
Notes	q45 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DID NOT VOTE	186	186.0	7.8%
2	LIB	933	933.0	39.4%
3	PC	668	668.0	28.2%
4	NDP-CCF	245	245.0	10.3%
5	SOC CREDIT CREDITIST	215	215.0	9.1%
6	UNION NAT	118	118.0	5.0%

var178: Party voted for in last provincial election

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
7	INDEPENDENT	4	4.0	0.2%
8	RIN	1	1.0	0.0%
0	NO ANSWR	284	284.0	
9	DON'T REMEMBER	113	113.0	

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.

var179: Did you vote in the last election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who have never voted, as indicated in q41.
Pre-question	Now thinking about this year's June election, we find that a lot of people weren't going to vote because they were sick, or didn't have time, or had some other reason for not voting.
Literal question	How about you? Did you vote this time or did something keep you from voting?
Notes	q46a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	YES-VOTED	2366	2366.0	85.5%
2	NO-DID NOT VOTE	401	401.0	14.5%

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.

var180: Which party did you vote for

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2287 / 2287] [Invalid=480 / 480]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who voted in the last election.
Literal question	For which party did you vote?
Notes	q46b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	LIB	1288	1288.0	56.3%
3	PC	637	637.0	27.9%
4	NDP	274	274.0	12.0%
5	CREDITISTE	46	46.0	2.0%
6	SOC CREDIT	39	39.0	1.7%
7	INDEPENDENT	1	1.0	0.0%
8	UNION NAT	2	2.0	0.1%
0	NO ANSWER	441	441.0	
9	DON'T REMEMBER	39	39.0	

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.

var181: Was there a particular reason for not voting

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=392 / 392] [Invalid=2375 / 2375]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who did not vote in the last election.
Literal question	Was there any particular reason why you didn't vote in the June election?
Notes	q46c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	SICK	81	81.0	20.7%

var181: Was there a particular reason for not voting

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	BUSY	61	61.0	15.6%
3	COULDN'T DECIDE	25	25.0	6.4%
4	NOT INTERESTED	53	53.0	13.5%
5	FORGOT	2	2.0	0.5%
6	DON'T KNOW	42	42.0	10.7%
7	NOT ELIGIBLE	9	9.0	2.3%
8	COULDN'T GET THERE	91	91.0	23.2%
9	OTHER	28	28.0	7.1%
0	NO ANSWER	2375	2375.0	

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.

var182: Who would you have voted for

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=372 / 372] [Invalid=2395 / 2395]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who did not vote in the last election.
Literal question	Who would you have voted for?
Post-question	If respondent has never voted, as indicated in q41, go to 53. If respondent has voted but not in 1968, go to q50.
Notes	q46d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	LIB	164	164.0	44.1%
3	PC	76	76.0	20.4%
4	NDP	31	31.0	8.3%
5	CREDITISTE	9	9.0	2.4%
6	SOC CREDIT	10	10.0	2.7%
7	NO ONE DIDN'T VOTE	6	6.0	1.6%
9	DON'T KNOW	76	76.0	20.4%
0	NO ANSWER	2395	2395.0	

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.

var183: Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - first mention

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-28] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2340 / 2340] [Invalid=427 / 427]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	Why voted as did in June 1968?
Notes	q47a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Cols. 41-42.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LONG TIME AGO	133	133.0	5.7%
2	BEFORE CAMPAIGN	7	7.0	0.3%
3	EARLY CAMPAIGN	12	12.0	0.5%
4	MID-CAMPAIGN	0	0.0	
5	LATE CAMPAIGN	9	9.0	0.4%
6	OTHER	1	1.0	0.0%
7	DURING CAM NON-SPEC	2	2.0	0.1%
8	POLICY ECONDMIC	105	105.0	4.5%
9	POLICY OTHER	14	14.0	0.6%

var183: Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - first mention

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
10	LEADER AGE	52	52.0	2.2%
11	LEADER FR-ENGL POS'N	19	19.0	0.8%
12	LEADER-GENERAL	345	345.0	14.7%
13	LEADER-OTHER	84	84.0	3.6%
14	LOCAL CAND GENERAL	10	10.0	0.4%
15	LOCAL CAND LIKE	205	205.0	8.8%
16	LOCAL CAND DISLIKE	17	17.0	0.7%
17	NO CAND 4 PREF PARTY	4	4.0	0.2%
18	FAMILY AGREEMENT	40	40.0	1.7%
19	PICKING THE WINNER	122	122.0	5.2%
20	PARTY LOYALTY	228	228.0	9.7%
21	CHANGE OLD PARTIES	93	93.0	4.0%
22	THE MAN	111	111.0	4.7%
23	UNSPECIFED FAVORABLE	55	55.0	2.4%
24	UNSPEC UNFAVORABLE	6	6.0	0.3%
25	DIEFENBAKER PRO-CON	7	7.0	0.3%
26	OTHER	70	70.0	3.0%
27	NO SPECIAL REASON	281	281.0	12.0%
28	PARTY)	308	308.0	13.2%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	427	427.0	

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.

var184: Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - second mention

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-28] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=508 / 508] [Invalid=2259 / 2259]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	Why voted as did in June 1968?
Notes	q47b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Cols. 43-44.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LONG TIME AGO	60	60.0	11.8%
2	BEFORE CAMPAIGN	1	1.0	0.2%
3	EARLY CAMPAIGN	5	5.0	1.0%
4	MID-CAMPAIGN	0	0.0	
5	LATE CAMPAIGN	6	6.0	1.2%
6	OTHER	0	0.0	
7	DURING CAM NON-SPEC	2	2.0	0.4%
8	POLICY ECONDMIC	37	37.0	7.3%
9	POLICY OTHER	8	8.0	1.6%
10	LEADER AGE	36	36.0	7.1%
11	LEADER FR-ENGL POS'N	11	11.0	2.2%
12	LEADER-GENERAL	102	102.0	20.1%
13	LEADER-OTHER	84	84.0	16.5%
14	LOCAL CAND GENERAL	2	2.0	0.4%
15	LOCAL CAND LIKE	35	35.0	6.9%
16	LOCAL CAND DISLIKE	8	8.0	1.6%

var184: Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - second mention

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
17	NO CAND 4 PREF PARTY	0	0.0	
18	FAMILY AGREEMENT	5	5.0	1.0%
19	PICKING THE WINNER	25	25.0	4.9%
20	PARTY LOYALTY	12	12.0	2.4%
21	CHANGE OLD PARTIES	6	6.0	1.2%
22	THE MAN	1	1.0	0.2%
23	UNSPECIFED FAVORABLE	1	1.0	0.2%
24	UNSPEC UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
25	DIEFENBAKER PRO-CON	4	4.0	0.8%
26	OTHER	8	8.0	1.6%
27	NO SPECIAL REASON	0	0.0	
28	PARTY)	49	49.0	9.6%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2259	2259.0	

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.

var185: Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - third mention

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-28] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=83 / 83] [Invalid=2684 / 2684]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	Why voted as did in June 1968?
Notes	q47c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Cols. 45-46.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LONG TIME AGO	1	1.0	1.2%
2	BEFORE CAMPAIGN	0	0.0	
3	EARLY CAMPAIGN	0	0.0	
4	MID-CAMPAIGN	0	0.0	
5	LATE CAMPAIGN	1	1.0	1.2%
6	OTHER	0	0.0	
7	DURING CAM NON-SPEC	0	0.0	
8	POLICY ECONDMIC	5	5.0	6.0%
9	POLICY OTHER	0	0.0	
10	LEADER AGE	10	10.0	12.0%
11	LEADER FR-ENGL POS'N	5	5.0	6.0%
12	LEADER-GENERAL	11	11.0	13.3%
13	LEADER-OTHER	30	30.0	36.1%
14	LOCAL CAND GENERAL	0	0.0	
15	LOCAL CAND LIKE	4	4.0	4.8%
16	LOCAL CAND DISLIKE	2	2.0	2.4%
17	NO CAND 4 PREF PARTY	0	0.0	
18	FAMILY AGREEMENT	1	1.0	1.2%
19	PICKING THE WINNER	5	5.0	6.0%
20	PARTY LOYALTY	0	0.0	
21	CHANGE OLD PARTIES	1	1.0	1.2%
22	THE MAN	0	0.0	
23	UNSPECIFED FAVORABLE	0	0.0	

var185: Why did you vote as you did in June 1968 - third mention

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
24	UNSPEC UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
25	DIEFENBAKER PRO-CON	1	1.0	1.2%
26	OTHER	1	1.0	1.2%
27	NO SPECIAL REASON	0	0.0	
28	PARTY)	5	5.0	6.0%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2684	2684.0	

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.

var186: When did you decide to vote

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-12] [Missing=*/88/89/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	When did you decide to vote?
Notes	q48a1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Col. 47.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	996	996.0	36.0%
1	INFLATION	436	436.0	15.8%
2	PROVINCE	100	100.0	3.6%
3	U.S.	472	472.0	17.1%
4	QUEBEC	219	219.0	7.9%
5	COMPETENT GOVT	323	323.0	11.7%
6	UNEMPLOYMENT	94	94.0	3.4%
7	SOCIAL WELFARE	127	127.0	4.6%
8	ENVT PROTECTION	0	0.0	
9	GOVT. SIZE	0	0.0	
10	WOMEN'S ISSUES	0	0.0	
11	WORLD PEACE	0	0.0	
12	DEFICIT	0	0.0	
88	DONT KNOW	0	0.0	
89	REFUSED	0	0.0	
99	NA	0	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.

var187: Was decision to vote related to incident

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=472 / 472] [Invalid=2295 / 2295]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	When did you decide to vote?
Notes	q48a2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Col. 48.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CONVENTION TIME	46	46.0	9.7%
2	LEADER'S NOMIINATION	120	120.0	25.4%
3	SELECTION OF LOC CAN	39	39.0	8.3%
4	POLICY ANNOUNCMENT	9	9.0	1.9%
5	DISCOVERD WHO RUNING	36	36.0	7.6%

var187: Was decision to vote related to incident

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	AFTER TV DEBATE	17	17.0	3.6%
7	AFTER ASSESS CAMPAGN	155	155.0	32.8%
8	OTHER	50	50.0	10.6%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2295	2295.0	

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.

var188: Why was the decision to vote not easy - first mention

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-21] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	Why not an easy decision?
Notes	q48c1c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Cols. 49-50.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		401	401.0	14.5%
1	EASY	1973	1973.0	71.3%
2	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	22	22.0	0.8%
3	LACK OF INF ORMAT	33	33.0	1.2%
4	TOO COMPLICATED	15	15.0	0.5%
6	POL'Y ASSESS DIFF	32	32.0	1.2%
7	PREF PTY-NOCANDIDATE	1	1.0	0.0%
8	CHANGE LOYALTY-VOTE	40	40.0	1.4%
9	UNCERTAINTY-GENERAL	86	86.0	3.1%
10	HOPE NDP SURVIVE	5	5.0	0.2%
11	LEADER-PRO-TRUDEAU	14	14.0	0.5%
12	LEADER PRO-STANFIELD	4	4.0	0.1%
13	LEADER-ANTI-TRUDEAU	18	18.0	0.7%
14	LEADER ANTI-STANFIED	10	10.0	0.4%
15	LEADER EFFECT AMBIV	31	31.0	1.1%
16	EFFCT-LDR OTHER	4	4.0	0.1%
17	LOCAL CAND LIKE	6	6.0	0.2%
18	LOCAL CAND DISLIKE	9	9.0	0.3%
21	OTHER	63	63.0	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.

var189: Why was the decision to vote not easy - second mention

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-21] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	Why not an easy decision?
Notes	q48c2c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 4, Cols. 51-52.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2742	2742.0	99.1%
1	EASY	0	0.0	
2	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	0	0.0	
3	LACK OF INF ORMAT	0	0.0	

var189: Why was the decision to vote not easy - second mention

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	TOO COMPLICATED	0	0.0	
6	POL'Y ASSESS DIFF	0	0.0	
7	PREF PTY-NOCANDIDATE	0	0.0	
8	CHANGE LOYALTY-VOTE	1	1.0	0.0%
9	UNCERTAINTY-GENERAL	1	1.0	0.0%
10	HOPE NDP SURVIVE	0	0.0	
11	LEADER-PRO-TRUDEAU	2	2.0	0.1%
12	LEADER PRO-STANFIELD	1	1.0	0.0%
13	LEADER-ANTI-TRUDEAU	5	5.0	0.2%
14	LEADER ANTI-STANFIED	4	4.0	0.1%
15	LEADER EFFECT AMBIV	1	1.0	0.0%
16	EFFCT-LDR OTHER	0	0.0	
17	LOCAL CAND LIKE	2	2.0	0.1%
18	LOCAL CAND DISLIKE	2	2.0	0.1%
21	OTHER	6	6.0	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.

var190: Which party would be your second choice

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2045 / 2045] [Invalid=722 / 722]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	If at this time you had to vote for one of the other federal parties, which party would you pick?
Interviewer's instructions	CHECK BELOW, DO NOT READ LIST
Notes	q49a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIB	481	481.0	23.5%
2	PC	701	701.0	34.3%
3	NDP	430	430.0	21.0%
4	CREDITISTE	61	61.0	3.0%
5	SOC CREDIT	74	74.0	3.6%
6	COMMUNIST LPP	2	2.0	0.1%
7	OTHER	5	5.0	0.2%
8	NO CHOICE	291	291.0	14.2%
0	NO ANSWER	430	430.0	
9	DON'T KNOW	292	292.0	

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.

var191: Which party would you least want to vote

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2038 / 2038] [Invalid=729 / 729]
Universe	Not asked to respondents who did not vote in the 1968 election, or who have never voted.
Literal question	Which of the federal parties today would you least want to vote for?
Interviewer's instructions	CHECK BELOW, DO NOT READ LIST
Notes	q49b in the documentation.

var191: Which party would you least want to vote

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LIB	211	211.0	10.4%
2	PC	314	314.0	15.4%
3	NDP	685	685.0	33.6%
4	CREDITISTE	335	335.0	16.4%
5	SOC CREDIT	253	253.0	12.4%
6	COMMUNIST LPP	55	55.0	2.7%
7	OTHER	5	5.0	0.2%
8	NO CHOICE	180	180.0	8.8%
0	NO ANSWER	423	423.0	
9	DON'T KNOW	306	306.0	

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.

var192: Which party did you vote for in 1965

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2473 / 2473] [Invalid=294 / 294]
Literal question	The last federal election before the one in June was in 1965. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in that election?
Post-question	IF VOTED: Which party did you vote for? (q50b)
Notes	q50a, q50b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DID NOT VOTE	460	460.0	18.6%
2	LIB	1017	1017.0	41.1%
3	PC	701	701.0	28.3%
4	NDP	224	224.0	9.1%
5	CREDITISTE	25	25.0	1.0%
6	SOC CREDIT	44	44.0	1.8%
7	COMMUNIST LPP	1	1.0	0.0%
8	OTHER	1	1.0	0.0%
0	NO ANSWER	134	134.0	
9	DON'T REMEMBER	160	160.0	

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.

var193: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Liberal

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=152 / 152] [Invalid=2615 / 2615]
Literal question	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
Notes	q51a1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 5, Col. 56 - Liberal.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER FAVORABLE	57	57.0	37.5%
2	LEADER UNFAVORABLE	15	15.0	9.9%
3	CANDIDATE FAVORABLE	14	14.0	9.2%
4	CANDIDATE UNFAVORABL	7	7.0	4.6%
5	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	9	9.0	5.9%
6	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	4	4.0	2.6%
7	GEN POLIC FAVORABLE	14	14.0	9.2%

var193: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Liberal

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	5	5.0	3.3%
9	OTHER	27	27.0	17.8%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2615	2615.0	

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.

var194: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Conservative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=88 / 88] [Invalid=2679 / 2679]
Literal question	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
Notes	q51a2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 5, Col. 57 - Conservative.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER FAVORABLE	10	10.0	11.4%
2	LEADER UNFAVORABLE	21	21.0	23.9%
3	CANDIDATE FAVORABLE	14	14.0	15.9%
4	CANDIDATE UNFAVORABL	10	10.0	11.4%
5	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
6	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	3	3.0	3.4%
7	GEN POLIC FAVORABLE	1	1.0	1.1%
8	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	9	9.0	10.2%
9	OTHER	20	20.0	22.7%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2679	2679.0	

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.

var195: Reasons fro changing vote 1965-1968 NDP

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=55 / 55] [Invalid=2712 / 2712]
Literal question	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
Notes	q51a3a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 5, Col. 58 - NDP.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER FAVORABLE	5	5.0	9.1%
2	LEADER UNFAVORABLE	1	1.0	1.8%
3	CANDIDATE FAVORABLE	7	7.0	12.7%
4	CANDIDATE UNFAVORABL	3	3.0	5.5%
5	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	1	1.0	1.8%
6	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	1	1.0	1.8%
7	GEN POLIC FAVORABLE	8	8.0	14.5%
8	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	6	6.0	10.9%
9	OTHER	23	23.0	41.8%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2712	2712.0	

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.

var196: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Social Credit

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=25 / 25] [Invalid=2742 / 2742]
Literal question	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?

var196: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 Social Credit

| | Notes | | q51a4a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 5, Col. 59 - Social Credit. | | |

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER FAVORABLE	4	4.0	16.0%
2	LEADER UNFAVORABLE	1	1.0	4.0%
3	CANDIDATE FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
4	CANDIDATE UNFAVORABL	2	2.0	8.0%
5	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
6	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
7	GEN POLIC FAVORABLE	5	5.0	20.0%
8	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	1	1.0	4.0%
9	OTHER	12	12.0	48.0%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2742	2742.0	

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.

var197: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 other party

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=0 / 0] [Invalid=2767 / 2767]
Literal question	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
Notes	q51a5a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 5, Col. 60 - Other party.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
2	LEADER UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
3	CANDIDATE FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
4	CANDIDATE UNFAVORABL	0	0.0	
5	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
6	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
7	GEN POLIC FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
8	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
9	OTHER	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2767	2767.0	

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.

var198: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 other

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=78 / 78] [Invalid=2689 / 2689]
Literal question	Reasons for changing vote between 1965 and 1968?
Notes	q51a6a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 5, Col. 61 - Other.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
2	LEADER UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
3	CANDIDATE FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
4	CANDIDATE UNFAVORABL	0	0.0	
5	SPEC POL FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
6	SPEC POL UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	
7	GEN POLIC FAVORABLE	0	0.0	
8	GEN POL UNFAVORABLE	0	0.0	

var198: Reasons for changing vote 1965-1968 other

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
9	OTHER	78	78.0		100.0%
0	DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER	2689	2689.0		

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.

var199: How did you vote in 1958

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/9/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2409 / 2409] [Invalid=358 / 358]
Literal question	Were you able to vote in the 1958 election, the one in which Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Pearson opposed one another for the first time?
Post-question	IF "YES": How did you vote at that time?
Notes	q52 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	811	811.0	33.7%
2	LIB	720	720.0	29.9%
3	PC	751	751.0	31.2%
4	NDP-CCF	103	103.0	4.3%
5	SOC CREDIT CREDITIST	24	24.0	1.0%
6	COMMUNIST LPP	0	0.0	
7	OTHER	0	0.0	
0	NO ANSWER	131	131.0	
8	DON'T REMEMBER VOTIN	21	21.0	
9	DON'T REMEMBER	206	206.0	

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.

var200: What do you like best about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=498 / 498] [Invalid=2269 / 2269]
Notes	q58a3a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 9 - 12, Card 4, cols. 63 - 66.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	10	10.0	2.0%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	14	14.0	2.8%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	0.2%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	23	23.0	4.6%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	26	26.0	5.2%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	6	6.0	1.2%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	4	4.0	0.8%
15	PERSONALITY	17	17.0	3.4%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	4	4.0	0.8%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	33	33.0	6.6%
18	COURAGE	4	4.0	0.8%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	16	16.0	3.2%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	4	4.0	0.8%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	6	6.0	1.2%
23	AGE	23	23.0	4.6%

var200: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
24	MATURITY OR LACK	3	3.0	0.6%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	3	3.0	0.6%
26	INDEPENDENCE	16	16.0	3.2%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	2	2.0	0.4%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	3	3.0	0.6%
29	EASY MANNER	13	13.0	2.6%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	3	3.0	0.6%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	3	3.0	0.6%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	9	9.0	1.8%
34	EDUCATION	28	28.0	5.6%
35	BILINGUAL	1	1.0	0.2%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	1	1.0	0.2%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	1	1.0	0.2%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	33	33.0	6.6%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	14	14.0	2.8%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	24	24.0	4.8%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	5	5.0	1.0%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	9	9.0	1.8%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	9	9.0	1.8%
50	4 WORKING MAN	1	1.0	0.2%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	3	3.0	0.6%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	2	2.0	0.4%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	2	2.0	0.4%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	1	1.0	0.2%
59	OTHER PO L	11	11.0	2.2%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	2.0	0.4%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	24	24.0	4.8%
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	0.2%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	24	24.0	4.8%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	9	9.0	1.8%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	2	2.0	0.4%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	1	1.0	0.2%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	9	9.0	1.8%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	21	21.0	4.2%

var200: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	0.2%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	1	1.0	0.2%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	2	2.0	0.4%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	9	9.0	1.8%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	1	1.0	0.2%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2269	2269.0	

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.

var201: What do you like best about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=158 / 158] [Invalid=2609 / 2609]
Notes	q58a4a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 9 - 12, Card 4, cols. 63 - 66.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	1	1.0	0.6%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	2	2.0	1.3%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	4	4.0	2.5%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	7	7.0	4.4%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	14	14.0	8.9%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	2	2.0	1.3%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	5	5.0	3.2%
15	PERSONALITY	4	4.0	2.5%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	3	3.0	1.9%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	6	6.0	3.8%
18	COURAGE	2	2.0	1.3%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	6	6.0	3.8%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	7	7.0	4.4%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	0.6%
26	INDEPENDENCE	1	1.0	0.6%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	2	2.0	1.3%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.6%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	

var201: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	4	4.0	2.5%
34	EDUCATION	9	9.0	5.7%
35	BILINGUAL	1	1.0	0.6%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	2	2.0	1.3%
37	SWINGER	1	1.0	0.6%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	14	14.0	8.9%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	3	3.0	1.9%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	10	10.0	6.3%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	1	1.0	0.6%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	3	3.0	1.9%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	3	3.0	1.9%
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	1	1.0	0.6%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	8	8.0	5.1%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	7	7.0	4.4%
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	5	5.0	3.2%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	6	6.0	3.8%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	1	1.0	0.6%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	7	7.0	4.4%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	2	2.0	1.3%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	1	1.0	0.6%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	1	1.0	0.6%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2609	2609.0	

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.

var202: What do you like least about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=37 / 37] [Invalid=2730 / 2730]
Notes	q58b3b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 13 - 16, Card 4, cols. 67- 70.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	1	1.0	2.7%
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	1.0	2.7%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	0	0.0	
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	3	3.0	8.1%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	1	1.0	2.7%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	7	7.0	18.9%
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	4	4.0	10.8%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	1	1.0	2.7%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	1	1.0	2.7%
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	2	2.0	5.4%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	2	2.0	5.4%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	

var202: What do you like least about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	2	2.0	5.4%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	2	2.0	5.4%
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	3	3.0	8.1%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	1	1.0	2.7%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	2.7%
67	BEHAVIOR WITH WOMEN	3	3.0	8.1%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	1	1.0	2.7%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	1	1.0	2.7%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2730	2730.0	

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.

var203: What do you like least about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4 / 4] [Invalid=2763 / 2763]
Notes	q58b4b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 13 - 16, Card 4, cols. 67- 70.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	

var203: What do you like least about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	1	1.0	25.0%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	0	0.0	
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	1	1.0	25.0%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	1	1.0	25.0%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	1	1.0	25.0%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	

var203: What do you like least about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2763	2763.0	

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.

var204: What do you like most about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=110 / 110] [Invalid=2657 / 2657]
Notes	q58c3c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 17 - 20, Card 4, cols. 71 - 74.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	3	3.0	2.7%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	7	7.0	6.4%
11	MARITAL STATUS	2	2.0	1.8%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	7	7.0	6.4%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	7	7.0	6.4%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	1	1.0	0.9%

var204: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
15	PERSONALITY	1	1.0	0.9%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	9	9.0	8.2%
18	COURAGE	1	1.0	0.9%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	2	2.0	1.8%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	5	5.0	4.5%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	9	9.0	8.2%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	1	1.0	0.9%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	2	2.0	1.8%
29	EASY MANNER	6	6.0	5.5%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.9%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	2	2.0	1.8%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	1	1.0	0.9%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	19	19.0	17.3%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	4	4.0	3.6%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.9%
43	CONSERVATISM	2	2.0	1.8%
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	1	1.0	0.9%
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	0.9%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	2	2.0	1.8%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	4	4.0	3.6%
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	

var204: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	2	2.0	1.8%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	0.9%
67	BEHAVIOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	5	5.0	4.5%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	0.9%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2657	2657.0	

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.

var205: What do you like most about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=14 / 14] [Invalid=2753 / 2753]
Notes	q58c4c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 17 - 20, Card 4, cols. 71 - 74.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	1	1.0	7.1%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	1	1.0	7.1%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	2	2.0	14.3%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	1	1.0	7.1%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	1	1.0	7.1%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	1	1.0	7.1%

var205: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	3	3.0	21.4%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	1	1.0	7.1%
29	EASY MANNER	1	1.0	7.1%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	1	1.0	7.1%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	0	0.0	
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	

var205: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	7.1%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2753	2753.0	

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.

var206: What do you like least about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=58 / 58] [Invalid=2709 / 2709]
Notes	q58d3d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 21 - 24, Card 4, co1s. 75 - 78.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	2	2.0	3.4%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	1.7%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	1	1.0	1.7%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	1	1.0	1.7%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	2	2.0	3.4%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	1	1.0	1.7%
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	1	1.0	1.7%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	8	8.0	13.8%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	1	1.0	1.7%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
22		2	2.0	3.4%
23	AGE	4	4.0	6.9%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	1.7%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	1	1.0	1.7%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	

var206: What do you like least about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	1	1.0	1.7%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	1	1.0	1.7%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	2	2.0	3.4%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	2	2.0	3.4%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	3	3.0	5.2%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	1.0	1.7%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	3	3.0	5.2%
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	1.7%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	5	5.0	8.6%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	1	1.0	1.7%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	6	6.0	10.3%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	1	1.0	1.7%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	1.7%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	1	1.0	1.7%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	3	3.0	5.2%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2709	2709.0	

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.

var207: What do you like least about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10 / 10] [Invalid=2757 / 2757]
Notes	q58d4d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 21 - 24, Card 4, co1s. 75 - 78.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	10.0%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	0	0.0	
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	0	0.0	
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	0	0.0	
15	PERSONALITY	0	0.0	
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	0	0.0	
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
22		1	1.0	10.0%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	1	1.0	10.0%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	1	1.0	10.0%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	1	1.0	10.0%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	0	0.0	
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	

var207: What do you like least about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	0	0.0	
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	1	1.0	10.0%
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	10.0%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	1	1.0	10.0%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	1	1.0	10.0%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	1	1.0	10.0%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	0	0.0	
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2757	2757.0	

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.

var208: Rating of Trudeau on thermometer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2659 / 2659] [Invalid=108 / 108]
Pre-question	There are many aspects of political parties which strike Canadians in different ways. We would like to get your feelings towards some of those aspects of our parties. We are interested to see how you liked the leaders, the work of the members of the various parties in the Parliament, which sat before the last election, and the party as a whole. You'll see here a drawing of a thermometer. It's been called a "feeling thermometer" because it helps measure one's feelings towards various things. Here's how it works. If you don't particularly like or dislike the person, group or activity we are asking about, place them at the 50 degree mark. If your feelings are very warm then you would give a score between 50 and 100, the warmer your feelings, the higher the score. On the other hand, if you do not like the person, group or activity very much, you would place theim somewhere between 0 and 50. The cooler your feelings, the closer the number will be to 0.

var208: Rating of Trudeau on thermometer

	If you don't know too much about one of the items mentioned, just say so, and we'll go on to the next one. Let's start with the Liberals.
Literal question	How much do you like their leader, Mr. Trudeau? where would you place him on the thermometer?
Interviewer's instructions	POINT TO PAGE 8 OF WHITE SHEETS
Notes	q53a1a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		98	98.0	3.7%
3		122	122.0	4.6%
4		75	75.0	2.8%
5		93	93.0	3.5%
6		417	417.0	15.7%
7		202	202.0	7.6%
8		340	340.0	12.8%
9		515	515.0	19.4%
10		445	445.0	16.7%
11		352	352.0	13.2%
0	NA	11	11.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	97	97.0	

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.

var209: Rating of Stanfield on thermometer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2617 / 2617] [Invalid=150 / 150]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR CONSERVATIVE PARTY
Notes	q53apa in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		89	89.0	3.4%
3		151	151.0	5.8%
4		128	128.0	4.9%
5		233	233.0	8.9%
6		620	620.0	23.7%
7		479	479.0	18.3%
8		374	374.0	14.3%
9		302	302.0	11.5%
10		141	141.0	5.4%
11		100	100.0	3.8%
0	NA	11	11.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	139	139.0	

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.

var210: Rating of Douglas on thermometer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2348 / 2348] [Invalid=419 / 419]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR N.D.P. PARTY (Insert Douglas' name as leader)
Notes	q53ana in the documentation.

var210: Rating of Douglas on thermometer

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		163	163.0	6.9%
3		196	196.0	8.3%
4		127	127.0	5.4%
5		193	193.0	8.2%
6		524	524.0	22.3%
7		299	299.0	12.7%
8		274	274.0	11.7%
9		318	318.0	13.5%
10		157	157.0	6.7%
11		97	97.0	4.1%
0	NA	21	21.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	398	398.0	

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.

var211: Rating of Caouette on thermometer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=582 / 582] [Invalid=2185 / 2185]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Creditistes in this riding in the 1968 election.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR DES CREDITISTES (Insert Caouette's name as leader)
Notes	q53aca in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		79	79.0	13.6%
3		83	83.0	14.3%
4		38	38.0	6.5%
5		45	45.0	7.7%
6		105	105.0	18.0%
7		64	64.0	11.0%
8		59	59.0	10.1%
9		56	56.0	9.6%
10		29	29.0	5.0%
11		24	24.0	4.1%
0	NA	2080	2080.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	105	105.0	

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.

var212: Rating of Patterson on thermometer

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=213 / 213] [Invalid=2554 / 2554]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Social Credit party in this riding in the 1968 elecetion.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY (Insert Patterson's name)
Notes	q53asa in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		8	8.0	3.8%
3		16	16.0	7.5%
4		10	10.0	4.7%

var212: Rating of Patterson on thermometer

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5		17	17.0	8.0%
6		99	99.0	46.5%
7		21	21.0	9.9%
8		17	17.0	8.0%
9		13	13.0	6.1%
10		9	9.0	4.2%
11		3	3.0	1.4%
0	NA	2485	2485.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	69	69.0	

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.

var213: Rating of work in last Parliament of Liberal Members

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2534 / 2534] [Invalid=233 / 233]
Literal question	And what about the work of the Liberal Members in the last Parliament? How did you like what they did, taken as a whole?
Notes	q53a1b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		54	54.0	2.1%
3		172	172.0	6.8%
4		131	131.0	5.2%
5		226	226.0	8.9%
6		523	523.0	20.6%
7		483	483.0	19.1%
8		398	398.0	15.7%
9		361	361.0	14.2%
10		130	130.0	5.1%
11		56	56.0	2.2%
0	NA	13	13.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	220	220.0	

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.

var214: Rating of work in last Parliament of Conservative Members

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2498 / 2498] [Invalid=269 / 269]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR CONSERVATIVE PARTY (Insert Stanfield's name as leader)
Notes	q53apb in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		60	60.0	2.4%
3		160	160.0	6.4%
4		184	184.0	7.4%
5		298	298.0	11.9%
6		644	644.0	25.8%
7		491	491.0	19.7%
8		341	341.0	13.7%
9		213	213.0	8.5%

var214: Rating of work in last Parliament of Conservative Members

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
10		67	67.0	2.7%
11		40	40.0	1.6%
0	NA	12	12.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	257	257.0	

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.

var215: Rating of work in last Parliament of NDP Members

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2153 / 2153] [Invalid=614 / 614]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR N.D.P. PARTY
Notes	q53anb in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		142	142.0	6.6%
3		205	205.0	9.5%
4		176	176.0	8.2%
5		200	200.0	9.3%
6		582	582.0	27.0%
7		341	341.0	15.8%
8		240	240.0	11.1%
9		166	166.0	7.7%
10		72	72.0	3.3%
11		29	29.0	1.3%
0	NA	27	27.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	587	587.0	

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.

var216: Rating of work in last Parliament of Creditiste Members

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=524 / 524] [Invalid=2243 / 2243]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Creditistes in this riding in the 1968 election.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR DES CREDITISTES
Notes	q53acb in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		62	62.0	11.8%
3		76	76.0	14.5%
4		44	44.0	8.4%
5		51	51.0	9.7%
6		96	96.0	18.3%
7		63	63.0	12.0%
8		60	60.0	11.5%
9		44	44.0	8.4%
10		18	18.0	3.4%
11		10	10.0	1.9%
0	NA	2081	2081.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	162	162.0	

var216: Rating of work in last Parliament of Creditiste Members

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

var217: Rating of work in last Parliament of Social Credit Members

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=224 / 224] [Invalid=2543 / 2543]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Social Credit party in this riding in the 1968 elecetion.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY
Notes	q53asb in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		13	13.0	5.8%
3		27	27.0	12.1%
4		24	24.0	10.7%
5		31	31.0	13.8%
6		76	76.0	33.9%
7		25	25.0	11.2%
8		13	13.0	5.8%
9		7	7.0	3.1%
10		3	3.0	1.3%
11		5	5.0	2.2%
0	NA	2484	2484.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	59	59.0	

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.

var218: Rating of local Liberal candidate in 1968 election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2339 / 2339] [Invalid=428 / 428]
Literal question	How much did you like your local Liberal candidate in the 1968 election?
Notes	q53a1c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		70	70.0	3.0%
3		104	104.0	4.4%
4		74	74.0	3.2%
5		116	116.0	5.0%
6		616	616.0	26.3%
7		275	275.0	11.8%
8		358	358.0	15.3%
9		381	381.0	16.3%
10		185	185.0	7.9%
11		160	160.0	6.8%
0	NA	11	11.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	417	417.0	

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.

var219: Rating of local Conservative candidate in 1968 election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2223 / 2223] [Invalid=544 / 544]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR CONSERVATIVE PARTY

var219: Rating of local Conservative candidate in 1968 election

Notes	q53apc in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		78	78.0	3.5%
3		109	109.0	4.9%
4		98	98.0	4.4%
5		128	128.0	5.8%
6		744	744.0	33.5%
7		287	287.0	12.9%
8		274	274.0	12.3%
9		255	255.0	11.5%
10		146	146.0	6.6%
11		104	104.0	4.7%
0	NA	14	14.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	530	530.0	

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.

var220: Rating of local NDP candidate in 1968 election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1839 / 1839] [Invalid=928 / 928]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR N.D.P. PARTY
Notes	q53anc in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		163	163.0	8.9%
3		173	173.0	9.4%
4		122	122.0	6.6%
5		113	113.0	6.1%
6		701	701.0	38.1%
7		163	163.0	8.9%
8		155	155.0	8.4%
9		126	126.0	6.9%
10		71	71.0	3.9%
11		52	52.0	2.8%
0	NA	53	53.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	875	875.0	

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.

var221: Rating of local Credisiste candidate in 1968 election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=393 / 393] [Invalid=2374 / 2374]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Creditistes in this riding in the 1968 election.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR DES CREDITISTES
Notes	q53acc in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		79	79.0	20.1%
3		56	56.0	14.2%
4		19	19.0	4.8%

var221: Rating of local Credisiste candidate in 1968 election

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5		27	27.0	6.9%
6		114	114.0	29.0%
7		25	25.0	6.4%
8		26	26.0	6.6%
9		33	33.0	8.4%
10		6	6.0	1.5%
11		8	8.0	2.0%
0	NA	2082	2082.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	292	292.0	

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.

var222: Rating of local Social Credit candidate in 1968 election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=201 / 201] [Invalid=2566 / 2566]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Social Credit party in this riding in the 1968 elecetion.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY
Notes	q53asc in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		6	6.0	3.0%
3		18	18.0	9.0%
4		14	14.0	7.0%
5		24	24.0	11.9%
6		87	87.0	43.3%
7		20	20.0	10.0%
8		15	15.0	7.5%
9		7	7.0	3.5%
10		6	6.0	3.0%
11		4	4.0	2.0%
0	NA	2484	2484.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	82	82.0	

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.

var223: Rating of Liberal party taken as a whole

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2602 / 2602] [Invalid=165 / 165]
Literal question	How would you rate the Liberal party, taken as a whole?
Notes	q53a1d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		41	41.0	1.6%
3		101	101.0	3.9%
4		75	75.0	2.9%
5		120	120.0	4.6%
6		425	425.0	16.3%
7		355	355.0	13.6%
8		465	465.0	17.9%

var223: Rating of Liberal party taken as a whole

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
9		586	586.0	22.5%
10		272	272.0	10.5%
11		162	162.0	6.2%
0	NA	11	11.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	154	154.0	

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.

var224: Rating of Conservative party taken as a whole

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2536 / 2536] [Invalid=231 / 231]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR CONSERVATIVE PARTY
Notes	q53apd in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		52	52.0	2.1%
3		103	103.0	4.1%
4		165	165.0	6.5%
5		267	267.0	10.5%
6		636	636.0	25.1%
7		502	502.0	19.8%
8		350	350.0	13.8%
9		277	277.0	10.9%
10		109	109.0	4.3%
11		75	75.0	3.0%
0	NA	15	15.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	216	216.0	

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.

var225: Rating of NDP party taken as a whole

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2217 / 2217] [Invalid=550 / 550]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR N.D.P. PARTY
Notes	q53and in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		170	170.0	7.7%
3		231	231.0	10.4%
4		187	187.0	8.4%
5		216	216.0	9.7%
6		605	605.0	27.3%
7		302	302.0	13.6%
8		220	220.0	9.9%
9		152	152.0	6.9%
10		76	76.0	3.4%
11		58	58.0	2.6%
0	NA	26	26.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	524	524.0	

var225: Rating of NDP party taken as a whole

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

var226: Rating of Creditiste party taken as a whole

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=527 / 527] [Invalid=2240 / 2240]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Creditistes in this riding in the 1968 election.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR DES CREDITISTES
Notes	q53acd in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		73	73.0	13.9%
3		87	87.0	16.5%
4		41	41.0	7.8%
5		52	52.0	9.9%
6		102	102.0	19.4%
7		63	63.0	12.0%
8		47	47.0	8.9%
9		38	38.0	7.2%
10		13	13.0	2.5%
11		11	11.0	2.1%
0	NA	2082	2082.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	158	158.0	

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.

var227: Rating of Social Credit party taken as a whole

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=228 / 228] [Invalid=2539 / 2539]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Social Credit party in this riding in the 1968 elecetion.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY
Notes	q53asd in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		16	16.0	7.0%
3		23	23.0	10.1%
4		19	19.0	8.3%
5		28	28.0	12.3%
6		73	73.0	32.0%
7		28	28.0	12.3%
8		13	13.0	5.7%
9		14	14.0	6.1%
10		8	8.0	3.5%
11		6	6.0	2.6%
0	NA	2485	2485.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	54	54.0	

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.

var228: Rating of Liberal national campaign before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2476 / 2476] [Invalid=291 / 291]

var228: Rating of Liberal national campaign before election

Literal question	And, finally, what about the Liberals' national campaign before the last election?
Notes	q53a1e in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		62	62.0	2.5%
3		114	114.0	4.6%
4		78	78.0	3.2%
5		115	115.0	4.6%
6		383	383.0	15.5%
7		280	280.0	11.3%
8		350	350.0	14.1%
9		550	550.0	22.2%
10		345	345.0	13.9%
11		199	199.0	8.0%
0	NA	13	13.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	278	278.0	

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.

var229: Rating of Conservative national campaign before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2409 / 2409] [Invalid=358 / 358]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR CONSERVATIVE PARTY
Notes	q53ape in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		61	61.0	2.5%
3		128	128.0	5.3%
4		150	150.0	6.2%
5		260	260.0	10.8%
6		645	645.0	26.8%
7		449	449.0	18.6%
8		345	345.0	14.3%
9		225	225.0	9.3%
10		101	101.0	4.2%
11		45	45.0	1.9%
0	NA	14	14.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	344	344.0	

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.

var230: Rating of NDP national campaign before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2106 / 2106] [Invalid=661 / 661]
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR N.D.P. PARTY
Notes	q53ane in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		148	148.0	7.0%
3		198	198.0	9.4%
4		171	171.0	8.1%

var230: Rating of NDP national campaign before election

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5		195	195.0	9.3%
6		565	565.0	26.8%
7		347	347.0	16.5%
8		211	211.0	10.0%
9		154	154.0	7.3%
10		79	79.0	3.8%
11		38	38.0	1.8%
0	NA	29	29.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	632	632.0	

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.

var231: Rating of Creditiste national campaign before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=491 / 491] [Invalid=2276 / 2276]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Creditistes in this riding in the 1968 election.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR DES CREDITISTES
Notes	q53ace in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		65	65.0	13.2%
3		63	63.0	12.8%
4		43	43.0	8.8%
5		43	43.0	8.8%
6		94	94.0	19.1%
7		68	68.0	13.8%
8		42	42.0	8.6%
9		47	47.0	9.6%
10		16	16.0	3.3%
11		10	10.0	2.0%
0	NA	2082	2082.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	194	194.0	

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.

var232: Rating of Social Credit national campaign before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=223 / 223] [Invalid=2544 / 2544]
Universe	Asked only if there was a candidate from the Social Credit party in this riding in the 1968 elecetion.
Interviewer's instructions	REPEAT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT PARTY
Notes	q53ase in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		15	15.0	6.7%
3		26	26.0	11.7%
4		25	25.0	11.2%
5		21	21.0	9.4%
6		74	74.0	33.2%
7		33	33.0	14.8%

var232: Rating of Social Credit national campaign before election

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8		12	12.0	5.4%
9		11	11.0	4.9%
10		4	4.0	1.8%
11		2	2.0	0.9%
0	NA	2484	2484.0	
1	DNK,NO OPINION	60	60.0	

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.

var233: Most important in voting decision

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2625 / 2625] [Invalid=142 / 142]
Universe	All respondents
Literal question	In deciding what you would do in this recent election, which was most important to you: the leaders, the work of the MP's, your local candidate, or the parties as a whole?
Notes	q53ba in the documentation. NOTE: "THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN IN 1968" IS NOT TO BE INCLUDED IN PART -b).

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER OF PARTY	1069	1069.0	40.7%
2	PTY'S WORK-LAST PARL	229	229.0	8.7%
3	PTY'S 68 CAND-YR RID	421	421.0	16.0%
4	PARTY AS WHOLE	906	906.0	34.5%
5	DON'T KNOW	122	122.0	
6	NO ANSWER	20	20.0	

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.

var234: Next most important in voting decision

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2473 / 2473] [Invalid=294 / 294]
Literal question	Which was next most important to you?
Notes	q53bb in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER OF PARTY	678	678.0	27.4%
2	PTY'S WORK-LAST PARL	568	568.0	23.0%
3	PTY'S 68 CAND-YR RID	621	621.0	25.1%
4	PARTY AS WHOLE	606	606.0	24.5%
5	DON'T KNOW	265	265.0	
6	NO ANSWER	29	29.0	

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.

var235: Least important in voting decision

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1989 / 1989] [Invalid=778 / 778]
Literal question	Which would you say was least important?
Notes	q53bc in the voting decision.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	LEADER OF PARTY	262	262.0	13.2%

var235: Least important in voting decision

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	PTY'S WORK-LAST PARL	535	535.0	26.9%
3	PTY'S 68 CAND-YR RID	780	780.0	39.2%
4	PARTY AS WHOLE	412	412.0	20.7%
5	DON'T KNOW	745	745.0	
6	NO ANSWER	33	33.0	

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.

var236: Action if favourite party ran unfavourable candidate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2602 / 2602] [Invalid=165 / 165]
Pre-question	Suppose there was an election in which the party you favour ran a candidate in your riding whom you did not like or did not agree with.
Literal question	What would you be most likely to do? Vote for the candiate anyway? Consider another party's candidate? Or would you probably not vote at all?
Notes	q54 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VOTE CAND ANYWAY	990	990.0	38.0%
2	CONSIDER OTH PTY CAN	986	986.0	37.9%
3	WOULDN'T VOTE AT ALL	486	486.0	18.7%
4	IT DEPENDS-QUALIFIED	140	140.0	5.4%
5	DON'T KNOW	153	153.0	
6	NO ANSWER	12	12.0	

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.

var237: Action if favourite party had policy unfavourable to you

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2532 / 2532] [Invalid=235 / 235]
Pre-question	Suppose there was an election in which the party you prefer was in favour of some policy you did not like or did not agree with.
Literal question	What would you be most likely to do? Vote for the party's candidate anyway? Consider another party's candidate? Or would you probably not vote?
Notes	q55 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VOTE CANDID ANYWAY	673	673.0	26.6%
2	CONSIDER OTH PTY CAN	1168	1168.0	46.1%
3	WOULDN'T VOTE AT ALL	491	491.0	19.4%
4	DEPENDS-QUALIFIED	200	200.0	7.9%
5	DON'T KNOW	190	190.0	
6	NO PTY PREF NOW	35	35.0	
7	NO ANSWER	10	10.0	

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.

var238: Action if favourite party had unfavourable leader

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2524 / 2524] [Invalid=243 / 243]
Pre-question	Suppose there was an election in which the party you prefer had a leader or a team of leaders you did not like or did not agree with.

var238: Action if favourite party had unfavourable leader

	Literal question	What would you do? Vote for that party's candidate anyway? Consider another party's candidate? Or would you probably not vote?
	Notes	q56 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	VOTE CANDID ANYWAY	648	648.0	25.7%
2	CONSIDER OTH PTY CAN	1353	1353.0	53.6%
3	WOULDN'T VOTE AT ALL	402	402.0	15.9%
4	DEPENDS-QUALIFIED	121	121.0	4.8%
5	DON'T KNOW	196	196.0	
6	NO PTY PREF NOW	33	33.0	
7	NO ANSWER	14	14.0	

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.

var239: Degree of difference between federal political parties

	Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/4/6]
	Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2566 / 2566] [Invalid=201 / 201]
	Pre-question	One of the things we are interested in is the differences which exist between our federal political parties.
	Literal question	Considering everything the parties stand for, would you say that there is a good deal of difference between the parties, some difference, or not much difference?
	Notes	q57 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	GOOD DEAL OF DIFF	602	602.0	23.5%
2	SOME DIFF	1117	1117.0	43.5%
3	NOT MUCH DIFF	800	800.0	31.2%
5	DEPENDS ON PARTIES	47	47.0	1.8%
4	DON'TKNOW	172	172.0	
6	NO ANSWER	29	29.0	

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.

var240: What do you like best about Trudeau

	Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
	Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2509 / 2509] [Invalid=258 / 258]
	Notes	q58a1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 9 - 12, Card 4, cols. 63 - 66.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	6	6.0	0.2%
2	NOTHING	187	187.0	7.5%
3	HIS PARTY	13	13.0	0.5%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	32	32.0	1.3%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	59	59.0	2.4%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	24	24.0	1.0%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	142	142.0	5.7%
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	183	183.0	7.3%
11	MARITAL STATUS	2	2.0	0.1%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	236	236.0	9.4%

var240: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	14	14.0	0.6%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	35	35.0	1.4%
15	PERSONALITY	44	44.0	1.8%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	18	18.0	0.7%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	132	132.0	5.3%
18	COURAGE	14	14.0	0.6%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	67	67.0	2.7%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	15	15.0	0.6%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	19	19.0	0.8%
23	AGE	336	336.0	13.4%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
26	INDEPENDENCE	31	31.0	1.2%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	2	2.0	0.1%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	8	8.0	0.3%
29	EASY MANNER	37	37.0	1.5%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.0%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	5	5.0	0.2%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	16	16.0	0.6%
34	EDUCATION	43	43.0	1.7%
35	BILINGUAL	9	9.0	0.4%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	8	8.0	0.3%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	55	55.0	2.2%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	76	76.0	3.0%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	85	85.0	3.4%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.0%
43	CONSERVATISM	1	1.0	0.0%
45	REALISM OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	6	6.0	0.2%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	6	6.0	0.2%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	18	18.0	0.7%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	48	48.0	1.9%
50	4 WORKING MAN	8	8.0	0.3%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	7	7.0	0.3%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	2	2.0	0.1%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	2	2.0	0.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	4	4.0	0.2%
59	OTHER PO L	27	27.0	1.1%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	19	19.0	0.8%

var240: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	147	147.0	5.9%
62	PROMISES MADE	12	12.0	0.5%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	99	99.0	3.9%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	18	18.0	0.7%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	11	11.0	0.4%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	5	5.0	0.2%
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	32	32.0	1.3%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	30	30.0	1.2%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	1	1.0	0.0%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	5	5.0	0.2%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	4	4.0	0.2%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	7	7.0	0.3%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	23	23.0	0.9%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	4	4.0	0.2%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	258	258.0	

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.

var241: What do you like best about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1205 / 1205] [Invalid=1562 / 1562]
Notes	q58a2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 9 - 12, Card 4, cols. 63 - 66.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	2	2.0	0.2%
2	NOTHING	1	1.0	0.1%
3	HIS PARTY	3	3.0	0.2%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	9	9.0	0.7%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	19	19.0	1.6%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	61	61.0	5.1%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	73	73.0	6.1%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	11	11.0	0.9%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	12	12.0	1.0%
15	PERSONALITY	25	25.0	2.1%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	13	13.0	1.1%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	95	95.0	7.9%
18	COURAGE	16	16.0	1.3%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	63	63.0	5.2%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	12	12.0	1.0%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	18	18.0	1.5%

var241: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
23	AGE	98	98.0	8.1%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	2	2.0	0.2%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	13	13.0	1.1%
26	INDEPENDENCE	27	27.0	2.2%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	2	2.0	0.2%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	4	4.0	0.3%
29	EASY MANNER	25	25.0	2.1%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	2	2.0	0.2%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	8	8.0	0.7%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	17	17.0	1.4%
34	EDUCATION	48	48.0	4.0%
35	BILINGUAL	3	3.0	0.2%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	2	2.0	0.2%
37	SWINGER	4	4.0	0.3%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	2	2.0	0.2%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	38	38.0	3.2%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	48	48.0	4.0%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	101	101.0	8.4%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	2	2.0	0.2%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	3	3.0	0.2%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	2	2.0	0.2%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	11	11.0	0.9%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	33	33.0	2.7%
50	4 WORKING MAN	1	1.0	0.1%
51	4 FARMER	1	1.0	0.1%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	5	5.0	0.4%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	1	1.0	0.1%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	2	2.0	0.2%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	3	3.0	0.2%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	3	3.0	0.2%
59	OTHER PO L	27	27.0	2.2%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	6	6.0	0.5%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	55	55.0	4.6%
62	PROMISES MADE	5	5.0	0.4%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	65	65.0	5.4%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	18	18.0	1.5%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	3	3.0	0.2%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	4	4.0	0.3%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	20	20.0	1.7%

var241: What do you like best about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	24	24.0	2.0%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	1	1.0	0.1%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	2	2.0	0.2%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	6	6.0	0.5%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	15	15.0	1.2%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	6	6.0	0.5%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	4	4.0	0.3%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	1562	1562.0	

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.

var242: What do you like least about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2219 / 2219] [Invalid=548 / 548]
Notes	q58b1b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 13 - 16, Card 4, cols. 67- 70.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	21	21.0	0.9%
2	NOTHING	67	67.0	3.0%
3	HIS PARTY	7	7.0	0.3%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	26	26.0	1.2%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	58	58.0	2.6%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	2	2.0	0.1%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	689	689.0	31.1%
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	0.0%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	5	5.0	0.2%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	74	74.0	3.3%
11	MARITAL STATUS	32	32.0	1.4%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	44	44.0	2.0%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	40	40.0	1.8%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	122	122.0	5.5%
15	PERSONALITY	15	15.0	0.7%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	9	9.0	0.4%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	2	2.0	0.1%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	2	2.0	0.1%
23	AGE	10	10.0	0.5%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	89	89.0	4.0%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	12	12.0	0.5%
26	INDEPENDENCE	11	11.0	0.5%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	37	37.0	1.7%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	8	8.0	0.4%
29	EASY MANNER	6	6.0	0.3%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	3	3.0	0.1%

var242: What do you like least about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	1.0	0.0%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	4	4.0	0.2%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	103	103.0	4.6%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	8	8.0	0.4%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	55	55.0	2.5%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	19	19.0	0.9%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	3	3.0	0.1%
42	RADICALISM	21	21.0	0.9%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	14	14.0	0.6%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	17	17.0	0.8%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	10	10.0	0.5%
50	4 WORKING MAN	2	2.0	0.1%
51	4 FARMER	4	4.0	0.2%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	2	2.0	0.1%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	9	9.0	0.4%
54	4 UNIONS	1	1.0	0.0%
55	BILL OMNIBUS	43	43.0	1.9%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	4	4.0	0.2%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	14	14.0	0.6%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	18	18.0	0.8%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	27	27.0	1.2%
62	PROMISES MADE	6	6.0	0.3%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	19	19.0	0.9%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	1	1.0	0.0%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	1	1.0	0.0%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	33	33.0	1.5%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	203	203.0	9.1%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	9	9.0	0.4%
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	52	52.0	2.3%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	14	14.0	0.6%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	8	8.0	0.4%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	11	11.0	0.5%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	50	50.0	2.3%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	37	37.0	1.7%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	548	548.0	

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.

var243: What do you like least about Trudeau

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=264 / 264] [Invalid=2503 / 2503]
Notes	q58b2b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, cols. 13 - 16, Card 4, cols. 67- 70.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	1	1.0	0.4%
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	1	1.0	0.4%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	1.0	0.4%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	16	16.0	6.1%
11	MARITAL STATUS	8	8.0	3.0%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	11	11.0	4.2%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	7	7.0	2.7%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	12	12.0	4.5%
15	PERSONALITY	4	4.0	1.5%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	2	2.0	0.8%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	2	2.0	0.8%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
22		1	1.0	0.4%
23	AGE	3	3.0	1.1%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	32	32.0	12.1%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	3	3.0	1.1%
26	INDEPENDENCE	2	2.0	0.8%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	9	9.0	3.4%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	2	2.0	0.8%
29	EASY MANNER	1	1.0	0.4%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	0	0.0	
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	17	17.0	6.4%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	3	3.0	1.1%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	20	20.0	7.6%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	6	6.0	2.3%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	

var243: What do you like least about Trudeau

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.4%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	1	1.0	0.4%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	2	2.0	0.8%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	3	3.0	1.1%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	0	0.0	
50	4 WORKING MAN	1	1.0	0.4%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	3	3.0	1.1%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	1	1.0	0.4%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	1	1.0	0.4%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	2	2.0	0.8%
59	OTHER PO L	6	6.0	2.3%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	5	5.0	1.9%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	0	0.0	
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	0.4%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	6	6.0	2.3%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	1	1.0	0.4%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	5	5.0	1.9%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	30	30.0	11.4%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	1	1.0	0.4%
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	6	6.0	2.3%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	7	7.0	2.7%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	1	1.0	0.4%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	2	2.0	0.8%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	4	4.0	1.5%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	10	10.0	3.8%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2503	2503.0	

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.

var244: What do you like most about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2185 / 2185] [Invalid=582 / 582]
Notes	q58c1c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 17 - 20, Card 4, cols. 71 - 74.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	5	5.0	0.2%
2	NOTHING	159	159.0	7.3%
3	HIS PARTY	23	23.0	1.1%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	3	3.0	0.1%

var244: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	154	154.0	7.0%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	21	21.0	1.0%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	273	273.0	12.5%
8	HIS REGION TIES	24	24.0	1.1%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	144	144.0	6.6%
11	MARITAL STATUS	36	36.0	1.6%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	468	468.0	21.4%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	78	78.0	3.6%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	14	14.0	0.6%
15	PERSONALITY	22	22.0	1.0%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	20	20.0	0.9%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	63	63.0	2.9%
18	COURAGE	14	14.0	0.6%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	3	3.0	0.1%
23	AGE	18	18.0	0.8%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	59	59.0	2.7%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	71	71.0	3.2%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	6	6.0	0.3%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	23	23.0	1.1%
29	EASY MANNER	45	45.0	2.1%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	2	2.0	0.1%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	2.0	0.1%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	10	10.0	0.5%
34	EDUCATION	15	15.0	0.7%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	46	46.0	2.1%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	61	61.0	2.8%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	47	47.0	2.2%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.0%
43	CONSERVATISM	4	4.0	0.2%
45	REALISM OR LACK	5	5.0	0.2%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	3	3.0	0.1%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	5	5.0	0.2%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	3	3.0	0.1%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	8	8.0	0.4%
50	4 WORKING MAN	4	4.0	0.2%
51	4 FARMER	7	7.0	0.3%

var244: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	15	15.0	0.7%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	1	1.0	0.0%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	3	3.0	0.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	2	2.0	0.1%
59	OTHER PO L	21	21.0	1.0%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	6	6.0	0.3%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	77	77.0	3.5%
62	PROMISES MADE	6	6.0	0.3%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	2	2.0	0.1%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	4	4.0	0.2%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	8	8.0	0.4%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	36	36.0	1.6%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	4	4.0	0.2%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	6	6.0	0.3%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	5	5.0	0.2%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	14	14.0	0.6%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	582	582.0	

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.

var245: What do you like most about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=538 / 538] [Invalid=2229 / 2229]
Notes	q58c2c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 17 - 20, Card 4, cols. 71 - 74.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	3	3.0	0.6%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	1	1.0	0.2%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	2	2.0	0.4%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	2	2.0	0.4%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	37	37.0	6.9%
11	MARITAL STATUS	12	12.0	2.2%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	65	65.0	12.1%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	49	49.0	9.1%

var245: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	4	4.0	0.7%
15	PERSONALITY	10	10.0	1.9%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	6	6.0	1.1%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	39	39.0	7.2%
18	COURAGE	4	4.0	0.7%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	2	2.0	0.4%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
22		2	2.0	0.4%
23	AGE	2	2.0	0.4%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	23	23.0	4.3%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	26	26.0	4.8%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	4	4.0	0.7%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	10	10.0	1.9%
29	EASY MANNER	24	24.0	4.5%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.2%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	1.0	0.2%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	9	9.0	1.7%
34	EDUCATION	15	15.0	2.8%
35	BILINGUAL	1	1.0	0.2%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	11	11.0	2.0%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	44	44.0	8.2%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	28	28.0	5.2%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	2	2.0	0.4%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.2%
43	CONSERVATISM	5	5.0	0.9%
45	REALISM OR LACK	2	2.0	0.4%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	2	2.0	0.4%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	3	3.0	0.6%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	4	4.0	0.7%
50	4 WORKING MAN	6	6.0	1.1%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	5	5.0	0.9%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	2	2.0	0.4%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	1	1.0	0.2%
59	OTHER PO L	9	9.0	1.7%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	1	1.0	0.2%

var245: What do you like most about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	22	22.0	4.1%
62	PROMISES MADE	0	0.0	
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	3	3.0	0.6%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	1	1.0	0.2%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	0.2%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	4	4.0	0.7%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	18	18.0	3.3%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	3	3.0	0.6%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	3	3.0	0.6%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	0	0.0	
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	2	2.0	0.4%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	1	1.0	0.2%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2229	2229.0	

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.

var246: What do you like least about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2075 / 2075] [Invalid=692 / 692]
Notes	q58d1d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 21 - 24, Card 4, Cols. 75 - 78.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	16	16.0	0.8%
2	NOTHING	27	27.0	1.3%
3	HIS PARTY	34	34.0	1.6%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	8	8.0	0.4%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	150	150.0	7.2%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	63	63.0	3.0%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	407	407.0	19.6%
8	HIS REGION TIES	7	7.0	0.3%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	7	7.0	0.3%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	85	85.0	4.1%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	22	22.0	1.1%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	17	17.0	0.8%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	37	37.0	1.8%
15	PERSONALITY	7	7.0	0.3%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	5	5.0	0.2%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	12	12.0	0.6%
18	COURAGE	2	2.0	0.1%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	133	133.0	6.4%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	28	28.0	1.3%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	2	2.0	0.1%

var246: What do you like least about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
22		51	51.0	2.5%
23	AGE	69	69.0	3.3%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	3	3.0	0.1%
26	INDEPENDENCE	1	1.0	0.0%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	7	7.0	0.3%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
29	EASY MANNER	18	18.0	0.9%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	2.0	0.1%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	28	28.0	1.3%
34	EDUCATION	8	8.0	0.4%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	22	22.0	1.1%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	1	1.0	0.0%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	32	32.0	1.5%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	39	39.0	1.9%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	62	62.0	3.0%
42	RADICALISM	4	4.0	0.2%
43	CONSERVATISM	3	3.0	0.1%
45	REALISM OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	0	0.0	
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	5	5.0	0.2%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	7	7.0	0.3%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	20	20.0	1.0%
50	4 WORKING MAN	4	4.0	0.2%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	4	4.0	0.2%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	1	1.0	0.0%
54	4 UNIONS	1	1.0	0.0%
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	2	2.0	0.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	1	1.0	0.0%
59	OTHER PO L	7	7.0	0.3%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	13	13.0	0.6%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	270	270.0	13.0%
62	PROMISES MADE	25	25.0	1.2%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	3	3.0	0.1%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	106	106.0	5.1%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	10	10.0	0.5%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	

var246: What do you like least about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	11	11.0	0.5%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	71	71.0	3.4%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	16	16.0	0.8%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	40	40.0	1.9%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	5	5.0	0.2%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	9	9.0	0.4%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	18	18.0	0.9%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	1	1.0	0.0%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	692	692.0	

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.

var247: What do you like least about Stanfield

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=367 / 367] [Invalid=2400 / 2400]
Notes	q58d2d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 21 - 24, Card 4, cols. 75 - 78.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	1	1.0	0.3%
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	4	4.0	1.1%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	5	5.0	1.4%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	7	7.0	1.9%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	2	2.0	0.5%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	1	1.0	0.3%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	10	10.0	2.7%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	7	7.0	1.9%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	5	5.0	1.4%
15	PERSONALITY	9	9.0	2.5%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	5	5.0	1.4%
18	COURAGE	1	1.0	0.3%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	36	36.0	9.8%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	3	3.0	0.8%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	3	3.0	0.8%
22		12	12.0	3.3%
23	AGE	13	13.0	3.5%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	1	1.0	0.3%
26	INDEPENDENCE	1	1.0	0.3%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	2	2.0	0.5%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	2	2.0	0.5%
29	EASY MANNER	14	14.0	3.8%

var247: What do you like least about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	2.0	0.5%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	5	5.0	1.4%
34	EDUCATION	7	7.0	1.9%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	10	10.0	2.7%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	15	15.0	4.1%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	6	6.0	1.6%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	17	17.0	4.6%
42	RADICALISM	0	0.0	
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	1	1.0	0.3%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	2	2.0	0.5%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	1	1.0	0.3%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	4	4.0	1.1%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	6	6.0	1.6%
50	4 WORKING MAN	1	1.0	0.3%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	0.3%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	1	1.0	0.3%
59	OTHER PO L	3	3.0	0.8%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	4	4.0	1.1%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	52	52.0	14.2%
62	PROMISES MADE	8	8.0	2.2%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	2	2.0	0.5%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	38	38.0	10.4%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	4	4.0	1.1%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	2	2.0	0.5%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	12	12.0	3.3%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	2	2.0	0.5%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	9	9.0	2.5%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	5	5.0	1.4%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	2	2.0	0.5%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	1	1.0	0.3%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	

var247: What do you like least about Stanfield

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2400	2400.0	

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.

var248: What do you like best about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2049 / 2049] [Invalid=718 / 718]
Notes	q58e1e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 25 - 28, Card 3, Cols. 62 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	6	6.0	0.3%
2	NOTHING	106	106.0	5.2%
3	HIS PARTY	12	12.0	0.6%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	6	6.0	0.3%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	297	297.0	14.5%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	1	1.0	0.0%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	136	136.0	6.6%
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	118	118.0	5.8%
11	MARITAL STATUS	1	1.0	0.0%
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	231	231.0	11.3%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	24	24.0	1.2%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	8	8.0	0.4%
15	PERSONALITY	25	25.0	1.2%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	7	7.0	0.3%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	41	41.0	2.0%
18	COURAGE	15	15.0	0.7%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	87	87.0	4.2%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	45	45.0	2.2%
22		1	1.0	0.0%
23	AGE	1	1.0	0.0%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	1	1.0	0.0%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	2	2.0	0.1%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	44	44.0	2.1%
29	EASY MANNER	4	4.0	0.2%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.0%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	1	1.0	0.0%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	37	37.0	1.8%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	15	15.0	0.7%
34	EDUCATION	20	20.0	1.0%
35	BILINGUAL	2	2.0	0.1%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	2	2.0	0.1%

var248: What do you like best about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	39	39.0	1.9%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	70	70.0	3.4%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	9	9.0	0.4%
42	RADICALISM	2	2.0	0.1%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	3	3.0	0.1%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	1	1.0	0.0%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	2	2.0	0.1%
50	4 WORKING MAN	59	59.0	2.9%
51	4 FARMER	3	3.0	0.1%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	9	9.0	0.4%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	1	1.0	0.0%
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	6	6.0	0.3%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	12	12.0	0.6%
59	OTHER PO L	18	18.0	0.9%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	7	7.0	0.3%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	395	395.0	19.3%
62	PROMISES MADE	11	11.0	0.5%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	1	1.0	0.0%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	2	2.0	0.1%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	20	20.0	1.0%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	2	2.0	0.1%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	1	1.0	0.0%
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	12	12.0	0.6%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	31	31.0	1.5%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	2	2.0	0.1%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	1	1.0	0.0%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	16	16.0	0.8%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	9	9.0	0.4%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	4	4.0	0.2%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	718	718.0	

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.

var249: What do you like best about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=562 / 562] [Invalid=2205 / 2205]
Notes	q58e2e in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 25 - 28, Card 3, Cols. 62 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	2	2.0	0.4%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	0	0.0	
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	29	29.0	5.2%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	65	65.0	11.6%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	7	7.0	1.2%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	2	2.0	0.4%
15	PERSONALITY	17	17.0	3.0%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	6	6.0	1.1%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	33	33.0	5.9%
18	COURAGE	3	3.0	0.5%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	15	15.0	2.7%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	3	3.0	0.5%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	12	12.0	2.1%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	3	3.0	0.5%
26	INDEPENDENCE	2	2.0	0.4%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	23	23.0	4.1%
29	EASY MANNER	2	2.0	0.4%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	4	4.0	0.7%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	21	21.0	3.7%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	9	9.0	1.6%
34	EDUCATION	24	24.0	4.3%
35	BILINGUAL	1	1.0	0.2%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	2	2.0	0.4%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	24	24.0	4.3%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	33	33.0	5.9%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	1	1.0	0.2%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.2%

var249: What do you like best about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	0	0.0	
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	1	1.0	0.2%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	1	1.0	0.2%
50	4 WORKING MAN	26	26.0	4.6%
51	4 FARMER	3	3.0	0.5%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	7	7.0	1.2%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	4	4.0	0.7%
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	6	6.0	1.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	8	8.0	1.4%
59	OTHER PO L	6	6.0	1.1%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	3	3.0	0.5%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	97	97.0	17.3%
62	PROMISES MADE	5	5.0	0.9%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	18	18.0	3.2%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	0.2%
67	BEHAVIOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	4	4.0	0.7%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	15	15.0	2.7%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	6	6.0	1.1%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	5	5.0	0.9%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	2	2.0	0.4%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2205	2205.0	

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.

var250: What do you like least about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1806 / 1806] [Invalid=961 / 961]
Notes	q58f1f in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 29 - 32, Card 3, Cols. 66 - 69.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	14	14.0	0.8%
2	NOTHING	53	53.0	2.9%
3	HIS PARTY	138	138.0	7.6%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	6	6.0	0.3%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	292	292.0	16.2%

var250: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	23	23.0	1.3%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	446	446.0	24.7%
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	0.1%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	39	39.0	2.2%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	29	29.0	1.6%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	28	28.0	1.6%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	8	8.0	0.4%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	17	17.0	0.9%
15	PERSONALITY	4	4.0	0.2%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	1	1.0	0.1%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	3	3.0	0.2%
18	COURAGE	3	3.0	0.2%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	6	6.0	0.3%
22		3	3.0	0.2%
23	AGE	37	37.0	2.0%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	23	23.0	1.3%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	1	1.0	0.1%
29	EASY MANNER	6	6.0	0.3%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	1	1.0	0.1%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	2	2.0	0.1%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	3	3.0	0.2%
34	EDUCATION	5	5.0	0.3%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	2	2.0	0.1%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	1	1.0	0.1%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	18	18.0	1.0%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	123	123.0	6.8%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	26	26.0	1.4%
42	RADICALISM	57	57.0	3.2%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	40	40.0	2.2%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	3	3.0	0.2%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	1	1.0	0.1%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	3	3.0	0.2%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	3	3.0	0.2%
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	

var250: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	9	9.0	0.5%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	20	20.0	1.1%
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	1	1.0	0.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	13	13.0	0.7%
59	OTHER PO L	12	12.0	0.7%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	7	7.0	0.4%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	37	37.0	2.0%
62	PROMISES MADE	67	67.0	3.7%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	2	2.0	0.1%
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	2	2.0	0.1%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	5	5.0	0.3%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	2	2.0	0.1%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	12	12.0	0.7%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	30	30.0	1.7%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	41	41.0	2.3%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	35	35.0	1.9%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	5	5.0	0.3%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	10	10.0	0.6%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	13	13.0	0.7%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	961	961.0	

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.

var251: What do you like least about Douglas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=143 / 143] [Invalid=2624 / 2624]
Notes	q58f2f in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 29 - 32, Card 3, Cols. 66 - 69.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	3	3.0	2.1%
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	9	9.0	6.3%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	1	1.0	0.7%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	0	0.0	
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	0.7%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	3	3.0	2.1%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	5	5.0	3.5%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	4	4.0	2.8%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	0	0.0	

var251: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	2	2.0	1.4%
15	PERSONALITY	1	1.0	0.7%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	1	1.0	0.7%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	0	0.0	
23	AGE	6	6.0	4.2%
24	MATURITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	0	0.0	
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	2	2.0	1.4%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	2	2.0	1.4%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	1	1.0	0.7%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	0	0.0	
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	2	2.0	1.4%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	1	1.0	0.7%
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	3	3.0	2.1%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	10	10.0	7.0%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	7	7.0	4.9%
42	RADICALISM	11	11.0	7.7%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	15	15.0	10.5%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	1	1.0	0.7%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	0	0.0	
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	1	1.0	0.7%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	1	1.0	0.7%
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	2	2.0	1.4%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	1	1.0	0.7%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	5	5.0	3.5%
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	2	2.0	1.4%
59	OTHER PO L	1	1.0	0.7%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	7	7.0	4.9%

var251: What do you like least about Douglas

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
62	PROMISES MADE	9	9.0	6.3%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	2	2.0	1.4%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	1	1.0	0.7%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	0.7%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	4	4.0	2.8%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	6	6.0	4.2%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	4	4.0	2.8%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	1	1.0	0.7%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	2	2.0	1.4%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	1	1.0	0.7%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	1	1.0	0.7%
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2624	2624.0	

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.

var252: What do you like best about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1637 / 1637] [Invalid=1130 / 1130]
Notes	q58g1g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 33 - 36, Card 3, Cols. 70 - 73.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	2	2.0	0.1%
2	NOTHING	176	176.0	10.8%
3	HIS PARTY	2	2.0	0.1%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	4	4.0	0.2%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	412	412.0	25.2%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	6	6.0	0.4%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	201	201.0	12.3%
8	HIS REGION TIES	1	1.0	0.1%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	36	36.0	2.2%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	105	105.0	6.4%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	8	8.0	0.5%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	6	6.0	0.4%
15	PERSONALITY	8	8.0	0.5%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	2	2.0	0.1%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	26	26.0	1.6%
18	COURAGE	23	23.0	1.4%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	64	64.0	3.9%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	39	39.0	2.4%
23	AGE	0	0.0	

var252: What do you like best about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
24	MATURITY OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
26	INDEPENDENCE	3	3.0	0.2%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	0	0.0	
28	CONCERN OR LACK	10	10.0	0.6%
29	EASY MANNER	1	1.0	0.1%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	2	2.0	0.1%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	18	18.0	1.1%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	14	14.0	0.9%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	7	7.0	0.4%
34	EDUCATION	4	4.0	0.2%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	2	2.0	0.1%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	1	1.0	0.1%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	17	17.0	1.0%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	49	49.0	3.0%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	0	0.0	
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.1%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	1	1.0	0.1%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	4	4.0	0.2%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	6	6.0	0.4%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	9	9.0	0.5%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	10	10.0	0.6%
50	4 WORKING MAN	20	20.0	1.2%
51	4 FARMER	2	2.0	0.1%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	4	4.0	0.2%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	17	17.0	1.0%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	1	1.0	0.1%
56	POVERTY POLICIES	3	3.0	0.2%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	6	6.0	0.4%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	4	4.0	0.2%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	217	217.0	13.3%
62	PROMISES MADE	1	1.0	0.1%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	3	3.0	0.2%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	27	27.0	1.6%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	1	1.0	0.1%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	2	2.0	0.1%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	12	12.0	0.7%

var252: What do you like best about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	1	1.0	0.1%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	2	2.0	0.1%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	14	14.0	0.9%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	11	11.0	0.7%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	3	3.0	0.2%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	1130	1130.0	

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.

var253: What do you like best about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=280 / 280] [Invalid=2487 / 2487]
Notes	q58g2g in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 33 - 36, Card 3, Cols. 70 - 73.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	0	0.0	
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	0	0.0	
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	2	2.0	0.7%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	2	2.0	0.7%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	0	0.0	
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	9	9.0	3.2%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	33	33.0	11.8%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	4	4.0	1.4%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	1	1.0	0.4%
15	PERSONALITY	4	4.0	1.4%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	7	7.0	2.5%
18	COURAGE	6	6.0	2.1%
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	11	11.0	3.9%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	4	4.0	1.4%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	18	18.0	6.4%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	1	1.0	0.4%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	2	2.0	0.7%
26	INDEPENDENCE	5	5.0	1.8%
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	1	1.0	0.4%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	5	5.0	1.8%
29	EASY MANNER	0	0.0	
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	3	3.0	1.1%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	9	9.0	3.2%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	1.0	0.4%

var253: What do you like best about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	5	5.0	1.8%
34	EDUCATION	2	2.0	0.7%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	0	0.0	
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	13	13.0	4.6%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	17	17.0	6.1%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	2	2.0	0.7%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.4%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	1	1.0	0.4%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	2	2.0	0.7%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	2	2.0	0.7%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	4	4.0	1.4%
50	4 WORKING MAN	11	11.0	3.9%
51	4 FARMER	1	1.0	0.4%
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	5	5.0	1.8%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	3	3.0	1.1%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	3	3.0	1.1%
57	WELFARE POLICIES	1	1.0	0.4%
59	OTHER PO L	5	5.0	1.8%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	2	2.0	0.7%
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	34	34.0	12.1%
62	PROMISES MADE	4	4.0	1.4%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	0	0.0	
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	11	11.0	3.9%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	7	7.0	2.5%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	0	0.0	
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	0	0.0	
73	TV PERFORMANCE	5	5.0	1.8%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	7	7.0	2.5%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	4	4.0	1.4%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2487	2487.0	

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.

var254: What do you like least about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1618 / 1618] [Invalid=1149 / 1149]
Notes	q58h1h in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 37 - 40, Card 3, Cols. 74 - 77.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	33	33.0	2.0%
2	NOTHING	34	34.0	2.1%
3	HIS PARTY	33	33.0	2.0%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	27	27.0	1.7%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	397	397.0	24.5%
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	12	12.0	0.7%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	264	264.0	16.3%
8	HIS REGION TIES	3	3.0	0.2%
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	108	108.0	6.7%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	33	33.0	2.0%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	19	19.0	1.2%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	4	4.0	0.2%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	3	3.0	0.2%
15	PERSONALITY	5	5.0	0.3%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	1	1.0	0.1%
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	6	6.0	0.4%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	2	2.0	0.1%
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	1	1.0	0.1%
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	6	6.0	0.4%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	5	5.0	0.3%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	17	17.0	1.1%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	19	19.0	1.2%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	17	17.0	1.1%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	2	2.0	0.1%
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	8	8.0	0.5%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	1	1.0	0.1%
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	15	15.0	0.9%
35	BILINGUAL	1	1.0	0.1%
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	3	3.0	0.2%
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	4	4.0	0.2%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	29	29.0	1.8%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	120	120.0	7.4%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	3	3.0	0.2%
42	RADICALISM	42	42.0	2.6%

var254: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	41	41.0	2.5%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	7	7.0	0.4%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	74	74.0	4.6%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	2	2.0	0.1%
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	20	20.0	1.2%
50	4 WORKING MAN	1	1.0	0.1%
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	38	38.0	2.3%
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	1	1.0	0.1%
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	9	9.0	0.6%
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	33	33.0	2.0%
62	PROMISES MADE	19	19.0	1.2%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	23	23.0	1.4%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	4	4.0	0.2%
66	STATING INTENTIONS	2	2.0	0.1%
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	2	2.0	0.1%
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	18	18.0	1.1%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	10	10.0	0.6%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	14	14.0	0.9%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	3	3.0	0.2%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	4	4.0	0.2%
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	16	16.0	1.0%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	1149	1149.0	

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.

var255: What do you like least about Caouette

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-81] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=171 / 171] [Invalid=2596 / 2596]
Notes	q58h2h in the documentation. Done by Queen's, Card 6, Cols. 37 - 40, Card 3, Cols. 74 - 77.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EVERYTHING	1	1.0	0.6%
2	NOTHING	0	0.0	
3	HIS PARTY	5	5.0	2.9%
4	ETHNIC OR RELIG TIES	2	2.0	1.2%
5	UNINFORMED CAN'T SAY	0	0.0	

var255: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6	LANGUAGE BARRIER	1	1.0	0.6%
7	NOTHING IN PARTICULR	0	0.0	
8	HIS REGION TIES	0	0.0	
9	TALKS TOO MUCH	14	14.0	8.2%
10	PERSONALITY GEN UNSP	3	3.0	1.8%
11	MARITAL STATUS	0	0.0	
12	HONEST SINCERITY-LAK	4	4.0	2.3%
13	EXPERIENCE OR LACK	1	1.0	0.6%
14	APPEARANCE DRESS	1	1.0	0.6%
15	PERSONALITY	2	2.0	1.2%
16	SIMPLIC ITY	0	0.0	
17	INTELLIGENCE ABILITY	1	1.0	0.6%
18	COURAGE	0	0.0	
19	ENERGY VIGOR OR LACK	0	0.0	
20	DECISIVENESS OR LACK	0	0.0	
21	LACK OF AGGRESSIVENS	2	2.0	1.2%
23	AGE	0	0.0	
24	MATURITY OR LACK	1	1.0	0.6%
25	RELIABILITY OR LACK	3	3.0	1.8%
26	INDEPENDENCE	0	0.0	
27	HUMILITY ARROGANCE	5	5.0	2.9%
28	CONCERN OR LACK	0	0.0	
29	EASY MANNER	4	4.0	2.3%
30	IS NOT GOOD CAN'N	0	0.0	
31	COMICAL BEHAVIOR + -	1	1.0	0.6%
32	SENSE OF HUMOUR	0	0.0	
33	STRENGTH OF CHARACTR	0	0.0	
34	EDUCATION	3	3.0	1.8%
35	BILINGUAL	0	0.0	
36	QUIET MILD MANNER	0	0.0	
37	SWINGER	0	0.0	
38	DICTATEUR DESPOTE	4	4.0	2.3%
39	OTHER CHARACTERISTIC	11	11.0	6.4%
40	IDEAS POLICIES	18	18.0	10.5%
41	MOD PROGR OR LACK	2	2.0	1.2%
42	RADICALISM	1	1.0	0.6%
43	CONSERVATISM	0	0.0	
45	REALISM OR LACK	21	21.0	12.3%
46	IDEAS WELL THOUGHT	2	2.0	1.2%
47	SYMP 2 FR NAT OR QUE	13	13.0	7.6%
48	UNSYM 2 FR NAT OR QU	0	0.0	
49	CAN UNITY-STAND	5	5.0	2.9%
50	4 WORKING MAN	0	0.0	
51	4 FARMER	0	0.0	
52	ECONOMIC POLICIES	6	6.0	3.5%

var255: What do you like least about Caouette

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
53	RESPECT 4 FR-CANF	0	0.0	
54	4 UNIONS	0	0.0	
55	BILL OMNIBUS	0	0.0	
56	POVERTY POLICIES	0	0.0	
57	WELFARE POLICIES	0	0.0	
59	OTHER PO L	0	0.0	
60	CAMPAIGN STYLE	0	0.0	
61	SPEAKING ABILITY	6	6.0	3.5%
62	PROMISES MADE	8	8.0	4.7%
63	REFUSAL TO MAKE PROM	0	0.0	
64	PLAYING ON EMOTIONS	6	6.0	3.5%
65	AROUSAL ABILITY	0	0.0	
66	STATING INTENTIONS	0	0.0	
67	BEHAVOR WITH WOMEN	0	0.0	
68	ST J BAPTISTATTENDF	0	0.0	
69	OTHER CAMP STYLES	0	0.0	
70	POL SKILLS-LEADER AB	2	2.0	1.2%
71	CHANCES OF SUCCESS	4	4.0	2.3%
72	TOO CRIT'L OF OTHERS	5	5.0	2.9%
73	TV PERFORMANCE	1	1.0	0.6%
74	ISSUE PRESENTATION	0	0.0	
80	OTHER LIKES OR DISL	2	2.0	1.2%
81	REF TO ACT OR ATT PO	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNO W NO ANSWE	2596	2596.0	

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.

var256: Question order for q59a2q-q59a14a

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q59a1a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1		1393	1393.0	50.3%
2		1374	1374.0	49.7%

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.

var257: Trudeau is highly intelligent

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2549 / 2549] [Invalid=218 / 218]
Pre-question	Now I am going to read you a list of things often said about Mr. Trudeau. I would like your reaction to them. In each case please tell me whether you agree with the statement or whether you disaaree. If you don't know, just say so.
Literal question	Mr. Trudeau is highly intelligent.
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST BOTTOM TO TOP
Notes	q59a2a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	2438	2438.0	95.6%

var257: Trudeau is highly intelligent

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	DISAGREE	111	111.0	4.4%
3	DON'T KNOW	213	213.0	
4	NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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.

var258: Trudeau is tough minded

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2255 / 2255] [Invalid=512 / 512]
Literal question	He is tough-minded
Notes	q59a3a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	2017	2017.0	89.4%
2	DISAGREE	238	238.0	10.6%
3	DON'T KNOW	507	507.0	
4	NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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.

var259: Trudeau is arrogant

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2154 / 2154] [Invalid=613 / 613]
Literal question	He is arrogant
Notes	q59a4a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1261	1261.0	58.5%
2	DISAGREE	893	893.0	41.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	605	605.0	
4	NO ANSWER	8	8.0	

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.

var260: Trudeau is able in solving English-French problems

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2099 / 2099] [Invalid=668 / 668]
Literal question	He is capable of solving English- French problems in Canada
Notes	q59a5a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1697	1697.0	80.8%
2	DISAGREE	402	402.0	19.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	655	655.0	
4	NO ANSWER	13	13.0	

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.

var261: Trudeau is too rigid

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2047 / 2047] [Invalid=720 / 720]
Literal question	He is too rigid

var261: Trudeau is too rigid

	Notes		q59a6a in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	626	626.0	30.6%	
2	DISAGREE	1421	1421.0	69.4%	
3	DON'T KNOW	711	711.0		
4	NO ANSWER	9	9.0		

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.

var262: Trudeau is charming

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2376 / 2376] [Invalid=391 / 391]
Literal question	He is charming
Notes	q59a7a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	1615	1615.0	68.0%	
2	DISAGREE	761	761.0	32.0%	
3	DON'T KNOW	378	378.0		
4	NO ANSWER	13	13.0		

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.

var263: Trudeau is pro communist

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1778 / 1778] [Invalid=989 / 989]
Literal question	He is pro-communist
Notes	q59a8a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	406	406.0	22.8%	
2	DISAGREE	1372	1372.0	77.2%	
3	DON'T KNOW	966	966.0		
4	NO ANSWER	23	23.0		

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.

var264: Trudeau has conservative views

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2042 / 2042] [Invalid=725 / 725]
Literal question	His views are conservative
Notes	q59a9a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	919	919.0	45.0%	
2	DISAGREE	1123	1123.0	55.0%	
3	DON'T KNOW	713	713.0		
4	NO ANSWER	12	12.0		

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.

var265: Trudeau is fair minded

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]

var265: Trudeau is fair minded

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2171 / 2171] [Invalid=596 / 596]			
Literal question	He is fair-minded			
Notes	q59a10a in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1987	1987.0	91.5%
2	DISAGREE	184	184.0	8.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	585	585.0	
4	NO ANSWER	11	11.0	

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.

var266: Trudeau is honest

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2022 / 2022] [Invalid=745 / 745]
Literal question	He is honest
Notes	q59a11a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1907	1907.0	94.3%
2	DISAGREE	115	115.0	5.7%
3	DON'T KNOW	732	732.0	
4	NO ANSWER	13	13.0	

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.

var267: He has inadequate concern for public moral standards

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1944 / 1944] [Invalid=823 / 823]
Literal question	He has an inadequate concern for public moral standards
Notes	q59a12a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	841	841.0	43.3%
2	DISAGREE	1103	1103.0	56.7%
3	DON'T KNOW	799	799.0	
4	NO ANSWER	24	24.0	

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.

var268: Trudeau is able to stand up to Quebec

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2186 / 2186] [Invalid=581 / 581]
Literal question	He is able to stand up to Quebec
Notes	q59a13a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1912	1912.0	87.5%
2	DISAGREE	274	274.0	12.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	566	566.0	
4	NO ANSWER	15	15.0	

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.

var269: Trudeau is progressive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2340 / 2340] [Invalid=427 / 427]			
Literal question	He is progressive			
Notes	q59a14a in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	2206	2206.0	94.3%
2	DISAGREE	134	134.0	5.7%
3	DON'T KNOW	415	415.0	
4	NO ANSWER	12	12.0	

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.

var270: Stanfield is a man of great integrity

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2125 / 2125] [Invalid=642 / 642]
Pre-question	What about these statements sometimes made about Mr. Stanfield? Do you agree, disagree or don't you know?
Literal question	Mr. Stanfield is a man of great integrity
Interviewer's instructions	READ LIST BOTTOM TO TOP
Notes	q59b2b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1972	1972.0	92.8%
2	DISAGREE	153	153.0	7.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	632	632.0	
4	NO ANSWER	10	10.0	

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.

var271: Stanfield is highly intelligent

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2305 / 2305] [Invalid=462 / 462]
Literal question	He is highly intelligent
Notes	q59b3b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	2088	2088.0	90.6%
2	DISAGREE	217	217.0	9.4%
3	DON'T KNOW	455	455.0	
4	NO ANSWER	7	7.0	

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.

var272: Stanfield has a too slow manner

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2244 / 2244] [Invalid=523 / 523]
Literal question	His manner is too slow
Notes	q59b4b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	1841	1841.0	82.0%
2	DISAGREE	403	403.0	18.0%

var272: Stanfield has a too slow manner

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	DON'T KNOW	512	512.0	
4	NO ANSWER	11	11.0	

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.

var273: Stanfield is able in solving English-French problems

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1738 / 1738] [Invalid=1029 / 1029]
Literal question	He is capable of solving English- French problems in Canada
Notes	q59b5b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	583	583.0	33.5%
2	DISAGREE	1155	1155.0	66.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	1011	1011.0	
4	NO ANSWER	18	18.0	

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.

var274: Stanfield is fair minded

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2229 / 2229] [Invalid=538 / 538]
Literal question	He is fair-minded
Notes	q59b6b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	2094	2094.0	93.9%
2	DISAGREE	135	135.0	6.1%
3	DON'T KNOW	522	522.0	
4	NO ANSWER	16	16.0	

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.

var275: Stanfield is too soft on French Canada

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1608 / 1608] [Invalid=1159 / 1159]
Literal question	He is too soft on French Canada
Notes	q59b7b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE	959	959.0	59.6%
2	DISAGREE	649	649.0	40.4%
3	DON'T KNOW	1143	1143.0	
4	NO ANSWER	16	16.0	

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.

var276: Stanfield has conservative views

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2145 / 2145] [Invalid=622 / 622]
Literal question	His views are conservative
Notes	q59b8b in the documentation.

var276: Stanfield has conservative views

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	1987	1987.0		92.6%
2	DISAGREE	158	158.0	7.4%	
3	DON'T KNOW	608	608.0		
4	NO ANSWER	14	14.0		

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.

var277: Stanfield is too quick to make promises

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1930 / 1930] [Invalid=837 / 837]
Literal question	He is too quick to make promises
Notes	q59b9b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	937	937.0		48.5%
2	DISAGREE	993	993.0		51.5%
3	DON'T KNOW	815	815.0		
4	NO ANSWER	22	22.0		

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.

var278: Stanfield is honest

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2206 / 2206] [Invalid=561 / 561]
Literal question	He is honest
Notes	q59b10b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	2136	2136.0		96.8%
2	DISAGREE	70	70.0	3.2%	
3	DON'T KNOW	545	545.0		
4	NO ANSWER	16	16.0		

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.

var279: Stanfield is under Camp's influence

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1273 / 1273] [Invalid=1494 / 1494]
Literal question	He is under Dalton Camp's influence
Notes	q59b11b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	532	532.0		41.8%
2	DISAGREE	741	741.0		58.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	1462	1462.0		
4	NO ANSWER	32	32.0		

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.

var280: Stanfield is better suited for provincial politics

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1800 / 1800] [Invalid=967 / 967]

var280: Stanfield is better suited for provincial politics

Literal question	He is better suited for provincial than for federal politics
Notes	q59b12b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	1347	1347.0		74.8%
2	DISAGREE	453	453.0		25.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	939	939.0		
4	NO ANSWER	28	28.0		

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.

var281: Stanfield is progressive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2049 / 2049] [Invalid=718 / 718]
Literal question	He is progressive
Notes	q59b13b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE	1491	1491.0		72.8%
2	DISAGREE	558	558.0		27.2%
3	DON'T KNOW	698	698.0		
4	NO ANSWER	20	20.0		

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.

var282: How do you view Canada

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2708 / 2708] [Invalid=59 / 59]
Pre-question	We are interested in how Canadians think of their country. There is quite a variety of opinion here. Some think of Canada as basically an English country. Others see it as a partnership between French and English-speaking founding groups and still others view it primarily as the homeland of people of various different origins.
Literal question	Which of these fits your idea of Canada?
Notes	q62 in the documetation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	ENGLISH COUNTRY	233	233.0		8.6%
2	ENGL-FR PARTNERSMIP	423	423.0		15.6%
3	HOMELAND OFVAR PEOP	1454	1454.0		53.7%
4	JUST CANADA	587	587.0		21.7%
5	PART OF BRIT COMWTH	2	2.0	0.1%	
6	FRANCAIS-FREN COUNRY	5	5.0	0.2%	
7	HOMELAND OF INDIAN	1	1.0	0.0%	
8	SATELLITE OF USA	3	3.0	0.1%	
0	NO ANSWER	2	2.0		
9	DON'T KNOW	57	57.0		

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.

var283: How do you think of yourself

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2730 / 2730] [Invalid=37 / 37]
Literal question	How do you think of yourself?

var283: How do you think of yourself

Notes			q63a in the documentation. Done by Queen's , CARD 6, Col. 68 - basic code, Cols. 72-73 - specifications for 4 and 7 of the basic code.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	ENG-CANADIAN	283	283.0	10.4%
2	FR-CANADIAN	516	516.0	18.9%
3	SIMPLY CAN	1797	1797.0	65.8%
4	ETHNIC CAN	85	85.0	3.1%
5	QUEBECOIS	6	6.0	0.2%
6	CANADIEN	0	0.0	
7	OTHER	43	43.0	1.6%
9	NO OPINION	37	37.0	

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.

var284: Who has more in common - 1

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2284 / 2284] [Invalid=483 / 483]
Literal question	Who would you say have more in common: French Canadians and French people from France; or French Canadians and English Canadians, that is to say English-speaking people of British ancestry?
Notes	q64a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	FR-CAN AND FRENCH	662	662.0	29.0%
2	FR-CAN AND ENGLISH	1620	1620.0	70.9%
5	NEITHER	2	2.0	0.1%
3	DON'T KNOW	480	480.0	
4	NO ANSWER	3	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.

var285: Who has more in common - 2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2267 / 2267] [Invalid=500 / 500]
Pre-question	And who do you think has more in common when Canadians and Americans are compared?
Literal question	Who has more in common: English Canadians and French Canadians or English Canadians and Americans? Here again English refers to English-speaking people of British ancestry.
Notes	q64b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	ENGL AND FR-CAN	903	903.0	39.8%
2	ENGLISH AND AMERICAN	1355	1355.0	59.8%
5	NO DIFF-EQUAL-SAME	9	9.0	0.4%
3	DON'T KNOW	497	497.0	
4	NO ANSWER	3	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.

var286: Who has more in common - 3

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/3/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2267 / 2267] [Invalid=500 / 500]
Literal question	And what about English Canadians and French Canadians or English Canadians and British people-who has more in common?

var286: Who has more in common - 3

Notes	q64c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	ENGL-CAN AND FR-CAN	1141	1141.0		50.3%
2	ENGL-CAN AND BRITISH	1124	1124.0		49.6%
5	ALL THE SAME	2	2.0	0.1%	
3	DON'T KNOW	498	498.0		
4	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var287: How do you think of yourself

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-20] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	How do you think of yourself?
Notes	q63b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 6, Cols. 68 and 72 - 73- Col. 68 - basic code, Colss. 72-73 - specifications for 4 and 7 of the basic code

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		2639	2639.0		95.4%
1	ENGLISH	4	4.0	0.1%	
2	FRENCH	1	1.0	0.0%	
3	SCOTTISH	18	18.0	0.7%	
4	IRISH	23	23.0	0.8%	
5	GERMAN	7	7.0	0.3%	
6	UKRAINIAN	14	14.0	0.5%	
7	ITALIAN	17	17.0	0.6%	
8	NETHERLAND	3	3.0	0.1%	
9	POLISH	1	1.0	0.0%	
10	NATIVE AND ESKIMO	1	1.0	0.0%	
11	JEW	1	1.0	0.0%	
12	OTHER BRITISH ISLES	4	4.0	0.1%	
13	NORWEGIAN	1	1.0	0.0%	
14	HUNGARIAN	2	2.0	0.1%	
15	RUSS IAN	0	0.0		
16	SWEDISH	0	0.0		
17	ASIATIC	2	2.0	0.1%	
18	OTHER	27	27.0	1.0%	
19	NEWFOUNDLANDER	1	1.0	0.0%	
20	NOVA SCOTIAN	1	1.0	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.

var288: Question order for q65b - q65q

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-997] [Missing=*/998/999]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	Read list bottom to top
Notes	q65a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	DISLIKE	0	0.0	

var288: Question order for q65b - q65q

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1		1393	1393.0		50.3%
2		1374	1374.0		49.7%
100	LIKE	0	0.0		
997	MIX FEELING/DEPENDS	0	0.0		
998	NO FEELINGS	0	0.0		
999	DK/NO OPINION	0	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.

var289: Canada should abolish the monarchy

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2436 / 2436] [Invalid=331 / 331]
Pre-question	Now, once again I should like to read some short statements about Canada and I'd like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each. Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree mildly, disagree mildly, or disagree strongly.
Literal question	Canada should abolish the monarchy
Notes	q65b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE STRONGLY	670	670.0		27.5%
2	AGREE MILDLY	543	543.0		22.3%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	581	581.0		23.9%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	642	642.0		26.4%
5	NO OPINION	327	327.0		
6	NO ANSWER	4	4.0		

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.

var290: Canada's constitution should be changed

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2202 / 2202] [Invalid=565 / 565]
Literal question	Canada's constitution should be changed
Notes	q65c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE STRONGLY	643	643.0		29.2%
2	AGREE MILDLY	814	814.0		37.0%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	497	497.0		22.6%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	248	248.0		11.3%
5	NO OPINION	558	558.0		
6	NO ANSWER	7	7.0		

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.

var291: Homosexuals should be imprisoned

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2380 / 2380] [Invalid=387 / 387]
Literal question	Homosexuals should be imprisoned
Notes	q65d in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE STRONGLY	560	560.0		23.5%

var291: Homosexuals should be imprisoned

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	AGREE MILDLY	302	302.0	12.7%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	727	727.0	30.5%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	791	791.0	33.2%
5	NO OPINION	379	379.0	
6	NO ANSWER	8	8.0	

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.

var292: Canada should with draw its troops from Europe

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2238 / 2238] [Invalid=529 / 529]
Literal question	Canada should withdraw its troops from Europe
Notes	q65e in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	465	465.0	20.8%
2	AGREE MILDLY	483	483.0	21.6%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	733	733.0	32.8%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	557	557.0	24.9%
5	NO OPINION	524	524.0	
6	NO ANSWER	5	5.0	

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.

var293: Too much money is spent on churches

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2376 / 2376] [Invalid=391 / 391]
Literal question	Too much money is being spent on churches in Canada
Notes	q65f in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	565	565.0	23.8%
2	AGREE MILDLY	535	535.0	22.5%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	711	711.0	29.9%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	565	565.0	23.8%
5	NO OPINION	385	385.0	
6	NO ANSWER	6	6.0	

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.

var294: Canada and US should join together as one

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2556 / 2556] [Invalid=211 / 211]
Literal question	Canada and the United States should join together as one country
Notes	q65g in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	270	270.0	10.6%
2	AGREE MILDLY	271	271.0	10.6%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	340	340.0	13.3%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	1675	1675.0	65.5%

var294: Canada and US should join together as one

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	NO OPINION	193	193.0	
6	NO ANSWER	18	18.0	

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.

var295: Communists should be outlawed

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2498 / 2498] [Invalid=269 / 269]
Literal question	Communists should be outlawed
Notes	q65h in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	1155	1155.0	46.2%
2	AGREE MILDLY	335	335.0	13.4%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	587	587.0	23.5%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	421	421.0	16.9%
5	NO OPINION	260	260.0	
6	NO ANSWER	9	9.0	

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.

var296: Good idea to try to abolish death penalty

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2508 / 2508] [Invalid=259 / 259]
Literal question	It was a good idea to try to abolish the death penalty
Notes	q65i in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	680	680.0	27.1%
2	AGREE MILDLY	606	606.0	24.2%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	533	533.0	21.3%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	689	689.0	27.5%
5	NO OPINION	253	253.0	
6	NO ANSWER	6	6.0	

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.

var297: Illegal strikes should be broken by police

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2529 / 2529] [Invalid=238 / 238]
Literal question	Illegal strikes should be broken up by the police
Notes	q65j in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	1179	1179.0	46.6%
2	AGREE MILDLY	623	623.0	24.6%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	351	351.0	13.9%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	376	376.0	14.9%
5	NO OPINION	226	226.0	
6	NO ANSWER	12	12.0	

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.

var298: Canada needs less severe divorce laws

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2490 / 2490] [Invalid=277 / 277]
Literal question	Canada needs less severe divorce laws
Notes	q65k in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	993	993.0	39.9%
2	AGREE MILDLY	705	705.0	28.3%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	361	361.0	14.5%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	431	431.0	17.3%
5	NO OPINION	265	265.0	
6	NO ANSWER	12	12.0	

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.

var299: Canada would be better if all were same religion

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2507 / 2507] [Invalid=260 / 260]
Literal question	Canada would be a better place if all people had the same religion
Notes	q65l in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	293	293.0	11.7%
2	AGREE MILDLY	305	305.0	12.2%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	638	638.0	25.4%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	1271	1271.0	50.7%
5	NO OPINION	254	254.0	
6	NO ANSWER	6	6.0	

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.

var300: Canada would be better if all had one national origin

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2486 / 2486] [Invalid=281 / 281]
Literal question	Canada would be a better place if all people had the same national origin
Notes	q65m in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	257	257.0	10.3%
2	AGREE MILDLY	252	252.0	10.1%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	675	675.0	27.2%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	1302	1302.0	52.4%
5	NO OPINION	268	268.0	
6	NO ANSWER	13	13.0	

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.

var301: Good idea to unify the armed forces

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2178 / 2178] [Invalid=589 / 589]
Literal question	It was a good idea to unify the armed forces
Notes	q65n in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	848	848.0	38.9%
2	AGREE MILDLY	796	796.0	36.5%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	257	257.0	11.8%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	277	277.0	12.7%
5	NO OPINION	567	567.0	
6	NO ANSWER	22	22.0	

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.

var302: Provincial governments shoud participate in international educational conferences

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2258 / 2258] [Invalid=509 / 509]
Literal question	Provincial governments should participate at international educational conferences
Notes	q65o in the documentation.

var302: Provincial governments shoud participate in international educational conferences

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE STRONGLY	1164	1164.0		51.6%
2	AGREE MILDLY	737	737.0		32.6%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	151	151.0		6.7%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	206	206.0		9.1%
5	NO OPINION	494	494.0		
6	NO ANSWER	15	15.0		

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.

var303: Maintain peace keeping forces overseas

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2446 / 2446] [Invalid=321 / 321]
Literal question	Canada should continue providing peacekeeping forces overseas
Notes	q65p in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE STRONGLY	1007	1007.0		41.2%
2	AGREE MILDLY	929	929.0		38.0%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	277	277.0		11.3%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	233	233.0		9.5%
5	NO OPINION	310	310.0		
6	NO ANSWER	11	11.0		

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.

var304: Non-involved in problems of other countries

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2482 / 2482] [Invalid=285 / 285]
Literal question	Canada should not get involved in the problems of other countries
Notes	q65q in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	AGREE STRONGLY	613	613.0		24.7%
2	AGREE MILDLY	592	592.0		23.9%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	740	740.0		29.8%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	537	537.0		21.6%
5	NO OPINION	278	278.0		
6	NO ANSWER	7	7.0		

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.

var305: How many of every 100 speak only French

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/98/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2477 / 2477] [Invalid=290 / 290]
Pre-question	Now, I will ask you a couple of questions about English-French relations in Canada.
Literal question	Thinking now of the total population in Canada, how many out of every 100 Canadaians would you guess are able to speak only French?
Notes	q66 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		9	9.0		0.4%

var305: How many of every 100 speak only French

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1		1149	1149.0		46.4%
2		453	453.0		18.3%
3		360	360.0		14.5%
4		177	177.0		7.1%
5		187	187.0		7.5%
6		37	37.0		1.5%
7		29	29.0		1.2%
8		57	57.0		2.3%
9		16	16.0		0.6%
97		3	3.0		0.1%
98	DNK	252	252.0		
99	NA	38	38.0		

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.

var306: How do you feel about Quebec separating

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2734 / 2734] [Invalid=33 / 33]
Pre-question	There has been quite a bit of talk recently about the possibility of Quebec separating from the rest of Canada and becoming an independent country.
Literal question	Are you in favour of separation or opposed to it? Please tell me whether you are in favour of separation, slightly in favour, undecided, slightly opposed, or strongly opposed to separation.
Notes	q67a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	STRONGLY IN FAVOUR	77	77.0		2.8%
2	SLIGHTLY IN FAVOUR	133	133.0		4.9%
3	1NDECIDED	373	373.0		13.6%
4	SLIGHTLY OPPOSED	350	350.0		12.8%
5	STRONGLY OPPOSED	1801	1801.0		65.9%
6	NO ANSWER	33	33.0		

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.

var307: Do you think Quebec will separate in future

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2163 / 2163] [Invalid=604 / 604]
Literal question	Do you think that Quebec will separate some time in the future?
Notes	q67b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	YES	517	517.0		23.9%
2	NO	1646	1646.0		76.1%
3	DON'T KNOW	583	583.0		
4	NO ANSWER	21	21.0		

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.

var308: Per cent of Quebcois vote for separation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/98/99]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2506 / 2506] [Invalid=261 / 261]

var308: Per cent of Quebcois vote for separation

Literal question	Suppose a vote were taken in Quebec tomorrow on the question of separation, about what percentage of the voters in Quebec do you think would vote for separation?
Notes	q67c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		6	6.0	0.2%
1		377	377.0	15.0%
2		398	398.0	15.9%
3		537	537.0	21.4%
4		352	352.0	14.0%
5		321	321.0	12.8%
6		168	168.0	6.7%
7		100	100.0	4.0%
8		162	162.0	6.5%
9		62	62.0	2.5%
10		2	2.0	0.1%
97		21	21.0	0.8%
98	DNK	248	248.0	
99	NA	13	13.0	

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.

var309: Job of federal government if Quebec voted to separate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-18] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2102 / 2102] [Invalid=665 / 665]
Notes	q67d1d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 7, Cols. 32 - 33 - first mention.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	NOTHING CAN BE D	105	105.0	5.0%
4	PREVENT THE ISSUE	47	47.0	2.2%
5	LET QUE GO STONGLY -	40	40.0	1.9%
6	LET QUE GO MILDLY -	101	101.0	4.8%
7	LET QUE GO-NEUTRAL	613	613.0	29.2%
8	LET QUE GO-PRO QUE	80	80.0	3.8%
9	TAKE VOTE-INCL REST	48	48.0	2.3%
10	COMPROMISE	113	113.0	5.4%
11	MAKE QUE STAY-VIOL	100	100.0	4.8%
12	MAKE QUE STAY-PERSU	127	127.0	6.0%
13	MAKE QUE STAY-UNSP	486	486.0	23.1%
15	OTHER	179	179.0	8.5%
16	CANCELLER ANNULER	50	50.0	2.4%
18	OTTAWA MIND OWN BUS	13	13.0	0.6%
0	NO ANSWER	35	35.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	630	630.0	

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.

var310: Job of federal government if Quebec voted to separate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-18] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=111 / 111] [Invalid=2656 / 2656]
Notes	q67d2d in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 7, Cols. 34 - 35 - second mention.

var310: Job of federal government if Quebec voted to separate

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	NOTHING CAN BE D	10	10.0	9.0%
4	PREVENT THE ISSUE	5	5.0	4.5%
5	LET QUE GO STONGLY -	0	0.0	
6	LET QUE GO MILDLY -	4	4.0	3.6%
7	LET QUE GO-NEUTRAL	16	16.0	14.4%
8	LET QUE GO-PRO QUE	1	1.0	0.9%
9	TAKE VOTE-INCL REST	5	5.0	4.5%
10	COMPROMISE	8	8.0	7.2%
11	MAKE QUE STAY-VIOL	12	12.0	10.8%
12	MAKE QUE STAY-PERSU	8	8.0	7.2%
13	MAKE QUE STAY-UNSP	9	9.0	8.1%
15	OTHER	31	31.0	27.9%
16	CANCELLER ANNULER	2	2.0	1.8%
18	OTTAWA MIND OWN BUS	0	0.0	
0	NO ANSWER	2656	2656.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	0	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.

var311: Which is most dangerous to Canada's survival

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2585 / 2585] [Invalid=182 / 182]
Literal question	Which of the following is the most dangerous to the survival of Canada:
Interviewer's instructions	TURN TO PAGE 11 ON WHITE SHEETS AND READ LIST
Notes	q68a in the documentatation. Responses: Internal disunity resulting from English- French conflict; External danger of communism; An atomic war; The using up of natural resources; American economic and social domination.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	INTERNAL DISUNITY	608	608.0	23.5%
2	EXT DANGER OF COMM'N	368	368.0	14.2%
3	ATOMIC WAR	984	984.0	38.1%
4	USING UP NAT RESOUR	138	138.0	5.3%
5	AMER EC - SOC DOMIN	487	487.0	18.8%
6	NO OPINION DONT KNOW	169	169.0	
7	NO ANSWER REFUSED	13	13.0	

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.

var312: Which is least dangerous to Canada's survival

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2394 / 2394] [Invalid=373 / 373]
Literal question	Which, of the remaining four, is the least dangerous to Canada?
Interviewer's instructions	TURN TO PAGE 11 ON WHITE SHEETS AND READ LIST
Notes	q68b in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	INTERNAL DISUNITY	356	356.0	14.9%
2	EXT DANGER OF COMM'N	450	450.0	18.8%
3	ATOMIC WAR	421	421.0	17.6%

var312: Which is least dangerous to Canada's survival

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	USING UP NAT RESOUR	662	662.0	27.7%
5	AMER EC - SOC DOMIN	505	505.0	21.1%
6	NO OPINION DONT KNOW	360	360.0	
7	NO ANSWER REFUSED	13	13.0	

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.

var313: What is your interest in foreign affairs

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2665 / 2665] [Invalid=102 / 102]
Pre-question	Although Canada's role in world affairs did not become a major issue in the election, it did come up for discussion.
Literal question	Are you extremely interested, very interested, fairly interestd, or not too interested in foreign affairs?
Notes	q70 in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	EXTREMELY INTERESTED	208	208.0	7.8%
2	VERY INTERESTED	396	396.0	14.9%
3	FAIRLY INTERESTED	872	872.0	32.7%
4	NOT TOO INTERESTED	1189	1189.0	44.6%
5	NO OPINION	100	100.0	
6	NO ANSWER	2	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.

var314: Canada should become more involved in Latin America

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2560 / 2560] [Invalid=207 / 207]
Pre-question	Here are some of the suggestions that have been made about what Canada should do in world affairs. For each, please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree mildly, disagree mildly or disagree strongly. If you have no opinion, please say so.
Literal question	Canada should become more involved in Latin America.
Notes	q71a in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	50.4%
1	AGREE STRONGLY	162	162.0	6.3%
2	AGREE MILDLY	447	447.0	17.5%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	448	448.0	17.5%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	212	212.0	8.3%
5	NO OPINION	206	206.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var315: Level of military forces not necessary

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2677 / 2677] [Invalid=90 / 90]
Literal question	Canada does not need to maintain its present level of military forces.
Notes	q71b in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	48.2%

var315: Level of military forces not necessary

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	194	194.0	7.2%
2	AGREE MILDLY	330	330.0	12.3%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	423	423.0	15.8%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	439	439.0	16.4%
5	NO OPINION	90	90.0	
6	NO ANSWER	0	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.

var316: Canada and Communist China should establish closer relations

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2629 / 2629] [Invalid=138 / 138]
Literal question	Canada should establish closer relations with Communist China.
Notes	q71c in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	49.1%
1	AGREE STRONGLY	198	198.0	7.5%
2	AGREE MILDLY	489	489.0	18.6%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	307	307.0	11.7%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	344	344.0	13.1%
5	NO OPINION	137	137.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var317: Canada should reduce its foreign aid

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2603 / 2603] [Invalid=164 / 164]
Literal question	Canada should reduce its foreign aid.
Notes	q71d in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	49.6%
1	AGREE STRONGLY	95	95.0	3.6%
2	AGREE MILDLY	402	402.0	15.4%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	536	536.0	20.6%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	279	279.0	10.7%
5	NO OPINION	164	164.0	
6	NO ANSWER	0	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.

var318: Canada should send forces to Vietnam to help US

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2683 / 2683] [Invalid=84 / 84]
Literal question	Canada should send militiry forces to help the United States in Vietnam.
Notes	q71e in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	48.1%

var318: Canada should send forces to Vietnam to help US

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	64	64.0	2.4%
2	AGREE MILDLY	949	949.0	35.4%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	250	250.0	9.3%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	129	129.0	4.8%
5	NO OPINION	83	83.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var319: US continue to use Canadian bases and air space

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2296 / 2296] [Invalid=471 / 471]
Literal question	Canada should continue to give the United States the use of Canadian bases and air space.
Notes	q71f in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	56.2%
1	AGREE STRONGLY	87	87.0	3.8%
2	AGREE MILDLY	161	161.0	7.0%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	158	158.0	6.9%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	599	599.0	26.1%
5	NO OPINION	470	470.0	
6	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var320: Canada's foreign policy should be more independent of US

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2663 / 2663] [Invalid=104 / 104]
Literal question	Canada's foreign policy should be more independent of the United States.
Notes	q71g in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	48.5%
1	AGREE STRONGLY	606	606.0	22.8%
2	AGREE MILDLY	481	481.0	18.1%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	194	194.0	7.3%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	91	91.0	3.4%
5	NO OPINION	104	104.0	
6	NO ANSWER	0	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.

var321: Increase number of immigrants from Asia and Africa

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2637 / 2637] [Invalid=130 / 130]
Literal question	Canada should encourage an increase in the number of immigrants from Asia and Africa.
Notes	q71h in the documentatation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1291	1291.0	49.0%

var321: Increase number of immigrants from Asia and Africa

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	AGREE STRONGLY	93	93.0	3.5%
2	AGREE MILDLY	356	356.0	13.5%
3	DISAGREE MILDLY	456	456.0	17.3%
4	DISAGREE STRONGLY	441	441.0	16.7%
5	NO OPINION	127	127.0	
6	NO ANSWER	3	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.

var322: Party closest to views on foreign policy

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*/9/10]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2748 / 2748] [Invalid=19 / 19]
Literal question	Taking foreign policy as a whole, which party is closest to your views?
Notes	q72 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1696	1696.0	61.7%
1	LIB	720	720.0	26.2%
2	PC	215	215.0	7.8%
3	NDP	89	89.0	3.2%
4	CREDITISTE	2	2.0	0.1%
5	SOC CREDIT	14	14.0	0.5%
6	LIB AND PC	6	6.0	0.2%
7	DEMOCRATIQUE	0	0.0	
8	ALL THE SAME	6	6.0	0.2%
9	NONE	15	15.0	
10	REFUSED	4	4.0	

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.

var323: What is your marital status

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Pre-question	Now I have just a few more questions, this time about you.
Literal question	Are you married, widowed, separated, divorced, or are you single?
Notes	q73 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	PROFESS	2181	2181.0	78.8%
2	OWNER-MANAGER-BUS EX	204	204.0	7.4%
3	SALES	46	46.0	1.7%
4	CLE RICAL	13	13.0	0.5%
5	SKILLED LABOUR	322	322.0	11.6%
6	UNSKILLED LABOUR	1	1.0	0.0%
7	FARMER	0	0.0	
8	HOUSEWIFE WIDOW SPIN	0	0.0	
9	PENSIONED RETIRED	0	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.

var324: What is your occupation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/0]	
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1681 / 1681] [Invalid=1086 / 1086]	
Literal question	What is your occupation?	
Notes	q74a1 in the documentation.	

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	STRONGLY AGREE	177	177.0	10.5%
2	AGREE SOMEWHAT	170	170.0	10.1%
3	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	92	92.0	5.5%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	263	263.0	15.6%
5		429	429.0	25.5%
6		217	217.0	12.9%
7	NEITHER AG NOR DISAG	121	121.0	7.2%
9		212	212.0	12.6%
0	REFUSED	197	197.0	
8	NO OPINION	889	889.0	

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.

var325: What kind of work do you actually do

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]	
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]	
Interviewer's instructions	PROBE: What kind of work do you actually do?	
Notes	q74a2 in the documentation.	

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2570	2570.0	93.0%
1	SERVICE OR PROTECIV	131	131.0	4.7%
2	ARMED FORCES	6	6.0	0.2%
3	STU DENTS	32	32.0	1.2%
4	UNEMPLOYED	24	24.0	0.9%
5	REFUSED	4	4.0	

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.

var326: In what type of business do you work

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*]	
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]	
Literal question	In what type of business do you work?	
Notes	q74b1 in the documentation.	

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1710	1710.0	61.8%
1	EDUCA'N	125	125.0	4.5%
2	HEALTH AND WELF	90	90.0	3.3%
3	OTHER PROF-TECH	41	41.0	1.5%
4	GOV	128	128.0	4.6%
5	TRANS COMM AND UTIL	205	205.0	7.4%
6	RECREATION-ENTERTAIN	36	36.0	1.3%
7	OTHER PERSONAL SERV	93	93.0	3.4%

var326: In what type of business do you work

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8	MANUFACTUR	241	241.0	8.7%
9	CONSTRUCTN	98	98.0	3.5%
10	FORESTRY OIL MINING	0	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.

var327: What do you do there

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1613 / 1613] [Invalid=1154 / 1154]
Interviewer's instructions	PROBE: What do you do there?
Notes	q74b2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CRAFTSMAN PROD-PROC	82	82.0	5.1%
2	TRADE	148	148.0	9.2%
3	FINAN INSUR RE AL	73	73.0	4.5%
4	SALES	13	13.0	0.8%
5	CLERICAL	3	3.0	0.2%
6	BUSINESS SERVICE	9	9.0	0.6%
7	AGRI	128	128.0	7.9%
8	NOT EMPLOY	1157	1157.0	71.7%
0	REFUSED NO ANSWER	1154	1154.0	

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.

var328: Who is your family main wage earner

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Who usually is your family's main wage earner?
Notes	q75 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	RESPONDENT-MALE HEAD	1296	1296.0	46.8%
2	RESPONDENT'HUSAND	1018	1018.0	36.8%
3	RESPONDENT'FATHER	101	101.0	3.7%
4	RESPONDENT'FATHER-N-	1	1.0	0.0%
5	RESPONDENT-FEMALE HE	277	277.0	10.0%
6	RESPONDENT'WIFE	13	13.0	0.5%
7	OTHER MALE	40	40.0	1.4%
8	OTHER FEMALE	21	21.0	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.

var329: Main wage earner's occupation

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/8/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1070 / 1070] [Invalid=1697 / 1697]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are not the main wage earner in their family.
Literal question	What is the main earner's occupation.
Notes	q76a1 in the documentation.

var329: Main wage earner's occupation

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	STRONGLY AGREE	78	78.0	7.3%
2	AGREE SOMEWHAT	150	150.0	14.0%
3	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	66	66.0	6.2%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	90	90.0	8.4%
5		316	316.0	29.5%
6		166	166.0	15.5%
7	NEITHER AG NOR DISAG	116	116.0	10.8%
9		88	88.0	8.2%
0	REFUSED	1697	1697.0	
8	NO OPINION	0	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.

var330: What kind of work does he actually do

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2756 / 2756] [Invalid=11 / 11]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are not the main wage earner in their family.
Interviewer's instructions	PROBE: What kind of work does (he/she) actually do?
Notes	q76a2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2643	2643.0	95.9%
1	SERVICE OR PROTECIV	84	84.0	3.0%
2	ARMED FORCES	11	11.0	0.4%
3	STU DENTS	1	1.0	0.0%
4	UNEMPLOYED	17	17.0	0.6%
5	REFUSED	11	11.0	

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.

var331: In what type of business does he work

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are not the main wage earner in their family.
Literal question	In what type of business does (he/she) work?
Notes	q76b1 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2098	2098.0	75.8%
1	EDUCA'N	41	41.0	1.5%
2	HEALTH AND WELF	37	37.0	1.3%
3	OTHER PROF-TECH	22	22.0	0.8%
4	GOV	90	90.0	3.3%
5	TRANS COMM AND UTIL	156	156.0	5.6%
6	RECREATION-ENTERTAIN	23	23.0	0.8%
7	OTHER PERSONAL SERV	50	50.0	1.8%
8	MANUFACTUR	163	163.0	5.9%
9	CONSTRUCTN	87	87.0	3.1%
10	FORESTRY OIL MINING	0	0.0	

var331: In what type of business does he work

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

var332: What does he do there

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=430 / 430] [Invalid=2337 / 2337]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are not the main wage earner in their family.
Interviewer's instructions	PROBE: What does (he/she) do there?
Notes	q76b2 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CRAFTSMAN PROD-PROC	60	60.0	14.0%
2	TRADE	94	94.0	21.9%
3	FINAN INSUR RE AL	39	39.0	9.1%
4	SALES	2	2.0	0.5%
5	CLERICAL	2	2.0	0.5%
6	BUSINESS SERVICE	7	7.0	1.6%
7	AGRI	120	120.0	27.9%
8	NOT EMPLOY	106	106.0	24.7%
0	REFUSED NO ANSWER	2337	2337.0	

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.

var333: How many years of school did you attend

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/8/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 / 2743] [Invalid=24 / 24]
Literal question	How many years of school did you attend?
Notes	q77a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	STRONGLY AGREE	222	222.0	8.4%
2	AGREE SOMEWHAT	1345	1345.0	51.0%
3	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	1003	1003.0	38.0%
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	69	69.0	2.6%
7	NEITHER AG NOR DISAG	0	0.0	
0	REFUSED	24	24.0	
8	NO OPINION	0	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.

var334: What is the highest grade you reached

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2764 / 2764] [Invalid=3 / 3]
Literal question	What is the highest grade of school you reached?
Notes	q77b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		24	24.0	0.9%
1	ONE	12	12.0	0.4%
2	2	20	20.0	0.7%
3	3	44	44.0	1.6%
4	4	84	84.0	3.0%

var334: What is the highest grade you reached

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	5	84	84.0	3.0%
6	6	135	135.0	4.9%
7	7	195	195.0	7.1%
8	8	386	386.0	14.0%
9	9	289	289.0	10.5%
10	10	338	338.0	12.2%
11	11	298	298.0	10.8%
12	12	383	383.0	13.9%
13	13	98	98.0	3.5%
14	FIRST YR UNIVERSITY	47	47.0	1.7%
15	SECOND YR	49	49.0	1.8%
16	THIRD YR	41	41.0	1.5%
17	FOURTH YR	73	73.0	2.6%
18	FIVE OR MORE YRS	21	21.0	0.8%
19	MA	13	13.0	0.5%
20	PHD	3	3.0	0.1%
21	H-SCHOOL--TEACH COLL	34	34.0	1.2%
22	H-SCHOOL PLUS RN	14	14.0	0.5%
23	H-SCH PLUS-COMM TECH	28	28.0	1.0%
24	SOME H-SCH COMM-TECH	18	18.0	0.7%
25	UNIV PLUS TEACH COLL	11	11.0	0.4%
26	5-YR-MORE UNIV EDUCN	17	17.0	0.6%
27	GRD-8 PLUS BUS-COLL	5	5.0	0.2%
30	NO ANSWER DON'T KNOW	3	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.

var335: Was any of your education in a separate school

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2653 / 2653] [Invalid=114 / 114]
Literal question	Did you take any of your primary or secondary education in a church-affiliated or "separate" school?
Notes	q77c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		24	24.0	0.9%
1	YES	852	852.0	32.1%
2	NO	1777	1777.0	67.0%
3	DON'T KNOW	49	49.0	
4	NO ANSWER	65	65.0	

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.

var336: What language did you study at college

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/7/8]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2744 / 2744] [Invalid=23 / 23]
Universe	q77d asked only to respondents with more than 11 years of schooling.
Literal question	Did you ever attend University or College?
Post-question	IF "YES", ASK: In what language did you study at University or College? (q77e)

var336: What language did you study at college

Notes	q77d, q77e in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1895	1895.0	69.1%
1	UPPER CLAS	440	440.0	16.0%
2	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	268	268.0	9.8%
3	MIDDLE CLASS	60	60.0	2.2%
4	WORKING CLASS	54	54.0	2.0%
5	LOWER CLASS	6	6.0	0.2%
6	NO SUCH THING	12	12.0	0.4%
9	NO	9	9.0	0.3%
7	DON'T KNOW	5	5.0	
8	NO ANSWER	18	18.0	

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.

var337: How many years did father attend school

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-30] [Missing=*/30]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2426 / 2426] [Invalid=341 / 341]
Literal question	How many years of school did your father attend? Your best guess will do.
Notes	q78 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		152	152.0	6.3%
1	ONE	24	24.0	1.0%
2	2	65	65.0	2.7%
3	3	111	111.0	4.6%
4	4	167	167.0	6.9%
5	5	223	223.0	9.2%
6	6	248	248.0	10.2%
7	7	207	207.0	8.5%
8	8	492	492.0	20.3%
9	9	167	167.0	6.9%
10	10	199	199.0	8.2%
11	11	71	71.0	2.9%
12	12	135	135.0	5.6%
13	13	38	38.0	1.6%
14	FIRST YR UNIVERSITY	20	20.0	0.8%
15	SECOND YR	18	18.0	0.7%
16	THIRD YR	40	40.0	1.6%
17	FOURTH YR	15	15.0	0.6%
18	FIVE OR MORE YRS	12	12.0	0.5%
19	MA	2	2.0	0.1%
20	PHD	14	14.0	0.6%
21	H-SCHOOL--TEACH COLL	2	2.0	0.1%
22	H-SCHOOL PLUS RN	1	1.0	0.0%
23	H-SCH PLUS-COMM TECH	1	1.0	0.0%
24	SOME H-SCH COMM-TECH	1	1.0	0.0%
25	UNIV PLUS TEACH COLL	1	1.0	0.0%

var337: How many years did father attend school

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
26	5-YR-MORE UNIV EDUCN	0	0.0	
27	GRD-8 PLUS BUS-COLL	0	0.0	
30	NO ANSWER DON'T KNOW	341	341.0	

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.

var338: Which social class are you in

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*/0/8]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2766 / 2766] [Invalid=1 / 1]
Pre-question	One hears a lot about different social classes.
Literal question	Do you ever think of yourself as belonging to a social class?
Notes	q79a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	TOO MUCH	9	9.0	0.3%
2	ABOUT RIGHT	109	109.0	3.9%
3	NOT ENOUGH	553	553.0	20.0%
4		382	382.0	13.8%
5		14	14.0	0.5%
7		14	14.0	0.5%
9		1685	1685.0	60.9%
0	REFUSED	0	0.0	
8	DK/NO OPINION	1	1.0	

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.

var339: If you were to choose which class are in

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-8] [Missing=*/8/7]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2689 / 2689] [Invalid=78 / 78]
Universe	q79b asked only to respondents who answered "yes" for q79a. q79c asked only to respondents who answered "no" for q79a.
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?(q79b) / Well, if you had to make a choice, would you say you were in - upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, working class, or lower class? (q79c)
Notes	q79b, q79c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1068	1068.0	39.7%
1	UPPER CLASS	6	6.0	0.2%
2	UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	80	80.0	3.0%
3	MIDDLE CLASS	657	657.0	24.4%
4	WORKING CLASS	751	751.0	27.9%
5	LOWER CLASS	52	52.0	1.9%
6	NO SUCH THING	75	75.0	2.8%
7	DON'T KNOW	71	71.0	
8	NO ANSWER	7	7.0	

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.

var340: What is your religion

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*/40]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]

var340: What is your religion

Literal question	What is your religion?
Interviewer's instructions	IF "PROTESTANT" PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DENOMINATION
Notes	q80 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	96	96.0	3.5%
1	RC	1153	1153.0	41.7%
2	UN CH	559	559.0	20.2%
3	ANGL	346	346.0	12.5%
4	PRES	140	140.0	5.1%
5	BAPTIS	113	113.0	4.1%
6	LUTHERAN	112	112.0	4.1%
7	UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC	31	31.0	1.1%
8	GREEK ORTHODOX	39	39.0	1.4%
9	JEWISH	42	42.0	1.5%
10	NO REG CH-BELIEV-GO	3	3.0	0.1%
11	MENNONITE	15	15.0	0.5%
12	PENTECOSTAL	21	21.0	0.8%
13	FREE METH-METHODIST	7	7.0	0.3%
14	SALVATION ARMY	10	10.0	0.4%
15	CHURCH OF NAZARENE	4	4.0	0.1%
16	CHRISTIAN REFORMED	5	5.0	0.2%
17	JEHOVAH WITNESS	5	5.0	0.2%
18	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST	9	9.0	0.3%
19	7TH-DAY ADVENTIST	1	1.0	0.0%
21	MORMON	2	2.0	0.1%
22	EVANGELICAN	3	3.0	0.1%
23	BRETHERN UNSPEC	4	4.0	0.1%
24	CHRISTN SCIENCE	0	0.0	
25	BUDDHIST	2	2.0	0.1%
26	UNITARIAN	6	6.0	0.2%
27	CHURCH OF GOD	3	3.0	0.1%
28	NON-DENOMINATIONAL	16	16.0	0.6%
29	LATTER-DAY SAINTS	3	3.0	0.1%
30	CHRISTIAN CHURCH	3	3.0	0.1%
31	CONGREGATIONAL	0	0.0	
32	CHURCH OF MOD-DAY ST	0	0.0	
33	SIHK MOSLEM	1	1.0	0.0%
34	SPIRITUALIST	1	1.0	0.0%
35	APOSTOLIC	1	1.0	0.0%
36	QUAKER	0	0.0	
37	PROTESTANT	4	4.0	0.1%
38	HUTTERITE	2	2.0	0.1%
39	SWEDEN BORGIAN	1	1.0	0.0%
41	ZWINGLI	0	0.0	
40	REFUSED	4	4.0	

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.

var341: How often do you attend church

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2760 / 2760] [Invalid=7 / 7]
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	q81 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		96	96.0	3.5%
1	WEEKLY	1090	1090.0	39.5%
2	2-3 TIMES MONTHLY	309	309.0	11.2%
3	ONCE A MON	248	248.0	9.0%
4	FEW TIMES YR OR LESS	819	819.0	29.7%
5	NEVER	198	198.0	7.2%
6	NO ANSWER	7	7.0	

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.

var342: Which other language do you speak at home

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who speak more than one language at home.
Literal question	Which one?
Notes	q88c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2724	2724.0	98.4%
1	ENGL AND OTHERS	9	9.0	0.3%
2	FRENCH AND OTHERS	11	11.0	0.4%
3	ENGL-FREN AND OTHER	1	1.0	0.0%
4	INDIAN	5	5.0	0.2%
5	GREEK	3	3.0	0.1%
6	CHINESE---JAPANESE	3	3.0	0.1%
7	ARABIC----SYRIAN	2	2.0	0.1%
8	GAELIC	2	2.0	0.1%
9	OTHER COMB	7	7.0	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.

var343: What other language do you speak at work

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Which one?
Notes	q89c in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2751	2751.0	99.4%
1	HUNGARIAN	3	3.0	0.1%
2	GERMAN AND 1+ SLAVIC	4	4.0	0.1%
3	GERMAN-1+ SLAVIC	4	4.0	0.1%
4	GERMAN-HUNG-ITAL	1	1.0	0.0%

var343: What other language do you speak at work

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	JEWISH AND POLISM	1	1.0	0.0%
6	INDIAN	1	1.0	0.0%
7	MANY OF THE M	2	2.0	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.

var344: What language do you speak with your friends

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	What language do you usually speak with your friends?
Notes	q90 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2748	2748.0	99.3%
1	ENGL-FREN AND OTHERS	8	8.0	0.3%
2	INDIAN	3	3.0	0.1%
3	GREEK MACEDONIAN	3	3.0	0.1%
4	CHINESE	2	2.0	0.1%
5	GERMAN AND OTHER	3	3.0	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.

var345: What is the religion of your spouse

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*/40]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2765 / 2765] [Invalid=2 / 2]
Literal question	What is your husband's (wife's) religion?
Notes	q82a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	634	634.0	22.9%
1	RC	906	906.0	32.8%
2	UN CH	461	461.0	16.7%
3	ANGL	258	258.0	9.3%
4	PRES	107	107.0	3.9%
5	BAPTIS	98	98.0	3.5%
6	LUTHERAN	105	105.0	3.8%
7	UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC	24	24.0	0.9%
8	GREEK ORTHODOX	27	27.0	1.0%
9	JEWISH	36	36.0	1.3%
10	NO REG CH-BELIEV-GO	1	1.0	0.0%
11	MENNONITE	14	14.0	0.5%
12	PENTECOSTAL	22	22.0	0.8%
13	FREE METH-METHODIST	9	9.0	0.3%
14	SALVATION ARMY	10	10.0	0.4%
15	CHURCH OF NAZARENE	2	2.0	0.1%
16	CHRISTIAN REFORMED	5	5.0	0.2%
17	JEHOVAH WITNESS	6	6.0	0.2%
18	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST	4	4.0	0.1%
19	7TH-DAY ADVENTIST	2	2.0	0.1%

var345: What is the religion of your spouse

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
21	MORMON	0	0.0	
22	EVANGELICAN	3	3.0	0.1%
23	BRETHERN UNSPEC	2	2.0	0.1%
24	CHRISTN SCIENCE	0	0.0	
25	BUDDHIST	1	1.0	0.0%
26	UNITARIAN	5	5.0	0.2%
27	CHURCH OF GOD	2	2.0	0.1%
28	NON-DENOMINATIONAL	13	13.0	0.5%
29	LATTER-DAY SAINTS	1	1.0	0.0%
30	CHRISTIAN CHURCH	1	1.0	0.0%
31	CONGREGATIONAL	0	0.0	
32	CHURCH OF MOD-DAY ST	0	0.0	
33	SIHK MOSLEM	0	0.0	
34	SPIRITUALIST	1	1.0	0.0%
35	APOSTOLIC	0	0.0	
36	QUAKER	0	0.0	
37	PROTESTANT	2	2.0	0.1%
38	HUTTERITE	1	1.0	0.0%
39	SWEDEN BORGIAN	1	1.0	0.0%
41	ZWINGLI	1	1.0	0.0%
40	REFUSED	2	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.

var346: How often does your spouse attend church

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*/6]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2735 / 2735] [Invalid=32 / 32]
Literal question	How often does he (she) attend church (synagogue)?
Notes	q82b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.4%
1	WEEKLY	861	861.0	31.5%
2	2-3 TIMES MONTHLY	265	265.0	9.7%
3	ONCE A MON	182	182.0	6.7%
4	FEW TIMES YR OR LESS	607	607.0	22.2%
5	NEVER	234	234.0	8.6%
6	NO ANSWER	32	32.0	

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.

var347: Your mother's religion in your youth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*/40]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2765 / 2765] [Invalid=2 / 2]
Literal question	What was your mother's religion when you were growing up?
Notes	q83a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	12	12.0	0.4%

var347: Your mother's religion in your youth

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	RC	1195	1195.0	43.2%
2	UN CH	395	395.0	14.3%
3	ANGL	388	388.0	14.0%
4	PRES	186	186.0	6.7%
5	BAPTIS	130	130.0	4.7%
6	LUTHERAN	137	137.0	5.0%
7	UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC	37	37.0	1.3%
8	GREEK ORTHODOX	61	61.0	2.2%
9	JEWISH	42	42.0	1.5%
10	NO REG CH-BELIEV-GO	1	1.0	0.0%
11	MENNONITE	22	22.0	0.8%
12	PENTECOSTAL	16	16.0	0.6%
13	FREE METH-METHODIST	46	46.0	1.7%
14	SALVATION ARMY	9	9.0	0.3%
15	CHURCH OF NAZARENE	3	3.0	0.1%
16	CHRISTIAN REFORMED	5	5.0	0.2%
17	JEHOVAH WITNESS	5	5.0	0.2%
18	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST	7	7.0	0.3%
19	7TH-DAY ADVENTIST	2	2.0	0.1%
20		26	26.0	0.9%
21	MORMON	1	1.0	0.0%
22	EVANGELICAN	2	2.0	0.1%
23	BRETHERN UNSPEC	4	4.0	0.1%
24	CHRISTN SCIENCE	3	3.0	0.1%
25	BUDDHIST	3	3.0	0.1%
26	UNITARIAN	2	2.0	0.1%
27	CHURCH OF GOD	2	2.0	0.1%
28	NON-DENOMINATIONAL	10	10.0	0.4%
29	LATTER-DAY SAINTS	2	2.0	0.1%
30	CHRISTIAN CHURCH	1	1.0	0.0%
31	CONGREGATIONAL	2	2.0	0.1%
32	CHURCH OF MOD-DAY ST	0	0.0	
33	SIHK MOSLEM	1	1.0	0.0%
34	SPIRITUALIST	1	1.0	0.0%
35	APOSTOLIC	1	1.0	0.0%
36	QUAKER	1	1.0	0.0%
37	PROTESTANT	0	0.0	
38	HUTTERITE	3	3.0	0.1%
39	SWEDEN BORGIAN	1	1.0	0.0%
41	ZWINGLI	0	0.0	
40	REFUSED	2	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.

var348: Your father's religion in your youth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-41] [Missing=*/40]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2765 / 2765] [Invalid=2 / 2]

var348: Your father's religion in your youth

Literal question	What was your father's religion when you were growing up?			
Notes	q84a in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NONE	52	52.0	1.9%
1	RC	1153	1153.0	41.7%
2	UN CH	375	375.0	13.6%
3	ANGL	384	384.0	13.9%
4	PRES	185	185.0	6.7%
5	BAPTIS	126	126.0	4.6%
6	LUTHERAN	138	138.0	5.0%
7	UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC	35	35.0	1.3%
8	GREEK ORTHODOX	60	60.0	2.2%
9	JEWISH	44	44.0	1.6%
10	NO REG CH-BELIEV-GO	2	2.0	0.1%
11	MENNONITE	22	22.0	0.8%
12	PENTECOSTAL	16	16.0	0.6%
13	FREE METH-METHODIST	35	35.0	1.3%
14	SALVATION ARMY	11	11.0	0.4%
15	CHURCH OF NAZARENE	3	3.0	0.1%
16	CHRISTIAN REFORMED	5	5.0	0.2%
17	JEHOVAH WITNESS	3	3.0	0.1%
18	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST	7	7.0	0.3%
19	7TH-DAY ADVENTIST	3	3.0	0.1%
20		69	69.0	2.5%
21	MORMON	2	2.0	0.1%
22	EVANGELICAN	4	4.0	0.1%
23	BRETHERN UNSPEC	3	3.0	0.1%
24	CHRISTN SCIENCE	1	1.0	0.0%
25	BUDDHIST	3	3.0	0.1%
26	UNITARIAN	1	1.0	0.0%
27	CHURCH OF GOD	2	2.0	0.1%
28	NON-DENOMINATIONAL	9	9.0	0.3%
29	LATTER-DAY SAINTS	3	3.0	0.1%
30	CHRISTIAN CHURCH	0	0.0	
31	CONGREGATIONAL	2	2.0	0.1%
32	CHURCH OF MOD-DAY ST	0	0.0	
33	SIHK MOSLEM	2	2.0	0.1%
34	SPIRITUALIST	0	0.0	
35	APOSTOLIC	0	0.0	
36	QUAKER	0	0.0	
37	PROTESTANT	1	1.0	0.0%
38	HUTTERITE	3	3.0	0.1%
39	SWEDEN BORGIAN	1	1.0	0.0%
41	ZWINGLI	0	0.0	
40	REFUSED	2	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.

var349: Mother's interest in her religion

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2684 / 2684] [Invalid=83 / 83]
Literal question	Do you remember whether she was very much interested in her religion, somewhat interested, or didn't pay much attention to it?
Notes	q83b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	VERY MUCH INTERESTED	1813	1813.0		67.5%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	655	655.0		24.4%
3	DIDNT PAY MUCH ATTEN	216	216.0		8.0%
4	CAN'T REMEMBER	70	70.0		
5	NO ANSWER-REFUSED	13	13.0		

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.

var350: Father's interest in his religion

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2598 / 2598] [Invalid=169 / 169]
Literal question	Do you remember whether he was very much interested in his religion, somewhat interested, or didn't pay much attention to it?
Notes	q84b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	VERY MUCH INTERESTED	1453	1453.0		55.9%
2	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	676	676.0		26.0%
3	DIDNT PAY MUCH ATTEN	469	469.0		18.1%
4	CAN'T REMEMBER	129	129.0		
5	NO ANSWER-REFUSED	40	40.0		

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.

var351: Proportion of your friends of your religion

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2497 / 2497] [Invalid=270 / 270]
Literal question	What proportion of your friends have the same religion as you?
Notes	q85 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	ALL	551	551.0		22.1%
2	ALMOST ALL	725	725.0		29.0%
3	HALF	727	727.0		29.1%
4	LESS THAN HALF	349	349.0		14.0%
5	ALMOST NONE	145	145.0		5.8%
6	DON'T KNOW	263	263.0		
7	NO ANSWER	7	7.0		

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.

var352: In what country were you born

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-12] [Missing=*/12]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2766 / 2766] [Invalid=1 / 1]
Literal question	In what county were you born?

var352: In what country were you born

	Notes		q86a in the documentation.		

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	CANADA	2264	2264.0		81.9%
2	BRITISH ISLES	191	191.0	6.9%	
3	GERMANY	32	32.0	1.2%	
4	HUNGARY	24	24.0	0.9%	
5	ITALY	32	32.0	1.2%	
6	HOLLAND	13	13.0	0.5%	
7	POLAND	38	38.0	1.4%	
8	RUSSIA	21	21.0	0.8%	
9	EUROPEAN--OTHER	47	47.0	1.7%	
10	USA	39	39.0	1.4%	
11	ALL OTHER	65	65.0	2.3%	
12	NO ANSWER	1	1.0		

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.

var353: In what year did you move to Canada

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-69] [Missing=*/8/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2725 / 2725] [Invalid=42 / 42]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who were born outside of Canada.
Literal question	In what year did you come to live in Canada?
Interviewer's instructions	WRITE IN PRECISE YEAR
Notes	q86b1b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	STRONGLY AGREE	2	2.0	0.1%	
2	AGREE SOMEWHAT	2291	2291.0		88.1%
3	DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	65	65.0	2.5%	
4	STRONGLY DISAGREE	67	67.0	2.6%	
7	NEITHER AG NOR DISAG	175	175.0	6.7%	
0	REFUSED	0	0.0		
8	NO OPINION	42	42.0		

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.

var354: Approximation of year moved to Canada

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]
Universe	Asked only to respondents who are not sure of the exact year they moved to Canada.
Literal question	Was it between 1960 and 1968? Between 1946 and 1960? between 1939 and 1945? Or before 1939?
Notes	q86b2b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		2264	2264.0		81.9%
1	BTWN 1961-1968	33	33.0	1.2%	
2	BTWN 1946-1960	230	230.0	8.3%	
3	BTWN 1939-1945	15	15.0	0.5%	
4	BEFORE-39	221	221.0	8.0%	

var354: Approximation of year moved to Canada

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	NO IDEA	4	4.0	

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.

var355: Country from which most ancestors came

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-38] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2756 / 2756] [Invalid=11 / 11]
Literal question	Please tell me from what country most of your ancestors came.
Notes	q87a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CANADA	752	752.0	27.3%
2	USA	54	54.0	2.0%
3	BRITISH IS	1044	1044.0	37.9%
4	CHINA	6	6.0	0.2%
5	FRA NCE	246	246.0	8.9%
6	GERMANY	112	112.0	4.1%
7	HUNGARY	31	31.0	1.1%
8	ITALY	48	48.0	1.7%
9	JAPAN	2	2.0	0.1%
10	MEXICO	0	0.0	
11	HOLLAND---BELGIUM	44	44.0	1.6%
12	POLAND	70	70.0	2.5%
13	SCANDINAV-COUNTRIES	55	55.0	2.0%
14	UKRAINE---RUSSIA	119	119.0	4.3%
15	AUSTRIA	25	25.0	0.9%
16	CZECH	10	10.0	0.4%
17	YUGOSLAVIA	6	6.0	0.2%
18	ROUMANIA--B ULGARIA	8	8.0	0.3%
19	SWITZERLAND	8	8.0	0.3%
20	ESTONIA	3	3.0	0.1%
21	LITHUANIA-LATVIA	5	5.0	0.2%
22	ICELAND	1	1.0	0.0%
23	SPAIN PORTUGAL	3	3.0	0.1%
24	GREECE MALTA	6	6.0	0.2%
25	LEBANON SYRIA TURKEY	7	7.0	0.3%
27	AUSTRALIA	1	1.0	0.0%
28	INDIA PAKISTAN	2	2.0	0.1%
29	AFRICA	2	2.0	0.1%
30	BRIT ISLES -FRANCE	20	20.0	0.7%
31	BRIT ISLES-GERMANY	17	17.0	0.6%
32	BRIT ISLES-NETHERL'D	9	9.0	0.3%
33	BRIT ISLES-SCANDINAV	5	5.0	0.2%
34	BRIT ISLES-1 OTH EUR	5	5.0	0.2%
35	BRIT ISLES-2 EUR CON	6	6.0	0.2%
36	FRANCE-1-2 EUR COUN	7	7.0	0.3%
37	OTHER COMB-EUR COUN	16	16.0	0.6%

var355: Country from which most ancestors came

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
38	CANARY IS	1	1.0	0.0%
0	DON'T KNOW	11	11.0	

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.

var356: Before North America where did ancestors come from

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-38] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=675 / 675] [Invalid=2092 / 2092]
Universe	Asked to respondents who mentioned Canada or U.S.A. in q67a.
Literal question	And before that, where did most of your ancestors come from?
Notes	q87b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CANADA	141	141.0	20.9%
2	USA	7	7.0	1.0%
3	BRITISH IS	162	162.0	24.0%
4	CHINA	0	0.0	
5	FRA NCE	265	265.0	39.3%
6	GERMANY	22	22.0	3.3%
7	HUNGARY	0	0.0	
8	ITALY	2	2.0	0.3%
9	JAPAN	0	0.0	
10	MEXICO	0	0.0	
11	HOLLAND---BELGIUM	9	9.0	1.3%
12	POLAND	2	2.0	0.3%
13	SCANDINAV-COUNTRIES	4	4.0	0.6%
14	UKRAINE---RUSSIA	5	5.0	0.7%
15	AUSTRIA	1	1.0	0.1%
16	CZECH	0	0.0	
17	YUGOSLAVIA	0	0.0	
18	ROUMANIA--B ULGARIA	2	2.0	0.3%
19	SWITZERLAND	1	1.0	0.1%
20	ESTONIA	0	0.0	
21	LITHUANIA-LATVIA	0	0.0	
22	ICELAND	0	0.0	
23	SPAIN PORTUGAL	1	1.0	0.1%
24	GREECE MALTA	0	0.0	
25	LEBANON SYRIA TURKEY	0	0.0	
27	AUSTRALIA	0	0.0	
28	INDIA PAKISTAN	0	0.0	
29	AFRICA	0	0.0	
30	BRIT ISLES -FRANCE	18	18.0	2.7%
31	BRIT ISLES-GERMANY	7	7.0	1.0%
32	BRIT ISLES-NETHERL'D	2	2.0	0.3%
33	BRIT ISLES-SCANDINAV	4	4.0	0.6%
34	BRIT ISLES-1 OTH EUR	2	2.0	0.3%
35	BRIT ISLES-2 EUR CON	5	5.0	0.7%

var356: Before North America where did ancestors come from

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
36	FRANCE-1-2 EUR COUN	9	9.0	1.3%
37	OTHER COMB-EUR COUN	4	4.0	0.6%
38	CANARY IS	0	0.0	
0	DON'T KNOW	2092	2092.0	

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.

var357: Language most often spoken at home

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	What language do you speak most often at home
Notes	q88a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	OTHER COMB	3	3.0	0.1%
1	ENGLISH	1907	1907.0	68.9%
2	FRENCH	716	716.0	25.9%
3	GERM-DUTCH-OTH GER'C	27	27.0	1.0%
4	ITALIAN SPANISH	27	27.0	1.0%
5	UKRAN POLE-OTH SLAVC	46	46.0	1.7%
6	HUNG-FINN-ESTONIAN	9	9.0	0.3%
7	HEBREW JEWISH	7	7.0	0.3%
8	ENGL-FREN EQUALLY	14	14.0	0.5%
9	OTHER SING MENTIONS	11	11.0	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.

var358: Which other language is spoken at home

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2639 / 2639] [Invalid=128 / 128]
Literal question	Do you speak any other language at home?
Interviewer's instructions	Specify
Notes	q88b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NO	2143	2143.0	81.2%
2	FRENCH	77	77.0	2.9%
3	GERMAN DUTCH	86	86.0	3.3%
4	ITAL-SPAN--PORT-MALT	17	17.0	0.6%
5	UKRAN-POLE-OTH SLAV	63	63.0	2.4%
6	HUNG-FINN-ESTONIAN	13	13.0	0.5%
7	HEB-JEWISH	11	11.0	0.4%
8	ENGL AND FRENCH	8	8.0	0.3%
9	ENGLISH	221	221.0	8.4%
0	REFUSED-NO ANSWER	128	128.0	

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.

var359: Which language do you speak most at work

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2217 / 2217] [Invalid=550 / 550]

var359: Which language do you speak most at work

Literal question	Which language do you speak most at work?
Notes	q89a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	ENGLISH	1696	1696.0		76.5%
2	FRENCH	479	479.0		21.6%
3	GERMAN-DUT	6	6.0	0.3%	
4	ITALIAN	9	9.0	0.4%	
5	HUNGARIAN-FINNISH	7	7.0	0.3%	
6	CHINESE	3	3.0	0.1%	
7	SAULTEAUX INDIAN	2	2.0	0.1%	
8	ENG-FRENCH EQUALLY	13	13.0	0.6%	
9	ENGLISH AND OTHER	2	2.0	0.1%	
0	NO ANSWER	550	550.0		

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.

var360: Do you speak any other language at work

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2162 / 2162] [Invalid=605 / 605]
Literal question	Do you speak any other language at work?
Interviewer's instructions	Specify
Notes	q89b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NO	1786	1786.0		82.6%
2	FRENCH	118	118.0	5.5%	
3	GERM-DUTCH	24	24.0	1.1%	
4	ITAL-PORT-SPANISH	11	11.0	0.5%	
5	UKRAN-POLE-OTH SLAV	27	27.0	1.2%	
6	ENGL AND OTHERS	3	3.0	0.1%	
7	FREN AND OTHERS	10	10.0	0.5%	
8	ENGL AND FRENCH	3	3.0	0.1%	
9	ENGLISH	180	180.0	8.3%	
0	NO ANSWER	605	605.0		

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.

var361: What language do you speak with friends

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	What language do you usually speak with your friends?
Notes	q90 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	FREN AND OTHERS	37	37.0	1.3%	
1	FRENCH	650	650.0		23.5%
2	ENGLISH	1890	1890.0		68.3%
3	GERM-DUTCH	18	18.0	0.7%	
4	ITALIAN - SPANISH	17	17.0	0.6%	

var361: What language do you speak with friends

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5	UKRAN-POLE-OTH SLAV	32	32.0	1.2%
6	HUNG-FINN-ESTONIAN	8	8.0	0.3%
7	JEWISH	4	4.0	0.1%
8	ENGL-FREN EQUALLY	67	67.0	2.4%
9	ENGL AND OTHERS	44	44.0	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.

var362: During schooling where did you live

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/4]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2743 / 2743] [Invalid=24 / 24]
Literal question	During most of your school years, where did you live - mostly in a city or suburb, mostly in a village or small town, or mostly on a farm?
Notes	q91 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CITIES OR SUBURBS	1067	1067.0	38.9%
2	VILLAGES--SMALL TOWN	902	902.0	32.9%
3	ON FARMS	774	774.0	28.2%
4	NO ANSWER-REFUSED	24	24.0	

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.

var363: As member activity in trade union

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2754 / 2754] [Invalid=13 / 13]
Interviewer's instructions	Where degree of activeness is not indicated, code, alternately, "very active" and "inactive".
Notes	q92a1a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOT A MEMB	2291	2291.0	83.2%
2	VERY ACTIV	83	83.0	3.0%
3	FAIRLY ACT	211	211.0	7.7%
4	INACTIVE	169	169.0	6.1%
5	NO REPLY	13	13.0	

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.

var364: Activity in business or professional association

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2761 / 2761] [Invalid=6 / 6]
Notes	q92a2a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOT A MEMB	2467	2467.0	89.4%
2	VERY ACTIV	76	76.0	2.8%
3	FAIRLY ACT	125	125.0	4.5%
4	INACTIVE	93	93.0	3.4%
5	NO REPLY	6	6.0	

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.

var365: Activity in other occupational group

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2747 / 2747] [Invalid=20 / 20]			
Notes	q92a3a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOT A MEMB	2546	2546.0	92.7%
2	VERY ACTIV	47	47.0	1.7%
3	FAIRLY ACT	85	85.0	3.1%
4	INACTIVE	69	69.0	2.5%
5	NO REPLY	20	20.0	

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.

var366: Activity in fraternal organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2749 / 2749] [Invalid=18 / 18]			
Notes	q92a4a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOT A MEMB	2533	2533.0	92.1%
2	VERY ACTIV	67	67.0	2.4%
3	FAIRLY ACT	70	70.0	2.5%
4	INACTIVE	79	79.0	2.9%
5	NO REPLY	18	18.0	

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.

var367: Activity in a service club

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2757 / 2757] [Invalid=10 / 10]			
Notes	q92a5a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOT A MEMB	2629	2629.0	95.4%
2	VERY ACTIV	63	63.0	2.3%
3	FAIRLY ACT	47	47.0	1.7%
4	INACTIVE	18	18.0	0.7%
5	NO REPLY	10	10.0	

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.

var368: Activity in a charitable organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2754 / 2754] [Invalid=13 / 13]			
Notes	q92a6a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	NOT A MEMB	2521	2521.0	91.5%
2	VERY ACTIV	70	70.0	2.5%
3	FAIRLY ACT	112	112.0	4.1%
4	INACTIVE	51	51.0	1.9%
5	NO REPLY	13	13.0	

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.

var369: Activity in a national organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2742 / 2742] [Invalid=25 / 25]
Notes	q92a7a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2638	2638.0		96.2%
2	VERY ACTIV	25	25.0	0.9%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	49	49.0	1.8%	
4	INACTIVE	30	30.0	1.1%	
5	NO REPLY	25	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.

var370: Activity in a sport and social organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2754 / 2754] [Invalid=13 / 13]
Notes	q92a8a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2127	2127.0		77.2%
2	VERY ACTIV	313	313.0	11.4%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	271	271.0	9.8%	
4	INACTIVE	43	43.0	1.6%	
5	NO REPLY	13	13.0		

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.

var371: Activity in an entertainment organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2747 / 2747] [Invalid=20 / 20]
Notes	q92a9a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2518	2518.0		91.7%
2	VERY ACTIV	100	100.0	3.6%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	109	109.0	4.0%	
4	INACTIVE	20	20.0	0.7%	
5	NO REPLY	20	20.0		

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.

var372: Activity in a religious organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2749 / 2749] [Invalid=18 / 18]
Notes	q92a10a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2586	2586.0		94.1%
2	VERY ACTIV	61	61.0	2.2%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	80	80.0	2.9%	
4	INACTIVE	22	22.0	0.8%	
5	NO REPLY	18	18.0		

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.

var373: Activity in a church organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2755 / 2755] [Invalid=12 / 12]
Notes	q92a11a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2251	2251.0		81.7%
2	VERY ACTIV	226	226.0	8.2%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	208	208.0	7.5%	
4	INACTIVE	70	70.0	2.5%	
5	NO REPLY	12	12.0		

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.

var374: Activity in Boy Scouts or Girl Guides

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2732 / 2732] [Invalid=35 / 35]
Notes	q92a12a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2603	2603.0		95.3%
2	VERY ACTIV	60	60.0	2.2%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	51	51.0	1.9%	
4	INACTIVE	18	18.0	0.7%	
5	NO REPLY	35	35.0		

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.

var375: Activity in a credit union or co-op

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]
Notes	q92a13a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2753	2753.0		99.6%
2	VERY ACTIV	4	4.0	0.1%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	4	4.0	0.1%	
4	INACTIVE	2	2.0	0.1%	
5	NO REPLY	4	4.0		

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.

var376: Activity in a regimental or veterans' group

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]
Notes	q92a14a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2707	2707.0		98.0%
2	VERY ACTIV	12	12.0	0.4%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	29	29.0	1.0%	
4	INACTIVE	15	15.0	0.5%	
5	NO REPLY	4	4.0		

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.

var377: Activity in all other organizations

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2763 / 2763] [Invalid=4 / 4]
Notes	q92a15a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	NOT A MEMB	2644	2644.0		95.7%
2	VERY ACTIV	67	67.0	2.4%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	33	33.0	1.2%	
4	INACTIVE	19	19.0	0.7%	
5	NO REPLY	4	4.0		

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.

var378: Total number organizations for respondent

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q92a16a in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		999	999.0		36.1%
1	ONE	787	787.0		28.4%
2	TWO	513	513.0		18.5%
3	THREE	279	279.0	10.1%	
4	FOUR	96	96.0	3.5%	
5	FIVE	53	53.0	1.9%	
6	SIX	23	23.0	0.8%	
7	SEVEN	13	13.0	0.5%	
8	EIGHT	1	1.0	0.0%	
9	NINE OR MORE	3	3.0	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.

var379: Activity of spouse in trade union

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2685 / 2685] [Invalid=82 / 82]
Notes	q92b1b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0		586	586.0	21.8%	
1	NOT A MEMB	1797	1797.0		66.9%
2	VERY ACTIV	58	58.0	2.2%	
3	FAIRLY ACT	130	130.0	4.8%	
4	INACTIVE	114	114.0	4.2%	
5	NO REPLY	82	82.0		

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.

var380: Activity of spouse in business or professional association

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2732 / 2732] [Invalid=35 / 35]
Notes	q92b2b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

var380: Activity of spouse in business or professional association

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.4%
1	NOT A MEMB	1990	1990.0	72.8%
2	VERY ACTIV	41	41.0	1.5%
3	FAIRLY ACT	68	68.0	2.5%
4	INACTIVE	47	47.0	1.7%
5	NO REPLY	35	35.0	

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.

var381: Activity of spouse in other occupational group

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2723 / 2723] [Invalid=44 / 44]
Notes	q92b3b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	2039	2039.0	74.9%
2	VERY ACTIV	18	18.0	0.7%
3	FAIRLY ACT	54	54.0	2.0%
4	INACTIVE	26	26.0	1.0%
5	NO REPLY	44	44.0	

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.

var382: Activity of spouse in fraternal organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2719 / 2719] [Invalid=48 / 48]
Notes	q92b4b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.6%
1	NOT A MEMB	1960	1960.0	72.1%
2	VERY ACTIV	48	48.0	1.8%
3	FAIRLY ACT	64	64.0	2.4%
4	INACTIVE	61	61.0	2.2%
5	NO REPLY	48	48.0	

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.

var383: Activity of spouse in service club

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2730 / 2730] [Invalid=37 / 37]
Notes	q92b5b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	2040	2040.0	74.7%
2	VERY ACTIV	46	46.0	1.7%
3	FAIRLY ACT	40	40.0	1.5%
4	INACTIVE	18	18.0	0.7%
5	NO REPLY	37	37.0	

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.

var384: Activity of spouse in charitable organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2729 / 2729] [Invalid=38 / 38]
Notes	q92b6b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	2023	2023.0	74.1%
2	VERY ACTIV	38	38.0	1.4%
3	FAIRLY ACT	67	67.0	2.5%
4	INACTIVE	15	15.0	0.5%
5	NO REPLY	38	38.0	

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.

var385: Activity of spouse in national organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2720 / 2720] [Invalid=47 / 47]
Notes	q92b7b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	2077	2077.0	76.4%
2	VERY ACTIV	16	16.0	0.6%
3	FAIRLY ACT	25	25.0	0.9%
4	INACTIVE	16	16.0	0.6%
5	NO REPLY	47	47.0	

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.

var386: Activity of spouse in sport and social organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2737 / 2737] [Invalid=30 / 30]
Notes	q92b8b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.4%
1	NOT A MEMB	1729	1729.0	63.2%
2	VERY ACTIV	224	224.0	8.2%
3	FAIRLY ACT	169	169.0	6.2%
4	INACTIVE	29	29.0	1.1%
5	NO REPLY	30	30.0	

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.

var387: Activity of spouse in entertainment organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2721 / 2721] [Invalid=46 / 46]
Notes	q92b9b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	1988	1988.0	73.1%
2	VERY ACTIV	69	69.0	2.5%

var387: Activity of spouse in entertainment organization

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	FAIRLY ACT	67	67.0	2.5%
4	INACTIVE	11	11.0	0.4%
5	NO REPLY	46	46.0	

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.

var388: Activity of spouse in religious organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2724 / 2724] [Invalid=43 / 43]
Notes	q92b10b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	2044	2044.0	75.0%
2	VERY ACTIV	35	35.0	1.3%
3	FAIRLY ACT	39	39.0	1.4%
4	INACTIVE	20	20.0	0.7%
5	NO REPLY	43	43.0	

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.

var389: Activity of spouse in church organization

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2730 / 2730] [Invalid=37 / 37]
Notes	q92b11b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.5%
1	NOT A MEMB	1794	1794.0	65.7%
2	VERY ACTIV	162	162.0	5.9%
3	FAIRLY ACT	144	144.0	5.3%
4	INACTIVE	44	44.0	1.6%
5	NO REPLY	37	37.0	

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.

var390: Activity of spouse in Boy Scouts/ Girl Guides

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2707 / 2707] [Invalid=60 / 60]
Notes	q92b12b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.6%
1	NOT A MEMB	2058	2058.0	76.0%
2	VERY ACTIV	31	31.0	1.1%
3	FAIRLY ACT	25	25.0	0.9%
4	INACTIVE	7	7.0	0.3%
5	NO REPLY	60	60.0	

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.

var391: Activity of spouse in credit union, co-op

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]

var391: Activity of spouse in credit union, co-op

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 / 2740] [Invalid=27 / 27]			
Notes	q92b13b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.4%
1	NOT A MEMB	2152	2152.0	78.5%
2	VERY ACTIV	1	1.0	0.0%
3	FAIRLY ACT	1	1.0	0.0%
4	INACTIVE	0	0.0	
5	NO REPLY	27	27.0	

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.

var392: Activity of spouse in regimental or veteran's group

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2740 / 2740] [Invalid=27 / 27]			
Notes	q92b14b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.4%
1	NOT A MEMB	2136	2136.0	78.0%
2	VERY ACTIV	7	7.0	0.3%
3	FAIRLY ACT	5	5.0	0.2%
4	INACTIVE	6	6.0	0.2%
5	NO REPLY	27	27.0	

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.

var393: Activity of spouse in all other organizations

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*/5]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2741 / 2741] [Invalid=26 / 26]			
Notes	q92b15b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		586	586.0	21.4%
1	NOT A MEMB	2086	2086.0	76.1%
2	VERY ACTIV	30	30.0	1.1%
3	FAIRLY ACT	32	32.0	1.2%
4	INACTIVE	7	7.0	0.3%
5	NO REPLY	26	26.0	

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.

var394: Total number of organizations for spouse

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]			
Notes	q92b16b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 34 - 65.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		1546	1546.0	55.9%
1	ONE	648	648.0	23.4%
2	TWO	331	331.0	12.0%
3	THREE	145	145.0	5.2%

var394: Total number of organizations for spouse

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	FOUR	47	47.0	1.7%
5	FIVE	28	28.0	1.0%
6	SIX	13	13.0	0.5%
7	SEVEN	8	8.0	0.3%
8	EIGHT	1	1.0	0.0%
9	NINE OR MORE	0	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.

var395: Did you watch TV debate between leaders

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*/4/3]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2695 / 2695] [Invalid=72 / 72]
Pre-question	I have just three more things to ask you about.
Literal question	First, did you watch the TV "debate" among the leaders before the election?
Notes	q95a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	YES	1688	1688.0	62.6%
2	NO	1007	1007.0	37.4%
3	DON'T REMEMBER	71	71.0	
4	NO ANSWER	1	1.0	

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.

var396: Who gained in your eyes because of debate

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/9/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1474 / 1474] [Invalid=1293 / 1293]
Literal question	Who gained most in your eyes as a result of the debate?
Notes	q95b in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CAOUETTE	78	78.0	5.3%
2	DOUGLAS	501	501.0	34.0%
3	STANFIELD	91	91.0	6.2%
4	TRUDEAU	698	698.0	47.4%
5	CAOUETTE AND DOUGLA	12	12.0	0.8%
6	TRUDEAU + ONE OTHER	28	28.0	1.9%
7	STANFIELD AND ONE	8	8.0	0.5%
8	OTHER	58	58.0	3.9%
0	NO ANSWER	598	598.0	
9	DON'T KNOW	695	695.0	

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.

var397: Whom did you like least

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*/0/9]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1299 / 1299] [Invalid=1468 / 1468]
Literal question	Whom did you like least?
Notes	q95c in the documentation.

var397: Whom did you like least

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	CAOUETTE	315	315.0	24.2%
2	DOUGLAS	234	234.0	18.0%
3	STANFIELD	484	484.0	37.3%
4	TRUDEAU	198	198.0	15.2%
5	CAOUETTE AND DOUGLA	20	20.0	1.5%
6	TRUDEAU + ONE OTHER	9	9.0	0.7%
7	STANFIELD AND ONE	15	15.0	1.2%
8	OTHER	24	24.0	1.8%
0	NO ANSWER	645	645.0	
9	DON'T KNOW	823	823.0	

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.

var398: What happened in Montreal the night before election

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-15] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1556 / 1556] [Invalid=1211 / 1211]
Notes	q96a, q96b in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Cols. 69 - 70.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3	INCORRECT	16	16.0	1.0%
4	GCOR NO COMM TRU SEP	742	742.0	47.7%
5	COR PRO TRUD INTEPRE	115	115.0	7.4%
6	COR ANTI TRUD INTEPR	17	17.0	1.1%
7	COR MENT'N TRUD NEUT	433	433.0	27.8%
8	COR NO TRU PRO FRCAN	0	0.0	
9	COR NO TRU ANT FRCAN	14	14.0	0.9%
10	COR MENT NAT-VAL JUD	94	94.0	6.0%
11	COR MENT SEP AGST TR	90	90.0	5.8%
12	COR SEPVTRUD+PRO TRU	23	23.0	1.5%
13	COR SEPVTRUD ANT-TRU	5	5.0	0.3%
14	COR SEPVTRUDAMB INT	4	4.0	0.3%
15	OTHER	3	3.0	0.2%
0	NO ANSWER	11	11.0	
1	DON'T REMEMBER	1002	1002.0	
2	DON'T KNOW	198	198.0	

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.

var399: How did riot influence your vote

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-21] [Missing=*/0/2]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1500 / 1500] [Invalid=1267 / 1267]
Literal question	How events in Montreal influenced vote?
Notes	q96c in the documentation. Done by Queen's, CARD 8, Col. 71 - 72.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	DIDN'T INFLUENCE	1434	1434.0		95.6%
3	PRO-TRUD	42	42.0	2.8%	
4	ANTI-TRUD	4	4.0	0.3%	
5	ANTI-SEP'T-ANTI-TRUD	1	1.0	0.1%	
6	ANTI-SEP'T-PRO-TRUD	4	4.0	0.3%	
7	ANTI-FRCAN-CAN NAT'L	2	2.0	0.1%	
8	PRO-SEPARA	0	0.0		
9	PRO-SEPARA-PRO-TRUD	0	0.0		
10	PRO-SEPARA-ANTI-TRUD	0	0.0		
21	OTHER	13	13.0	0.9%	
0	NO ANSWER	1252	1252.0		
2	DON'T KNOW	15	15.0		

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.

var400: Elections result show French Canadians support Trudeau's ideas on constitution

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2032 / 2032] [Invalid=735 / 735]
Literal question	Do you think that the election result shows that French Canadians in Quebec largely support Mr. Trudeau's ideas on the constitution?
Notes	q97 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	YES	1467	1467.0		72.2%
2	NO	565	565.0	27.8%	
3	DON'T KNOW	719	719.0		
4	NO ANSWER	16	16.0		

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.

var401: Sex of respondent

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	SEX OF RESPONDENT
Notes	q100 in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	MALE	1388	1388.0		50.2%
2	FEMALE	1379	1379.0		49.8%

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.

var402: Language respondent answered in

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Interviewer's instructions	In what language did respondent answer the questionnaire?

var402: Language respondent answered in

Notes	q101 in the documentation.				

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1	ENGL NO ASSISTANCE	2030	2030.0		73.4%
2	ENG ASSIST	46	46.0	1.7%	
3	ENGL-OTHER	27	27.0	1.0%	
4	FR NOASSISTANCE	657	657.0	23.7%	
5	FR ASSIST	6	6.0	0.2%	
6	FR OTHER	1	1.0	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.

var403: What is your age

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Estimated age
Notes	q93 in the documentation. Card 8, cols. 76/79.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
1		581	581.0		21.0%
2		589	589.0		21.3%
3		594	594.0		21.5%
4		90	90.0	3.3%	
5		305	305.0	11.0%	
6		146	146.0	5.3%	
7		38	38.0	1.4%	
8		1	1.0	0.0%	
21		58	58.0	2.1%	
52		45	45.0	1.6%	
53		54	54.0	2.0%	
54		51	51.0	1.8%	
55		35	35.0	1.3%	
56		50	50.0	1.8%	
57		44	44.0	1.6%	
58		50	50.0	1.8%	
59		35	35.0	1.3%	
99	HIGHEST AGE OR OVER	1	1.0	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.

var404: Income group of your family last year

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Literal question	Into which of the following groups did the total income for your family fall last year (before taxes)?
Notes	q94 in the documentation. Card 8, cols. 76.79.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)	
0	10000 14999	468	468.0		16.9%
1	UNDER 1000	79	79.0	2.9%	
2	1000 1999	216	216.0	7.8%	
3	2000 2999	214	214.0	7.7%	

var404: Income group of your family last year

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4	3000 3999	264	264.0	9.5%
5	4000 4999	297	297.0	10.7%
6	5000 5999	344	344.0	12.4%
7	6000 6999	317	317.0	11.5%
8	7000 7999	268	268.0	9.7%
9	8000 9999	300	300.0	10.8%

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.

var405: Income group of your family last year

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/2]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2758 / 2758] [Invalid=9 / 9]
Notes	q94b in the documentation. Card 8, cols. 76/79.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2614	2614.0	94.8%
1	15000 OR OVER	144	144.0	5.2%
2	REFUSED	9	9.0	

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.

var406

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-9] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	YES	1377	1377.0	49.8%
2	NO/NA	575	575.0	20.8%
3		339	339.0	12.3%
4		354	354.0	12.8%
5		34	34.0	1.2%
6		10	10.0	0.4%
7		18	18.0	0.7%
8		22	22.0	0.8%
9		38	38.0	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.

var484: Presentation order of q60a1a - q60a19a

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2] [Missing=*/999]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q60aa in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0	NO 2ND MENTION	0	0.0	
1		1373	1373.0	49.6%
2		1394	1394.0	50.4%
999	NA	0	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.

var485: Rate clergymen from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]

var485: Rate clergymen from 0 to 100

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2711 / 2711] [Invalid=56 / 56]
Pre-question	In an earlier question we asked you to indicate how you felt about some aspects of our political parties by giving them a score or mark between 0 and 100. I'd now like you to show in the same way how you feel about certain groups of people. Here again is the so-called "feeling thermometer" which may help you to reach a decision. Again, if you like a group very much, give it a mark close to 100, if you dislike it strongly, move close to 0 and if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward it, or if you don't know, place it in the middle. Would you please read this list of names of various groups and write down your score for each.
Literal question	Clergymen
Interviewer's instructions	POINT TO PAGE 9 ON WHITE SHEETS
Notes	q60a1a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	19	19.0	0.7%
2		20	20.0	0.7%
3		20	20.0	0.7%
4		25	25.0	0.9%
5		41	41.0	1.5%
6		4	4.0	0.1%
7		227	227.0	8.4%
8		297	297.0	11.0%
9		550	550.0	20.3%
10		509	509.0	18.8%
11		28	28.0	1.0%
50	NO FEELINGS	421	421.0	15.5%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	550	550.0	20.3%
0	NA	56	56.0	

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.

var486: Rate right wingers from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2630 / 2630] [Invalid=137 / 137]
Literal question	Right Wingers
Notes	q60a2a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	54	54.0	2.1%
2		30	30.0	1.1%
3		45	45.0	1.7%
4		64	64.0	2.4%
5		110	110.0	4.2%
6		9	9.0	0.3%
7		220	220.0	8.4%
8		178	178.0	6.8%
9		239	239.0	9.1%
10		97	97.0	3.7%
11		5	5.0	0.2%
50	NO FEELINGS	1476	1476.0	56.1%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	103	103.0	3.9%
0	NA	137	137.0	

var486: Rate right wingers from 0 to 100

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

var487: Rate French Canadians from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2701 / 2701] [Invalid=66 / 66]
Literal question	French Canadians
Notes	q60a3a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	15	15.0	0.6%
2		31	31.0	1.1%
3		42	42.0	1.6%
4		67	67.0	2.5%
5		109	109.0	4.0%
6		7	7.0	0.3%
7		279	279.0	10.3%
8		307	307.0	11.4%
9		405	405.0	15.0%
10		293	293.0	10.8%
11		15	15.0	0.6%
50	NO FEELINGS	667	667.0	24.7%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	464	464.0	17.2%
0	NA	66	66.0	

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.

var488: Rate whites from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2707 / 2707] [Invalid=60 / 60]
Literal question	Whites
Notes	q60a4a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	1	1.0	0.0%
2		1	1.0	0.0%
3		5	5.0	0.2%
4		4	4.0	0.1%
5		6	6.0	0.2%
7		140	140.0	5.2%
8		250	250.0	9.2%
9		518	518.0	19.1%
10		479	479.0	17.7%
11		23	23.0	0.8%
50	NO FEELINGS	432	432.0	16.0%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	848	848.0	31.3%
0	NA	60	60.0	

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.

var489: Rate Roman Catholics from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]

var489: Rate Roman Catholics from 0 to 100

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2709 / 2709] [Invalid=58 / 58]			
Literal question	Roman Catholics			
Notes	q60a5a in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	18	18.0	0.7%
2		16	16.0	0.6%
3		22	22.0	0.8%
4		38	38.0	1.4%
5		53	53.0	2.0%
6		4	4.0	0.1%
7		216	216.0	8.0%
8		290	290.0	10.7%
9		468	468.0	17.3%
10		319	319.0	11.8%
11		13	13.0	0.5%
50	NO FEELINGS	652	652.0	24.1%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	600	600.0	22.1%
0	NA	58	58.0	

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.

var490: Rate Russians from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]			
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2638 / 2638] [Invalid=129 / 129]			
Literal question	Russians			
Notes	q60a6a in the documentation.			

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	168	168.0	6.4%
2		135	135.0	5.1%
3		115	115.0	4.4%
4		119	119.0	4.5%
5		169	169.0	6.4%
6		6	6.0	0.2%
7		240	240.0	9.1%
8		178	178.0	6.7%
9		163	163.0	6.2%
10		72	72.0	2.7%
11		4	4.0	0.2%
50	NO FEELINGS	1160	1160.0	44.0%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	109	109.0	4.1%
0	NA	129	129.0	

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.

var491: Rate labour unions from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2671 / 2671] [Invalid=96 / 96]
Literal question	Labour unions

var491: Rate labour unions from 0 to 100

Notes	q60a7a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	130	130.0	4.9%
2		102	102.0	3.8%
3		124	124.0	4.6%
4		178	178.0	6.7%
5		228	228.0	8.5%
6		9	9.0	0.3%
7		325	325.0	12.2%
8		269	269.0	10.1%
9		289	289.0	10.8%
10		142	142.0	5.3%
11		6	6.0	0.2%
50	NO FEELINGS	681	681.0	25.5%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	188	188.0	7.0%
0	NA	96	96.0	

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.

var492: Rate Englishmen from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2695 / 2695] [Invalid=72 / 72]
Literal question	Englishmen
Notes	q60a8a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	26	26.0	1.0%
2		19	19.0	0.7%
3		38	38.0	1.4%
4		36	36.0	1.3%
5		77	77.0	2.9%
6		4	4.0	0.1%
7		312	312.0	11.6%
8		380	380.0	14.1%
9		475	475.0	17.6%
10		297	297.0	11.0%
11		10	10.0	0.4%
50	NO FEELINGS	661	661.0	24.5%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	360	360.0	13.4%
0	NA	72	72.0	

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.

var493: Rate policemen from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2705 / 2705] [Invalid=62 / 62]
Literal question	Policemen
Notes	q60a9a in the documentation.

var493: Rate policemen from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	14	14.0	0.5%
2		10	10.0	0.4%
3		16	16.0	0.6%
4		17	17.0	0.6%
5		44	44.0	1.6%
6		3	3.0	0.1%
7		234	234.0	8.7%
8		395	395.0	14.6%
9		581	581.0	21.5%
10		462	462.0	17.1%
11		30	30.0	1.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	349	349.0	12.9%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	550	550.0	20.3%
0	NA	62	62.0	

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.

var494: Rate people with ancestry other than British or French from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2667 / 2667] [Invalid=100 / 100]
Literal question	People whose ancestors come from countries other than Britain or France
Notes	q60a10a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	21	21.0	0.8%
2		24	24.0	0.9%
3		33	33.0	1.2%
4		32	32.0	1.2%
5		76	76.0	2.8%
6		2	2.0	0.1%
7		295	295.0	11.1%
8		353	353.0	13.2%
9		431	431.0	16.2%
10		234	234.0	8.8%
11		8	8.0	0.3%
50	NO FEELINGS	841	841.0	31.5%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	317	317.0	11.9%
0	NA	100	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.

var495: Rate big business from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2685 / 2685] [Invalid=82 / 82]
Literal question	Big business
Notes	q60a11a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	30	30.0	1.1%

var495: Rate big business from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		30	30.0	1.1%
3		45	45.0	1.7%
4		108	108.0	4.0%
5		173	173.0	6.4%
6		7	7.0	0.3%
7		320	320.0	11.9%
8		362	362.0	13.5%
9		415	415.0	15.5%
10		160	160.0	6.0%
11		5	5.0	0.2%
50	NO FEELINGS	838	838.0	31.2%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	192	192.0	7.2%
0	NA	82	82.0	

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.

var496: Rate Jews from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2694 / 2694] [Invalid=73 / 73]
Literal question	Jews
Notes	q60a12a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	53	53.0	2.0%
2		61	61.0	2.3%
3		71	71.0	2.6%
4		84	84.0	3.1%
5		110	110.0	4.1%
6		4	4.0	0.1%
7		316	316.0	11.7%
8		310	310.0	11.5%
9		357	357.0	13.3%
10		179	179.0	6.6%
11		3	3.0	0.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	913	913.0	33.9%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	233	233.0	8.6%
0	NA	73	73.0	

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.

var497: Rate Americans from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2704 / 2704] [Invalid=63 / 63]
Literal question	Americans
Notes	q60a13a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	19	19.0	0.7%
2		22	22.0	0.8%

var497: Rate Americans from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3		27	27.0	1.0%
4		42	42.0	1.6%
5		108	108.0	4.0%
6		11	11.0	0.4%
7		366	366.0	13.5%
8		424	424.0	15.7%
9		505	505.0	18.7%
10		267	267.0	9.9%
11		6	6.0	0.2%
50	NO FEELINGS	626	626.0	23.2%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	281	281.0	10.4%
0	NA	63	63.0	

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.

var498: Rate Protestants from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2702 / 2702] [Invalid=65 / 65]
Literal question	Protestants
Notes	q60a14a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	50	50.0	1.9%
2		19	19.0	0.7%
3		30	30.0	1.1%
4		27	27.0	1.0%
5		48	48.0	1.8%
6		3	3.0	0.1%
7		218	218.0	8.1%
8		294	294.0	10.9%
9		522	522.0	19.3%
10		335	335.0	12.4%
11		22	22.0	0.8%
50	NO FEELINGS	676	676.0	25.0%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	458	458.0	17.0%
0	NA	65	65.0	

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.

var499: Rate left wingers from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2585 / 2585] [Invalid=182 / 182]
Literal question	Left wingers
Notes	q60a15a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	167	167.0	6.5%
2		104	104.0	4.0%
3		87	87.0	3.4%

var499: Rate left wingers from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
4		116	116.0	4.5%
5		173	173.0	6.7%
6		14	14.0	0.5%
7		176	176.0	6.8%
8		115	115.0	4.4%
9		89	89.0	3.4%
10		33	33.0	1.3%
11		1	1.0	0.0%
50	NO FEELINGS	1475	1475.0	57.1%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	35	35.0	1.4%
0	NA	182	182.0	

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.

var500: Rate English Canadians from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2704 / 2704] [Invalid=63 / 63]
Literal question	English Canadians
Notes	q60a16a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	11	11.0	0.4%
2		8	8.0	0.3%
3		14	14.0	0.5%
4		16	16.0	0.6%
5		36	36.0	1.3%
7		261	261.0	9.7%
8		415	415.0	15.3%
9		541	541.0	20.0%
10		377	377.0	13.9%
11		21	21.0	0.8%
50	NO FEELINGS	550	550.0	20.3%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	454	454.0	16.8%
0	NA	63	63.0	

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.

var501: Rate the military from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2694 / 2694] [Invalid=73 / 73]
Literal question	Military
Notes	q60a17a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	20	20.0	0.7%
2		19	19.0	0.7%
3		38	38.0	1.4%
4		24	24.0	0.9%
5		74	74.0	2.7%

var501: Rate the military from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6		4	4.0	0.1%
7		313	313.0	11.6%
8		387	387.0	14.4%
9		476	476.0	17.7%
10		270	270.0	10.0%
11		19	19.0	0.7%
50	NO FEELINGS	620	620.0	23.0%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	430	430.0	16.0%
0	NA	73	73.0	

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.

var502: Rate Negroes from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2700 / 2700] [Invalid=67 / 67]
Literal question	Negroes
Notes	q60a18a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	27	27.0	1.0%
2		32	32.0	1.2%
3		40	40.0	1.5%
4		34	34.0	1.3%
5		83	83.0	3.1%
6		2	2.0	0.1%
7		313	313.0	11.6%
8		349	349.0	12.9%
9		420	420.0	15.6%
10		237	237.0	8.8%
11		9	9.0	0.3%
50	NO FEELINGS	828	828.0	30.7%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	326	326.0	12.1%
0	NA	67	67.0	

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.

var503: Rate atheists from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2567 / 2567] [Invalid=200 / 200]
Literal question	Athiests
Notes	q60a19a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	427	427.0	16.6%
2		197	197.0	7.7%
3		105	105.0	4.1%
4		118	118.0	4.6%
5		137	137.0	5.3%
6		7	7.0	0.3%

var503: Rate atheists from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
7		144	144.0	5.6%
8		95	95.0	3.7%
9		99	99.0	3.9%
10		63	63.0	2.5%
11		2	2.0	0.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	1080	1080.0	42.1%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	93	93.0	3.6%
0	NA	200	200.0	

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.

var504: Presentation order of q61a1a - q61a11a

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*/0/999]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]
Notes	q61aa in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1		1373	1373.0	49.6%
2		1394	1394.0	50.4%
0	NO 2ND MENTION	0	0.0	
999	NA	0	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.

var505: Rate Lester Pearson from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2706 / 2706] [Invalid=61 / 61]
Pre-question	Now that we've looked at some groups, I would like you to show your feelings about a few individuals whose names are listed on the next page again using our "feeling thermometer".
Literal question	Lester Pearson
Interviewer's instructions	POINT TO PAGE 10 ON WHITE SHEETS
Notes	q61a1a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	45	45.0	1.7%
2		37	37.0	1.4%
3		41	41.0	1.5%
4		44	44.0	1.6%
5		122	122.0	4.5%
6		5	5.0	0.2%
7		378	378.0	14.0%
8		409	409.0	15.1%
9		561	561.0	20.7%
10		365	365.0	13.5%
11		16	16.0	0.6%
50	NO FEELINGS	445	445.0	16.4%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	238	238.0	8.8%
0	NA	61	61.0	

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.

var506: Rate Ontario Premier Robarts from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2694 / 2694] [Invalid=73 / 73]
Literal question	Ontario's Premier Robarts
Notes	q61a2a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	26	26.0	1.0%
2		14	14.0	0.5%
3		27	27.0	1.0%
4		37	37.0	1.4%
5		86	86.0	3.2%
6		5	5.0	0.2%
7		331	331.0	12.3%
8		381	381.0	14.1%
9		394	394.0	14.6%
10		155	155.0	5.8%
11		9	9.0	0.3%
50	NO FEELINGS	1131	1131.0	42.0%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	98	98.0	3.6%
0	NA	73	73.0	

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.

var507: Rate Marcel Faribault from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2641 / 2641] [Invalid=126 / 126]
Literal question	Marcel Faribault
Notes	q61a3a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	88	88.0	3.3%
2		46	46.0	1.7%
3		48	48.0	1.8%
4		75	75.0	2.8%
5		134	134.0	5.1%
6		14	14.0	0.5%
7		168	168.0	6.4%
8		122	122.0	4.6%
9		102	102.0	3.9%
10		22	22.0	0.8%
11		3	3.0	0.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	1804	1804.0	68.3%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	15	15.0	0.6%
0	NA	126	126.0	

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.

var508: Rate former U.S. president from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2636 / 2636] [Invalid=131 / 131]

var508: Rate former U.S. president from 0 to 100

Literal question	U.S. President Lyndon Johnson
Notes	q61a4a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	52	52.0	2.0%
2		37	37.0	1.4%
3		54	54.0	2.0%
4		103	103.0	3.9%
5		196	196.0	7.4%
6		13	13.0	0.5%
7		425	425.0	16.1%
8		396	396.0	15.0%
9		417	417.0	15.8%
10		162	162.0	6.1%
11		9	9.0	0.3%
50	NO FEELINGS	651	651.0	24.7%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	121	121.0	4.6%
0	NA	131	131.0	

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.

var509: Rate General de Gaulle from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2474 / 2474] [Invalid=293 / 293]
Literal question	General de Gaulle
Notes	q61a5a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	324	324.0	13.1%
2		233	233.0	9.4%
3		164	164.0	6.6%
4		262	262.0	10.6%
5		286	286.0	11.6%
6		11	11.0	0.4%
7		181	181.0	7.3%
8		130	130.0	5.3%
9		118	118.0	4.8%
10		59	59.0	2.4%
11		8	8.0	0.3%
50	NO FEELINGS	636	636.0	25.7%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	62	62.0	2.5%
0	NA	293	293.0	

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.

var510: Rate Dalton Camp from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2634 / 2634] [Invalid=133 / 133]
Literal question	Dalton Camp
Notes	q61a6a in the documentation.

var510: Rate Dalton Camp from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	130	130.0	4.9%
2		103	103.0	3.9%
3		85	85.0	3.2%
4		113	113.0	4.3%
5		209	209.0	7.9%
6		14	14.0	0.5%
7		238	238.0	9.0%
8		109	109.0	4.1%
9		96	96.0	3.6%
10		19	19.0	0.7%
11		1	1.0	0.0%
50	NO FEELINGS	1502	1502.0	57.0%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	15	15.0	0.6%
0	NA	133	133.0	

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.

var511: Rate Rene Levesque from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2631 / 2631] [Invalid=136 / 136]
Literal question	Rene Levesque
Notes	q61a7a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	167	167.0	6.3%
2		120	120.0	4.6%
3		112	112.0	4.3%
4		156	156.0	5.9%
5		184	184.0	7.0%
6		13	13.0	0.5%
7		240	240.0	9.1%
8		142	142.0	5.4%
9		117	117.0	4.4%
10		46	46.0	1.7%
11		3	3.0	0.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	1301	1301.0	49.4%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	30	30.0	1.1%
0	NA	136	136.0	

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.

var512: Rate Newfoundland's Premier Smallwood from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2682 / 2682] [Invalid=85 / 85]
Literal question	Newfoundland's Premier Joey Smallwood
Notes	q61a8a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	58	58.0	2.2%

var512: Rate Newfoundland's Premier Smallwood from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2		47	47.0	1.8%
3		47	47.0	1.8%
4		78	78.0	2.9%
5		102	102.0	3.8%
6		9	9.0	0.3%
7		395	395.0	14.7%
8		340	340.0	12.7%
9		280	280.0	10.4%
10		107	107.0	4.0%
11		3	3.0	0.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	1121	1121.0	41.8%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	95	95.0	3.5%
0	NA	85	85.0	

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.

var513: Rate Diefenbaker from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2699 / 2699] [Invalid=68 / 68]
Literal question	John G. Diefenbaker
Notes	q61a9a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	92	92.0	3.4%
2		70	70.0	2.6%
3		81	81.0	3.0%
4		113	113.0	4.2%
5		185	185.0	6.9%
6		9	9.0	0.3%
7		418	418.0	15.5%
8		381	381.0	14.1%
9		396	396.0	14.7%
10		262	262.0	9.7%
11		17	17.0	0.6%
50	NO FEELINGS	507	507.0	18.8%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	168	168.0	6.2%
0	NA	68	68.0	

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.

var514: Rate Daniel Johnson from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2601 / 2601] [Invalid=166 / 166]
Literal question	Quebec's Premier Daniel Johnson
Notes	q61a10a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	66	66.0	2.5%
2		62	62.0	2.4%

var514: Rate Daniel Johnson from 0 to 100

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
3		61	61.0	2.3%
4		112	112.0	4.3%
5		159	159.0	6.1%
6		16	16.0	0.6%
7		335	335.0	12.9%
8		287	287.0	11.0%
9		261	261.0	10.0%
10		138	138.0	5.3%
11		8	8.0	0.3%
50	NO FEELINGS	950	950.0	36.5%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	146	146.0	5.6%
0	NA	166	166.0	

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.

var515: Rate Thatcher from 0 to 100

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2675 / 2675] [Invalid=92 / 92]
Literal question	Saskatchewan's Premier Thatcher
Notes	q61a11a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1	DISLIKE VERY MUCH	75	75.0	2.8%
2		45	45.0	1.7%
3		39	39.0	1.5%
4		67	67.0	2.5%
5		90	90.0	3.4%
6		7	7.0	0.3%
7		267	267.0	10.0%
8		222	222.0	8.3%
9		116	116.0	4.3%
10		43	43.0	1.6%
11		3	3.0	0.1%
50	NO FEELINGS	1673	1673.0	62.5%
99	LIKE VERY MUCH	28	28.0	1.0%
0	NA	92	92.0	

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.

var516: Importance of Members of Parliament in Ottawa

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2706 / 2706] [Invalid=61 / 61]
Literal question	Members of Parliament In Ottawa
Notes	q69a1a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	8	8.0	0.3%
3		3	3.0	0.1%
4		5	5.0	0.2%

var516: Importance of Members of Parliament in Ottawa

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
5		14	14.0	0.5%
6		22	22.0	0.8%
7		145	145.0	5.4%
8		181	181.0	6.7%
9		338	338.0	12.5%
10		615	615.0	22.7%
11		569	569.0	21.0%
12		34	34.0	1.3%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	772	772.0	28.5%
0	NA	49	49.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	12	12.0	

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.

var517: Importance of Provincial Legislatures

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2704 / 2704] [Invalid=63 / 63]
Literal question	Members of Provincial Legislatures
Notes	q69a2a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	8	8.0	0.3%
3		9	9.0	0.3%
4		14	14.0	0.5%
5		17	17.0	0.6%
6		36	36.0	1.3%
7		231	231.0	8.5%
8		271	271.0	10.0%
9		417	417.0	15.4%
10		614	614.0	22.7%
11		459	459.0	17.0%
12		27	27.0	1.0%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	601	601.0	22.2%
0	NA	49	49.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	14	14.0	

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.

var518: Importance of the Prime Minister of Canada

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2712 / 2712] [Invalid=55 / 55]
Literal question	The Prime Minister of Canada
Notes	q69a3a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	12	12.0	0.4%
3		7	7.0	0.3%
4		8	8.0	0.3%
5		13	13.0	0.5%

var518: Importance of the Prime Minister of Canada

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
6		11	11.0	0.4%
7		120	120.0	4.4%
8		92	92.0	3.4%
9		196	196.0	7.2%
10		458	458.0	16.9%
11		638	638.0	23.5%
12		64	64.0	2.4%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	1093	1093.0	40.3%
0	NA	48	48.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	7	7.0	

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.

var519: Importance of Provincial Premiers

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2703 / 2703] [Invalid=64 / 64]
Literal question	Provincial Premiers
Notes	q69a4a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	8	8.0	0.3%
3		5	5.0	0.2%
4		16	16.0	0.6%
5		14	14.0	0.5%
6		35	35.0	1.3%
7		179	179.0	6.6%
8		206	206.0	7.6%
9		397	397.0	14.7%
10		606	606.0	22.4%
11		496	496.0	18.3%
12		35	35.0	1.3%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	706	706.0	26.1%
0	NA	49	49.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	15	15.0	

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.

var520: Importance of Cabinet Ministers in federal government

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2694 / 2694] [Invalid=73 / 73]
Literal question	Federal Cabinet Ministers
Notes	q69a5a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	6	6.0	0.2%
3		7	7.0	0.3%
4		13	13.0	0.5%
5		14	14.0	0.5%
6		30	30.0	1.1%

var520: Importance of Cabinet Ministers in federal government

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
7		274	274.0	10.2%
8		272	272.0	10.1%
9		444	444.0	16.5%
10		637	637.0	23.6%
11		440	440.0	16.3%
12		29	29.0	1.1%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	528	528.0	19.6%
0	NA	50	50.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	23	23.0	

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.

var521: Importance of provincial Cabinet Ministers

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2690 / 2690] [Invalid=77 / 77]
Literal question	Provincial Cabinet Ministers
Notes	q69a6a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	7	7.0	0.3%
3		9	9.0	0.3%
4		21	21.0	0.8%
5		19	19.0	0.7%
6		44	44.0	1.6%
7		306	306.0	11.4%
8		328	328.0	12.2%
9		486	486.0	18.1%
10		596	596.0	22.2%
11		378	378.0	14.1%
12		22	22.0	0.8%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	474	474.0	17.6%
0	NA	52	52.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	25	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.

var522: Importance of the Queen

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2672 / 2672] [Invalid=95 / 95]
Literal question	The Queen
Notes	q69a7a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	278	278.0	10.4%
3		151	151.0	5.7%
4		124	124.0	4.6%
5		99	99.0	3.7%
6		99	99.0	3.7%
7		508	508.0	19.0%

var522: Importance of the Queen

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
8		221	221.0	8.3%
9		197	197.0	7.4%
10		290	290.0	10.9%
11		198	198.0	7.4%
12		16	16.0	0.6%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	491	491.0	18.4%
0	NA	67	67.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	28	28.0	

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.

var523: Importance of the Governor General

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/1/0]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2676 / 2676] [Invalid=91 / 91]
Literal question	The Governor General
Notes	q69a8a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	159	159.0	5.9%
3		129	129.0	4.8%
4		99	99.0	3.7%
5		96	96.0	3.6%
6		100	100.0	3.7%
7		476	476.0	17.8%
8		285	285.0	10.7%
9		320	320.0	12.0%
10		346	346.0	12.9%
11		265	265.0	9.9%
12		20	20.0	0.7%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	381	381.0	14.2%
0	NA	62	62.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	29	29.0	

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.

var524: Importance of your local mayor

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2679 / 2679] [Invalid=88 / 88]
Literal question	Your Local Mayor
Notes	q69a9a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	27	27.0	1.0%
3		45	45.0	1.7%
4		29	29.0	1.1%
5		52	52.0	1.9%
6		78	78.0	2.9%
7		307	307.0	11.5%
8		320	320.0	11.9%

var524: Importance of your local mayor

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
9		348	348.0	13.0%
10		522	522.0	19.5%
11		352	352.0	13.1%
12		27	27.0	1.0%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	572	572.0	21.4%
0	NA	72	72.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	16	16.0	

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.

var525: Importance of federal civil servants

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2686 / 2686] [Invalid=81 / 81]
Literal question	Federal Civil Servants
Notes	q69a10a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	22	22.0	0.8%
3		41	41.0	1.5%
4		29	29.0	1.1%
5		53	53.0	2.0%
6		101	101.0	3.8%
7		500	500.0	18.6%
8		353	353.0	13.1%
9		444	444.0	16.5%
10		528	528.0	19.7%
11		248	248.0	9.2%
12		12	12.0	0.4%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	355	355.0	13.2%
0	NA	55	55.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	26	26.0	

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.

var526: Importance of judges

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2701 / 2701] [Invalid=66 / 66]
Literal question	Judges
Notes	q69a11a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	13	13.0	0.5%
3		13	13.0	0.5%
4		15	15.0	0.6%
5		25	25.0	0.9%
6		44	44.0	1.6%
7		277	277.0	10.3%
8		238	238.0	8.8%
9		379	379.0	14.0%
10		555	555.0	20.5%
11		436	436.0	16.1%
12		26	26.0	1.0%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	680	680.0	25.2%
0	NA	55	55.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	11	11.0	

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.

var527: Importance of the armed forces

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2694 / 2694] [Invalid=73 / 73]
Literal question	Armed Forces
Notes	q69a12a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	12	12.0	0.4%
3		25	25.0	0.9%
4		22	22.0	0.8%
5		21	21.0	0.8%
6		72	72.0	2.7%
7		299	299.0	11.1%
8		281	281.0	10.4%
9		349	349.0	13.0%
10		490	490.0	18.2%
11		357	357.0	13.3%
12		34	34.0	1.3%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	732	732.0	27.2%
0	NA	54	54.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	19	19.0	

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.

var528: Importance of the police

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2712 / 2712] [Invalid=55 / 55]

var528: Importance of the police

Literal question	The Police
Notes	q69a13a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	6	6.0	0.2%
3		10	10.0	0.4%
4		7	7.0	0.3%
5		13	13.0	0.5%
6		33	33.0	1.2%
7		171	171.0	6.3%
8		153	153.0	5.6%
9		262	262.0	9.7%
10		547	547.0	20.2%
11		507	507.0	18.7%
12		39	39.0	1.4%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	964	964.0	35.5%
0	NA	48	48.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	7	7.0	

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.

var529: Importance of the Supreme Court

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-99] [Missing=*/0/1]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2690 / 2690] [Invalid=77 / 77]
Literal question	The Supreme Court
Notes	q69a14a in the documentation.

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
2	VERY UNIMPORTANT	15	15.0	0.6%
3		11	11.0	0.4%
4		11	11.0	0.4%
5		17	17.0	0.6%
6		37	37.0	1.4%
7		236	236.0	8.8%
8		186	186.0	6.9%
9		295	295.0	11.0%
10		514	514.0	19.1%
11		506	506.0	18.8%
12		35	35.0	1.3%
99	VERY IMPORTANT	827	827.0	30.7%
0	NA	52	52.0	
1	DON'T KNOW	25	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.

age: Age

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 21-99] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0] [Mean=44.647 / 44.647] [StdDev=15.692 / 15.692]
Notes	q93 in the documentation.

income: Income

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-15] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
1		79	79.0	2.9%
2		204	204.0	7.4%
3		196	196.0	7.1%
4		252	252.0	9.1%
5		279	279.0	10.1%
6		322	322.0	11.6%
7		305	305.0	11.0%
8		256	256.0	9.3%
9		284	284.0	10.3%
10		298	298.0	10.8%
11		131	131.0	4.7%
12		90	90.0	3.3%
13		31	31.0	1.1%
14		37	37.0	1.3%
15		3	3.0	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.

incom2: Income2

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-15] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2767 / 2767] [Invalid=0 / 0]

Value	Label	Cases	Weighted	Percentage (Weighted)
0		2	2.0	0.1%
1		35	35.0	1.3%
2		101	101.0	3.7%
3		200	200.0	7.2%
4		280	280.0	10.1%
5		330	330.0	11.9%
6		384	384.0	13.9%
7		342	342.0	12.4%
8		269	269.0	9.7%
9		319	319.0	11.5%
10		310	310.0	11.2%
11		121	121.0	4.4%
12		3	3.0	0.1%
13		60	60.0	2.2%
14		8	8.0	0.3%
15		3	3.0	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.