



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act*
and Security Measures in
Canada: Public Views,
Impacts and Travel
Experiences

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada: Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

Nicole Crutcher
&
Michelle Budak



Research and Statistics Division

December 2005

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Justice Canada.

rr05-11e



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Executive Summary	v
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Background.....	1
3.0 Purpose.....	3
4.0 Methodology	4
5.0 Results.....	5
5.1 Awareness and Concern.....	5
5.2 Application.....	7
5.3 Racial Profiling	8
5.4 Impact	10
5.5 Crossing borders and airport experiences	11
5.5.1 Air travel within Canada.....	11
5.5.2 Air travel between Canada and U.S.....	12
5.5.3 Air travel between Canada and countries outside North America.....	12
5.5.4 Travel between Canada and U.S. other than by air.....	12
5.5.5 Returning to Canada	12
6.0 Discussion and Conclusion	12
References.....	15
Appendix A.....	17
Appendix B	35



Acknowledgements

The authors would like to take the opportunity to thank Damir Kukec for designing the study and Jeff Latimer, Suzanne Wallace-Capretta, Cathy Thompson, Kim Burnett, Yvonne Stys, Mark Feldbauer and Allan Ferguson for providing valuable editorial comments. In addition, we would also like to thank Laura Hanby for providing the graphs.



Executive Summary

This report examined the responses of 1,703 Canadians in March 2005 to a variety of knowledge, opinion and experience-based questions in relation to the *Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA)*, as well as other post-9/11 security measures. In order to address concerns raised in previous research conducted by the Department that visible minority Canadians may be disproportionately affected by the *ATA* and other security measures, this study over-sampled people who self-identified as belonging to a visible minority group. In order to determine if visible minority respondents were disproportionately affected, their responses were compared to non-minority respondents. In addition to the overall results, only statistically significant differences between visible minority and non-minority respondents are provided in this report. The survey includes five sections: awareness and concern surrounding terrorism and anti-terrorism legislation, the application of terrorism-related legislation, racial profiling in Canada, impact of the legislation and the experiences of the respondents when crossing borders and passing through airport security. The discussion and conclusion provide a synthesis and analysis of the results of this survey.

Awareness and Concern

Only one percent of participants could identify the Canadian legislation (*ATA*/Bill C-36) enacted to combat terrorism. This level of awareness is consistent with findings from previous research. Many (58%) of the respondents were concerned about terrorism in Canada. There was general support of the actions taken by the Canadian government as respondents felt that such actions were needed and that the legislation has made Canada safer. Interestingly, the governmental actions most frequently noted were increased security at airports and increased screening of immigrants/refugees. While these changes were not part of the *ATA*, they are the areas Canadians most identify with. This is likely a result of 9/11 attacks in the United States and the subsequent media attention paid to airline and border security.

Governmental reporting responsibilities were relatively unknown amongst the respondents, yet there was some acknowledgement of safeguards to protect Canadians' rights and freedoms. Despite being unaware of the legislation, most (73%) respondents stated that they were aware that Parliament was required to review the *ATA*, but only 12% knew that a review was underway at the time of the survey. Fewer still were aware that the Department of Justice had established an Internet site specifically designed to provide information surrounding the review. The majority of respondents were interested in receiving more information concerning the *ATA* and would prefer to receive the information via a pamphlet mailed to their household (53%) or via the Internet (36%). This indicates that the Department has made the information available to the public in the medium of their choice.

There were a number of statistically significant differences between visible minority and non-minority respondents with respect to awareness and concern surrounding terrorism and corresponding legislation. More non-minority participants noticed increased security at borders and/or airports as responses to combat terrorism despite similar travel patterns. While the general consensus was that Canada's legislation was not as tough as the U.S. or the U.K.'s legislation, more visible minority respondents felt that the U.S. laws were tougher than Canada's.

Fewer visible minority respondents were aware of the safeguards in place within the *ATA* to protect Canadian's rights and freedoms.

Application

Most (75%) participants felt that the *ATA* was necessary and that it has made Canada safer (60%) from terrorist activity. There was overwhelming support for law enforcement and security officials to investigate individuals both within Canada and abroad (89%). However, many (52%) respondents felt that the application of the *ATA* has resulted in people being unfairly targeted because of their ethnic, racial, or religious background.

Fewer visible minority respondents felt that the enactment of the *ATA* was necessary or that the *Act* has resulted in a safer Canada. Further, more visible minority respondents felt that the *ATA* has resulted in the unfair targeting of certain individuals due to their ethnic, racial or religious background.

Racial Profiling

It was generally correctly indicated by the participants that Canada does not have an official policy to racially profile but it was thought that it unofficially occurs at least sometimes. If an individual had been targeted based on ethnic/racial background, most (79%) respondents thought the individual would still receive a fair trial in Canada. Still, most (79%) participants felt that it was inappropriate to screen individuals for potential terrorist activity based solely on race, ethnicity or religion and that this type of screening violated the principles of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

Visible minority respondents were more likely to indicate that Canada had an official policy to racially profile and that it occurs unofficially at least some of the time. Fewer visible minority respondents felt that an individual targeted because of his/her racial or ethnic background would get a fair trial in Canada. One-fifth (20%) of the visible minority participants felt that they had been the target of racial profiling over the last four years. The nature and extent of this perceived profiling was not addressed by the survey.

Impact

Almost three-quarters (73%) of the participants did not report being personally affected by the post-9/11 measures. The most common ways the new measures affected respondents were by increased security measures at airports/delays in travel (54%) and increased checks at customs/delays in crossing borders (44%).

Respondents were also asked questions regarding the affects of various anti-terrorism related measures on their immediate families. Overall, the respondents reported that the various areas related to terrorism, specifically, the *ATA*, security at airports/transportation centres and law enforcement/security agencies, had no impact on their immediate families.

Although most respondents indicated that they had not been affected by the post-9/11 security measures, more visible minority respondents indicated that they were affected when compared with non-minority respondents. Interestingly, non-minority participants reported experiencing greater delays in air travel/increased security at airports with no significant differences on the extent of their travel. Visible minority respondents indicated more impact on their immediate



families than non-minority respondents with regards to the *ATA*, security at airports/transportation centres and law enforcement/security agencies.

These differences indicate that Canadians who identified themselves as belonging to a visible minority group are generally more concerned with the use of the *ATA*, especially in relation to the safeguards, application and potential for racial profiling to occur. These concerns may have had an influence on how visible minority Canadians view the impact of the *ATA*, especially in relation to the impact of the legislation.

Crossing borders and airport experiences

Respondents were asked several questions regarding their experiences while travelling in Canada and abroad over the last four years. There were no statistically significant differences between visible minority and non-minority participants with respect to the extent of their travel, their experiences with additional screening, or how they felt about the additional screening.

When travelling by air (either within Canada or between Canada and the U.S.), approximately one-fifth (21%) of the participants had undergone additional screening. Smaller proportions of respondents had experienced additional screening when travelling by air outside of North America. The most common types of additional screening included property searches, personal searches and/or the removal of shoes/belts. For the most part, those who had experienced the additional screening felt that it was justified to ensure public safety.

When travelling between Canada and the U.S. by means other than air, about one-fifth (18%) of the respondents had undergone additional screening that consisted mainly of property searches, having documents questioned and being taken into an office and questioned. Only about half (51%) of those surveyed felt the additional screening was justified.

When returning to Canada, fewer respondents reported experiencing additional screening by immigration and/or customs officials (8%). The most common forms of additional screening were property searches and having documents questioned. Again, only about half of the participants felt that the additional screening was justified.

Discussion and Conclusion

Clearly, there is support for the Canadian government's response to terrorism and most participants felt such a response has made Canada a safer place. However, visible minority respondents were less likely to support the *ATA* or feel that it has had a positive impact on Canada's safety.

The change Canadians perceived most as a result of the government's response to combating terrorism was the increased security at airports and border crossings. Although there was widespread support for additional security measures in airports, this was not the case for additional security at border crossings. This may be the result of the visual impact the events of 9/11 have had on Canadians.

Racial profiling was definitely a concern for visible minority respondents. However, the results of this study indicate that there does not appear to be any disproportionate impact on visible minority Canadians at border crossings or when in airport security.



1.0 Introduction

This report examines the responses of 1,703 Canadians, including an over-representation of individuals who self-identified as a visible minority, to questions surrounding their knowledge, opinions and experiences regarding the *Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA)* and related security measures. Specifically, this report explores awareness and concern regarding terrorism and the Canadian government response to terrorism; the application of the *ATA* and racial profiling. In addition, data was collected regarding the travel and corresponding security experiences of the participants. Comparisons between visible minority and non-minority respondents were also included in the report. The main purpose of establishing comparison groups was to examine whether visible minority respondents were disproportionately affected by the *ATA* and travel-related security measures.

2.0 Background

In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States and in response to the increasing global threat of terrorism, the Government of Canada sought to strengthen its approach to combating terrorism and ensuring public security. Part of Canada's response to the threat of terrorism was the enactment of the *Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA)*, which received Royal Assent in December 2001.

The *Act* itself provided amendments to various Canadian statutes, including the *Criminal Code* and the *Security of Information Act*. The amendments were designed to disable terrorist groups and their supporters through various means including:

- Defining “terrorist activity”¹;
- Creating a process for listing an entity that, upon listing, becomes defined as a terrorist group;
- Creating new powers through the use of investigative hearings and a recognizance with conditions in order to prevent acts of terrorism;
- Creating new terrorism offences that include collecting property for the purpose of carrying out a terrorist activity, facilitating a terrorist activity, instructing someone to carry out a terrorist activity, and harbouring or concealing a person known to have carried out or who is likely to carry out a terrorist activity;
- Stronger laws against hate crimes and propaganda;
- Provided new investigative tools to security and law enforcement agencies by expanding the use of electronic surveillance and permitting the interception of communications of foreign targets abroad;

¹ Please see Section 83.01 of the *Criminal Code of Canada* for the full definition.

- Amendments to the *Official Secrets Act* (now the *Security of Information Act*) designed to counter intelligence-gathering activities by foreign powers and terrorist groups, to address the intimidation or coercion of communities in Canada, as well as to prohibit the unauthorized disclosure of special operational information by individuals bound to secrecy; and
- Amendments to the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act* to authorize the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre (FINTRAC) to detect financial transactions that may constitute threats to Canada's security and to notify the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS).

A Parliamentary review of the anti-terrorism legislation was mandated to take place within three years of the *Act* receiving Royal Assent. A motion was adopted by the House of Commons on December 9, 2004 authorizing the Standing Committee on Justice, Human Rights, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness to begin a review of the *ATA*. At the time that this report was written, the Subcommittee on Public Safety and National Security had begun work on the review. The Senate adopted a similar motion on December 13, 2004, establishing a Special Committee to undertake a separate review. These committees are to report back to Parliament within one year, unless their mandates are extended.

The two Parliamentary committees began hearing from witnesses in February 2005. The House Subcommittee formally extended its mandate to include a review of s. 4 of the *Security of Information Act* and security certificates under the *Immigration Refugee Protection Act*, while the Senate has effectively extended its review beyond the specific provisions of the *ATA*. Both committees concluded their hearings in November 2005. Once the committees have submitted their reports to Parliament, the government has 120 days to respond to the House Report and 150 days to respond to the Senate Report.

To inform the Parliamentary Review, the Department of Justice has undertaken various research projects, designed to obtain the views of visible minorities, the general public and Canadian scholars on different provisions of the *Act*.

The first of the projects was conducted in March 2003 (Créatec +, 2003). This project used focus groups to examine two separate cohorts. The first cohort included members of minority groups in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Calgary, and Vancouver. In the second cohort, focus groups were conducted with participants that were more ethnically proportionate to the general Canadian population. Results were presented overall and, where relevant, differences between the respondents in the two cohorts were noted. The focus group discussions revealed that general awareness of terrorism-related legislation was consistently low among all participants, with the exception of the post 9/11 travel-related security measures, especially at airports and borders. The majority of participants were aware of the new travel-related measures. Overall, the participants expressed support for the provisions of the *ATA*, with varying degrees of concern about its application. Canada's legislation was generally thought to be less severe than that of the United States and United Kingdom. Moreover, the *ATA* generally created a sense of comfort, safety and increased security among the focus group participants.



In March 2004 (Millward Brown Goldfarb, 2004), qualitative research surrounding public views of the *ATA* was also undertaken. The purpose of this research was to obtain the views and attitudes of the Canadian population with respect to anti-terrorism legislation, including specific provisions, and the potential impact of the legislation on their personal and community lives. Only about half of the focus group participants were aware of some aspects of the *ATA* legislation; and while participants provided general support for the concept of the legislation, many felt the *Act* was too broad and somewhat vague.

Next, the Department of Justice consulted a diverse group of Canadian scholars regarding their views of the *ATA* (Gabor, 2004). Scholars who participated in this report came from a variety of fields including, law, political science, history, and conflict studies. The scholars were asked to respond to a set of questions about the *ATA*, and were encouraged to offer their own opinions and observations regarding the Canadian anti-terrorism legislation and related emerging trends. At the time when the scholars were responding, some felt it was too early to assess the impact of the *ATA* while others felt the legislation had a negative impact on civil liberties and Canadian values. There were some that felt that the *ATA* acts as a deterrent and had contributed to improved intelligence and prosecutions without eroding civil liberties.

Finally, the Department of Justice conducted this survey of Canadian visible minorities and non-minorities in March 2005.

3.0 Purpose

The Department of Justice is committed to informing the *ATA* review as much as possible. In order to aid in this effort, the Department has undertaken public opinion polling to build upon the previous research and to explore the views and knowledge of Canadians on the anti-terrorism legislation. Therefore, due to concerns raised in the previously mentioned research regarding the potential for racial profiling and the impact of post-9/11 travel security measures, questions related to these issues were also included. As such, this report will address five separate topic areas and examine any statistically significant differences between the responses of visible minority and non-minority participants. Specifically, the five areas in this report include:

- Awareness of the *ATA* and its provisions;
- Application of the *ATA*;
- Defining racial profiling and perceived prevalence;
- Impact of the *ATA* and related measures on the participants; and
- Impact of travel-related security measures on the participants over the last four years.

4.0 Methodology

This national general population survey, conducted by Environics Research Group, was based on a sample of 1,703 respondents from the public above the age of 18 years. The sample was generated using random sampling methods. The sample also contains an over-representation of individuals from across the country who had self-identified as being from a visible minority group, as past research had indicated concerns surrounding the potential for visible minorities to be disproportionately affected by the anti-terrorism legislation and related measures.

The survey, which was administered in March 2005, took approximately 40 minutes to complete². The response rate was approximately 10% which is typical of a telephone survey conducted by a polling company. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A.

Only the participants that responded to the question regarding self-identification of visible minority or non-minority status were included in the comparative analysis. The number of respondents who identified as either a visible minority or non-minority was 1,685. Within this group, 23% of respondents self-identified themselves as a visible minority.³

Given the nature of the stratified sample and the over-representation of individuals who identified themselves as a visible minority, it is possible to generalize the findings of this study to the general Canadian population.

The data provided in this study were analyzed by creating dichotomous variables wherever possible. As many questions were based on a 4-point Likert-type scale, responses to each opposing end of the scale were merged. For example, if the response options were "very happy", "happy", "unhappy" and "very unhappy", the two "unhappy" categories were merged as were the two "happy" categories. Further, for open-ended questions, each response was re-coded to be a dichotomous variable for each of the individual responses. For these questions, participants may have provided more than one response. All comparative analyses were done using chi-squares, except for cells containing expected counts or five or less⁴.

² In addition to questions analyzed in this report, the survey also included questions on unrelated criminal justice issues.

³ Based on the 2001 Census by Statistics Canada, 13.4% of the Canadian population self-identify as being a member of a visible minority group.

⁴ A Bonferroni correction was not done as there were greater concerns over committing a Type I error than a Type II error. Specifically, given the nature of the area studied here, it was viewed as more important to incorrectly find statistically significant differences between the two groups than risk not finding a difference where one actually exists. Please note that statistical significance refers to the concept that the differences between the groups have not been found by chance. There were some instances where there appear to be large differences between visible minority and non-minority responses within this section. However, these apparent differences were not statistically significant due to the small numbers involved.



The analysis for each section is presented by the overall findings followed by statistically significant differences between visible minority responses and non-minority responses.

The results of this survey are accurate within $\pm 2.6\%$ for the entire sample and $\pm 5\%$ for the visible minority sample.

5.0 Results

5.1 Awareness and Concern

The first section of the survey focused on participants' awareness of government action in combating terrorism and their concern over terrorism in Canada. The data presented in this section can be found in Table 1 of Appendix B.

Overall, 58% of the respondents were concerned about the threat of terrorism in Canada. However, 63% felt that the threat of terrorism had been exaggerated and we should be careful not to overreact. Half (50%) of the participants felt that they were informed about what Canada was doing to combat terrorism with slightly more than half (58%) approving of the governments' performance with respect to this area. For those who approved, the main reasons provided were that the government was "doing a good job/what was needed" (27%) or that terrorism is a threat for which we have to be prepared (11%). About one-third (30%) of respondents indicated that they did not approve of Canada's performance mostly because they did not think enough was being done (23%) or they expressed concerns regarding the ease of crossing borders and lax immigration (19%).

Half (50%) of the respondents felt that the response of the Canadian government to combat terrorism was "about right" although, 36% felt the measures did not go far enough.

When asked about specific actions taken by the Canadian government over the last few years to combat terrorism, only 1% of respondents could identify the *ATA* or Bill C-36 by name. Slightly more than half (53%) of the respondents identified increased security measures at borders and/or airports as one of the actions taken by the government. The second most common action indicated by respondents was the increased screening of immigrants/refugees entering Canada (12%). Fewer visible minority respondents mentioned increased security at airports when compared to non-minority respondents (41% vs. 57%). Furthermore, a smaller proportion of visible minority respondents specified increased screening of immigrants/refugees as an action taken by the Canadian government when compared to non-minority respondents (9% vs. 13%).

Respondents who could not initially identify any specific actions taken by the government were asked generally if they were aware of any laws passed to deal with terrorism. More than two-thirds (65%) of respondents indicated they were unaware of any laws that had been passed.

The survey also asked those who had not mentioned the *ATA*/Bill C-36 if they had ever heard of the legislation. More than half (57%) of the participants indicated that they had not heard of the *ATA*/Bill C-36. Of those who had heard of the *ATA*/Bill C-36, when asked what it consisted of, almost three-quarters (70%) indicated that they did not know. When asked about how “tough” the *ATA* was, slightly more than half (54%) of the respondents felt that it was “tough” legislation.

All respondents were read a summary of the *ATA*, including its specific measures, and were subsequently asked a number of questions. Even after being provided with the summary, most respondents (82%) continued to maintain that they were unfamiliar with the *Act*. While familiarity between both groups was low, non-minority respondents were less familiar with the provisions than visible minority respondents (77% vs. 83%).

The majority (80%) of respondents perceived Canada’s anti-terrorism laws as “less tough” when compared to American legislation while fewer (44%) indicated that they believed the laws in the United Kingdom were “less tough” than Canada’s legislation. A greater proportion of non-minority respondents felt Canada’s laws were “less tough” than the American laws when compared to the responses of visible minority participants (82% vs. 75%).


Participants were also asked if, under the *ATA*, federal and provincial governments were obligated to publish annual reports related to the use of preventative arrest and investigative hearings. Almost half (48%) reported that they were unaware of any reporting obligations pursuant to the *ATA*. Fifty-three percent of respondents indicated that they felt there were safeguards in the *ATA* to protect Canadians’ rights and freedoms. Non-minority respondents were more likely to indicate there were safeguards compared to visible minority respondents (55% vs. 47%) (see Figure 1). While very few of the respondents were aware of the *ATA*, most respondents (73%) were aware that Parliament is required to review all aspects of the *ATA* but only 12% were aware that this review was currently underway.

Few participants (5%) were aware that, as part of the *ATA* review, the Department of Justice had established an Internet site for the general public. Further, few participants (8%) were aware of the Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security.⁵

⁵ The Cross Cultural Round Table was established to engage Canada’s diverse communities and get their input on security matters.



Figure 1



$p < .05$

When asked if the participants were interested in receiving more information on the *ATA*, two-thirds (66%) indicated interest. Significantly more visible minority respondents were interested in receiving information than non-minority respondents (72% vs. 64%). Those that were interested in receiving information on the *ATA* indicated that they would prefer to receive the information through pamphlets mailed to their household or via the Internet (53% and 36%, respectively).

5.2 Application


This section of the survey dealt with how the *ATA* has been applied as well as the possible effects of the legislation. Data for this section can be found in Table 2 of Appendix B.

The respondents were asked whether or not they felt that the *ATA* was a necessary response to the September 11, 2001 attacks on the U.S. Three-quarters (75%) of the participants indicated that the legislation was necessary and almost two-thirds (60%) felt that the *ATA* has made Canada safer from terrorist activity. When the responses of visible minority respondents were compared to non-minority respondents, fewer visible minority respondents felt the *ATA* was necessary, or that the legislation made Canada safer (69% vs. 76%; and 52% vs. 63%) (see Figure 2).

Slightly more than half (52%) of the respondents felt that the *ATA* has led to many people being unfairly targeted based on their ethnic, racial or religious background. Greater proportions of

non-minority participants felt the *ATA* has been applied fairly when compared to visible minority participants (43% vs. 35%).

Figure 2



$p < .05$

Most (89%) participants felt that it is vital for Canada to have law enforcement/security officials investigate individuals within Canada as well as abroad.

Finally, participants were provided with the following definition of terrorist activity:

In general, the Act defines “terrorist activity”, in part, as an illegal act that is committed either within or outside of Canada for a political, religious or ideological purpose; and “terrorist group” means, in part, an entity that has as one of its purposes or activities to facilitate or carry out any terrorist activity.

The majority (84%) of respondents agreed with this definition of terrorist activity.

5.3 Racial Profiling

The third section of the survey dealt with racial profiling as previous research conducted by the Department of Justice Canada on views of the *ATA* demonstrated concern in this area. Specifically, there were concerns that provisions found within the *ATA* may result in visible minorities being subject to unfair treatment. In order to address this issue, general questions



regarding racial profiling were included in the survey as well as questions specific to the ATA. All data for this section can be found in Table 3 of Appendix B.


Approximately two-thirds (69%) of the respondents indicated that they were “familiar” with racial profiling. When asked to describe what they thought racial profiling was, 23% of the respondents indicated they did not know. Almost one-fifth (17%) of the participants identified racial profiling as stereotyping and 11% indicated it was specifically about targeting individuals based on their racial/ethnic or religious background. More non-minority than visible minority participants felt that racial profiling could be described as stereotyping (18% vs. 13%).

More than half (57%) of the participants correctly determined that there was no official policy in Canada to profile individuals based on race. More non-minority respondents indicated that Canada did not have an official policy to racially profile individuals when compared to visible minority respondents (59% vs. 51%). More than half (59%) of the sample felt that screening a person for potential involvement in a terrorist activity solely based on race, ethnicity or religion was inappropriate and most participants (79%) felt racial profiling goes against the principles of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

More than three-quarters (79%) of those surveyed felt that individuals who were targeted because of their ethnic/racial background would still receive a fair trial in Canada, however, fewer visible minority respondents felt that this was the case when compared to non-minority respondents (71% vs. 81%). Not surprisingly, more participants who identified themselves as a visible minority felt that they had been the target of racial profiling over the last four years compared to non-minority participants (20% vs. 6%). When asked the extent to which racial profiling occurs unofficially, 20% of the participants felt it happened “all the time” and 62% felt that it happened “sometimes”. There was a difference between the two groups: 27% of visible minority respondents felt that racial profiling occurred unofficially “all the time” compared to 18% of non-minority respondents (see Figure 3).

When asked about the main causes of racial profiling, 33% of participants indicated it was caused by racism and prejudice, 14% thought it was because they felt that some religious or ethnic groups were more likely to commit certain crimes, 13% said it was due to terrorist activity and 12% felt racial profiling was caused by fear. A larger proportion of minority respondents felt racial profiling was the result of racism and prejudice (37% vs. 32%). Conversely, more non-minority than visible minority participants indicated that racial profiling was caused because they felt that some religious or ethnic groups were more likely to commit certain crimes (17% vs. 8%). Finally, larger proportions of non-minority respondents felt that terrorist activity caused racial profiling compared to visible minority respondents (14% vs. 9%).

Figure 3



$p < .001$

5.4 Impact

This section provides information relating to the perceived impact or effect that changes in security measures may have had on the participants. All data for this section may be found in Table 4 of Appendix B.


The majority (73%) of respondents indicated that they were not personally affected by any of the post-9/11 security measures; however, more visible minority participants felt that they were affected when compared to the responses of non-minority respondents (31% vs. 25%). The most common ways the participants were affected was by increased security at airports/delays in air travel (54%) and increased checks at customs/delays crossing borders (44%). Larger proportions of non-minority respondents reported experiencing increased security/delays in air travel when compared to minority respondents (57% vs. 44%).

The survey asked the respondents to comment upon the impact of the *ATA* and various related security measures on their immediate families. The majority (74%) of participants indicated that the *ATA* had no impact on their immediate families but more non-minority participants felt that the legislation had no impact on their immediate families compared to visible minority respondents (78% vs. 64%). When asked about the impact of the new security measures at borders and transportation centres on their immediate families, almost two-thirds (63%) felt there had been no impact. More non-minority respondents indicated the new measures had no impact on their immediate family when compared to visible minority respondents (65% vs. 56%) (see Figure 4). Lastly, the participants were asked about the impact Canadian law enforcement and national security agencies in Canada have had on the respondents' immediate families. Approximately three-quarters (73%) of the respondents indicated no impact; however, more non-



minority respondents felt there was no impact when compared to visible minority respondents (76% vs. 65%).

Figure 4



$p < .001$

5.5 Crossing borders and airport experiences

The survey inquired about the extent and type of travel the respondents had engaged in over the last four years. Respondents who indicated that they had travelled within this time frame were asked follow-up questions regarding their experiences with security and immigration officials. In this section, there were no statistically significant differences between the experiences and opinions of visible minority and non-minority respondents. All data for this section can be found in Table 5 of Appendix B.

5.5.1 Air travel within Canada

Almost half (45%, $n=765$) of the respondents had travelled by air within Canada over the last four years. Aside from the customary security procedures that all travellers experience, 21% of the participants reported being taken aside for additional security screening. Of those who received additional screening, most (65%) had their property searched, were personally searched (20%) and/or were required to remove their shoes/belt (18%). Of those who were subject to additional screening, most (70%) felt that it was justified to ensure public safety.

5.5.2 Air travel between Canada and U.S.

Approximately one-third (33%, n=559) of the participants had travelled by air between Canada and the U.S. within the last four years. One-quarter (25%) of these respondents were subject to additional screening aside from the standard security checks. Again, the most common form of additional screening were property searches (52%), removal of shoes and/or belts (35%), and personal searches (27%). Almost three-quarters (72%) of these respondents felt that the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety.

5.5.3 Air travel between Canada and countries outside North America

Almost one-third (29%, n=499) of the participants had travelled by air between Canada and a country outside North America over the last four years. Twelve percent had experienced additional screening while passing through the airport security in a foreign country. As with the results presented above, the most common forms of additional screening in foreign airports were property searches (50%) and personal searches (27%). This additional screening was viewed as justified in order to ensure public safety by most (74%) of the respondents.

5.5.4 Travel between Canada and U.S. other than by air

About half (45%, n=769) of the participants had travelled between Canada and the U.S. by other means (e.g. car, train or boat) over the last four years. Eighteen percent of those crossing the border into the U.S. from Canada received additional screening by U.S. border officials. The most common forms of additional screening were property searches (48%) and having their documentation questioned (31%). Fifteen percent of these respondents were taken into an office and questioned. Half (51%) of the respondents felt that the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety.

5.5.5 Returning to Canada

The respondents were asked about their experiences returning to Canada from the U.S. or another country. Eight percent (n=91) indicated they had received additional screening by Canadian immigration and customs officials (not airport security). Again, the most common forms of additional screening were property searches (55%) and having documentation questioned (29%). Slightly more than half (55%) felt the additional screening was justified.

6.0 Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of 1,703 Canadians concerning anti-terrorism legislation, security measures and other related issues. In addition, this study is unique in that it examined differences between visible minority and non-minority respondents.

For the most part, the results indicate that Canadians' level of awareness regarding government actions to combat terrorism except in relation to travel-based (non-legislated) initiatives is quite low. This may be due to the complex nature of some of the areas related to anti-terrorism.

While the Department of Justice has made an effort to inform Canadians by creating a website,



the existence of this method of information sharing, while preferred by the participants, is not widely known.

Generally, there was support for the governments' actions to combat terrorism - that the *ATA* was necessary to combat terrorism and that Canada is safer from terrorist activity because of the legislation. Despite the enactment of the *ATA* to combat terrorism, Canadians have primarily noticed the changes to airport security in response to the events of 9/11. Given the media coverage over the role airport security played in the 9/11 attacks, and the subsequent coverage concerning the changes to airport security, it is not surprising that the participants identified this as one of the main actions taken by the government.

Most of the individuals in the survey indicated that they were familiar with the concept of racial profiling. It was generally felt that while Canada does not have an official policy to profile individuals based on race, it occurs unofficially at least sometimes. Most respondents felt that it is inappropriate to screen someone based solely on race or ethnicity and that doing so would violate the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. However, it was felt that if an individual was targeted because of these factors, the individual would receive a fair trial in Canada.

As stated above, the most commonly cited impact of the post-9/11 security measures has clearly been the increased security at airports and borders. The survey also examined the travel experiences of the participants and found that those who were given additional screening mostly experienced property and personal searches. It appears that most of the respondents felt that the added security measures were sufficiently justified at airports in order to protect the public; however, this support decreased when applied to border crossings. It could be argued that the visual impact of the 9/11 events have enhanced the fear of a terrorist attack during air travel and therefore this type of screening is viewed more as a comfort than an infringement.

There were some statistically significant differences between minority and non-minority respondents. While a larger proportion of visible minority respondents reported being personally affected by the post-9/11 security measures, there were no significant differences on their experiences at both border crossings and airports.

Generally, visible minority participants were more concerned about the use of the *ATA*, especially with respect to safeguards and the application of the legislation, including concerns surrounding the potential for racial profiling to occur. Possibly as a result of these concerns, fewer minority respondents felt that the *ATA* was necessary or had made Canada safer from terrorist activity when compared to non-minority respondents.

Overall, while there were few differences between visible minority and non-minority respondents surrounding awareness and concern over terrorism, there does appear to be significant differences between the two groups with regards to a general trust in the government and its institutions to ensure fair treatment. Lastly, while racial profiling is a major concern, there were no statistically significant differences between visible minorities and non-minorities regarding additional security screening at airport security and border crossings.



References

Créatec + (2003). *Minority Views on the Canadian Anti-Terrorism Act (Formerly Bill C-36)*. Ottawa: Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice Canada.

Gabor, T. (2004). *The Views of Canadian Scholars on the Impact of the Anti-Terrorism Act*. Ottawa: Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice.

Millward Brown Goldfarb (2004). *Public Views on the Anti-Terrorism Act (formerly Bill C-36): A Qualitative Study*. Ottawa: Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice.



Appendix A

Environics Research Group.
March 15, 2005

Department of Justice Canada

DRAFT Questionnaire
PN5687

Hello, my name is _____ of Environics Research Group Ltd. We are conducting a brief survey about the justice system in Canada. Please be advised that we are not selling nor soliciting anything. Your answers are important to us and your responses will be kept strictly confidential.

We choose telephone numbers at random, then select one person from a household to be interviewed. May I please speak to the person in your household who is 18 years of age or older, and has had the most recent birthday.

- 01 Yes
 - 02 Not AvailableSCHEDULE CALL-BACK
 - 03 Refused.....DISCONTINUE & THANK
-

PERSPECTIVES ON THE ANTI-TERRORISM ACT AND POST 9/11
MEASURES

SECURITY

I am now going to ask you some questions about Canada's actions to combat terrorism

A. Awareness and Concern

1. How concerned are you personally about terrorism in Canada? Are you very, somewhat, not very or not at all concerned?

- 01 - Very concerned
- 02 - Somewhat concerned
- 03 - Not very concerned
- 04 - Not at all concerned
- 99 - DK/NA

2. Some people say [ROTATE] that terrorism represents a major threat to the safety of Canada and that we need to take drastic steps to combat it. Other people say [ROTATE] that the threat of terrorism in Canada is being exaggerated and that we need to be careful not to overreact to it. Which one of these views is closest to your own?

- 01 – Terrorism is a major threat
- 02 – Terrorism threat is exaggerated
- 99 – DK/NA

3. In general, how informed do you feel you are about what the Canadian government is doing to combat terrorism? Are you very, somewhat, not very or not at all informed?

- 01 – Very informed
- 02 – Somewhat informed
- 03 – Not very informed
- 04 – Not at all informed
- 99 – DK/NA

4. Do you approve or disapprove of the Canadian government's performance in taking steps to combat terrorism? Would that be strongly or somewhat?

- 01 – Strongly approve
- 02 – Somewhat approve
- 03 – Somewhat disapprove
- 04 – Strongly disapprove
- 99 - DK/NA

5. What are the main reasons why you [ANSWER TO Q. 4]?

6. Do you think that the measures that Canada has taken to combat terrorism over the last few years go too far, don't go far enough or are about right?

- 01 – Go too far
- 02 – Don't go far enough
- 03 – Are about right
- 99 – DK/NA

7. As far as you know, what specific actions has the Canadian Government taken in the last few years to combat terrorism? DO NOT READ...PROBE FOR UP TO THREE RESPONSES

- 01 – Anti-Terrorism Act/Bill C-36 SKIP TO Q. 10
- 02 - Passed new laws - unspecified
- 03 - Increased security measures at borders and airports
- 04 - Increased screening of immigrants and refugees attempting to enter Canada
- 05 - Increased screening of individuals wanting to visit Canada
- 06 - Increased funding for intelligence collection
- 07 – More police
- 08 – More powers for CSIS



- 09 – Working with the U.S.
- 10 – Working with other countries
- 11 – Racial profiling/targeting people unfairly
- 12 – Maher Arar case
- 13 - None
- 98 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT MENTION ANTI-TERRORISM ACT OR BILL C-36 IN Q. 7

8. Are you aware of any laws passed by the Government of Canada specifically to deal with terrorism? IF YES, Which laws?

- 01 – No, not aware of any laws
- 02 – Yes, aware of a law but unable to name it
- 03 – Yes, Anti-Terrorism Act SKIP TO Q. 10
- 04 – Yes, Bill C-36 SKIP TO Q. 10
- 05 – Yes, Other (SPECIFY) _____
- 99 – DK/NA

9. Have you ever heard of the Anti-Terrorism Act (formerly known as Bill C-36)?

- 01 – Yes
- 02 – No SKIP TO PREAMBLE BEFORE Q. 11
- 99 – DK/NA

ASK ALL WHO ARE AWARE OF THE ANTI-TERRORISM ACT IN Q. 7, 8 OR 9

10 a. As far as you know, what does the Anti-Terrorism Act consist of? Are you aware of any specific provisions in it?

10.b How tough do you think Canada's Anti-Terrorism Act is? Is It very, somewhat, not very or not at all tough?

- 01 – Very tough
- 02 – Somewhat tough
- 03 – Not very tough
- 04 – Not at all tough
- 99 – DK/NA

ASK ALL

In the fall of 2001, the Canadian Parliament passed new anti-terrorism legislation called the Anti-Terrorism Act (formerly referred to as Bill C-36). This law has taken steps to combat terrorism and terrorist activities at home and abroad through tough new measures. The new package of legislation: creates measures to deter, disable, identify, prosecute, convict and punish terrorist groups and provides new investigative tools to law enforcement and national security agencies.

The law is also intended to ensure that Canadian values of respect and fairness are preserved through rigorous safeguards to ensure that the fundamental rights and freedoms of Canadians are respected.

11. How familiar are you with the Anti-Terrorism Act and its provisions? Are you very, somewhat, not very or not at all familiar with it?

- 01 – Very familiar
- 02 – Somewhat familiar
- 03 – Not very familiar
- 04 – Not at all familiar
- 99 – DK/NA

The Anti-Terrorism Act contains a number of specific measures. These include:

- New offences under the Criminal Code for knowingly participating in, contributing to and financing terrorism
- A definition of terrorist activity
- Creating a public list of terrorist groups and individuals that are designated as “terrorists”
- New investigative powers for police such as wire-tapping, being able to apply for “investigative hearings” to question people who have not been charged about potential terrorist threats
- Allowing police to put people under “preventive arrest” under certain circumstances if they have reason to believe that the person might be involved in future terrorist activity.

12.a Were you very, somewhat, not very or not at all familiar with the fact that the Anti-Terrorism Act contained these provisions?

- 01 – Very familiar
- 02 – Somewhat familiar
- 03 – Not very familiar
- 04 – Not at all familiar
- 99 – DK/NA

12.b Do you think the Canadian Anti-Terrorism laws are tougher, less tough, or about the same as the anti-terrorism laws in each of the following? READ AND ROTATE

a. the United States

- 01 – Tougher
- 02 – Less tough
- 03 – About the same
- 99 – DK/NA

b. the United Kingdom (Great Britain)



13.a As far as you know, under the Anti-Terrorism Act, is there any obligation for federal and provincial governments to publish annual reports related to the use of preventative arrests and investigative hearings?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 -DK/NA

13.b Are there any safeguards in the Anti-Terrorism Act intended to protect Canadians' rights and freedoms?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

14. Is Parliament required to review all aspects of the Act at some point?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

15. In fact there is a review of the Anti-Terrorism Act underway right now. Were you aware of that?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

16. As part of the review process, the Department of Justice has established an Internet website for the general public? Were you aware of that?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

17. A year ago, in April 2004, the government announced the establishment of the Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security. This is meant to engage Canada's diverse communities and get their input on security matters. Had you heard of this?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

18. Would you be very, somewhat, not very or not at all interested in getting more information on the Anti-Terrorism Act?

- 01 - Very interested
- 02 - Somewhat interested
- 03 - Not very interested SKIP TO Q. 20
- 04 - Not at all interested SKIP TO Q. 20
- 99 - DK/NA

IF VERY/SOMEWHAT INTERESTED IN Q. 18, ASK:

19. How would like to receive information on the above issues? DO NOT READ

- 01 - Internet/Web
- 02 - Household mailing/pamphlet
- 03 - Ads in local/community/ethno-cultural news papers
- 04 - Ads in ethno-cultural magazines
- 05 - Television and radio ads (general/specialty programming)
- 06 - Newspaper/magazine articles
- 07 - News programs
- 08 - Public meetings
- 98 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL

B. Application

20. Some people say that [ROTATE] the Anti-Terrorism Act was necessary in the wake of the September 11 attacks on the US. Other people say that [ROTATE] Canada already had adequate laws to deal with terrorism before Sept. 11 and that the Anti-Terrorism Act was not necessary? Which of these views is closest to your own?

- 01 - Anti-Terrorism Act was necessary
- 02 - Anti-terrorism Act was not necessary
- 99 - DK/NA

21. To what extent do you think that the Anti-Terrorism Act has made Canada safer from terrorist activity? Has it made Canada much safer, a little safer or has it made no difference?

- 01 - Much safer
 - 02 - Somewhat safer
 - 03 - Has not made a difference
- VOLUNTEERED
- 04 - Has made Canada LESS safe
 - 99 - DK/NA

22. Some people say that [ROTATE] the Anti-Terrorism Act has been applied to everyone fairly and equally and that no one has been singled out for scrutiny just because of their ethnic, racial or religious background. Other people say that [ROTATE] the application of the Anti-Terrorism Act has led to people being unfairly targeted for scrutiny purely on the basis of their ethnic, religious or racial background. Which of these views is closest to your own?

- 01 - Anti-Terrorism Act has treated everyone fairly
- 02 - Anti-Terrorism Act has led to many people being unfairly targeted
- 99 - DK/NA



23. Do you think that having Canadian law enforcement and security officials investigate individuals in Canada and abroad is very, somewhat, not very or not at all vital to combating terrorism?

- 01 – Very vital
- 02 – Somewhat vital
- 03 – Not very vital
- 04 – Not at all vital
- 99 – DK/NA

I will describe to you how the Anti-Terrorism Act defines “terrorist activity” and “terrorist group.” In general, the Act defines “terrorist activity”, in part, as an illegal act that is committed either within or outside of Canada for a political, religious or ideological purpose; and “terrorist group” means, in part, an entity that has as one of its purposes or activities to facilitate or carry out any terrorist activity.

24. Do you agree or disagree with this definition of “terrorist activity” Would that be strongly or somewhat?

- 01 - Strongly agree
- 02 - Somewhat agree
- 03 - Somewhat disagree
- 04 - Strongly agree
- 99 - DK/NA

C. Racial Profiling

Now I would like to ask you a couple of questions related to the issue of Racial Profiling.

25. First of all, how familiar are you with the term “racial profiling”? Are you very, somewhat, not very or not at all familiar with it?

- 01 – Very familiar
- 02 – Somewhat familiar
- 03 – Not very familiar
- 04 – Not at all familiar
- 99 – DK/NA

26. What is “racial profiling”? How would you describe it?

27. Racial profiling is when there is an official policy to target and scrutinize individuals solely on the basis of their race, ethnicity, or religion. As far as you know, is there a policy in Canada to do racial profiling?

- 01 – Yes, there is
- 02 – No, there isn't
- 99 – DK/NA

28. Some say that [ROTATE] screening a person for potential involvement in terrorist activity solely on the basis of their perceived race, ethnicity or religion is inappropriate. Others say that [ROTATE] screening a person on the basis of their perceived race, ethnicity or religion is a necessary step to counter terrorist activities. Which view is closer to your own?

- 01 – Screening a person on race/religion/ethnicity is inappropriate
- 02 – Screening a person on race/religion/ethnicity is a necessary step
- 99 – DK/NA

29. I am going to read you some statements about racial profiling. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following? READ AND ROTATE

a. Racial profiling goes against the principles of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

- 01 - Strongly agree
- 02 - Somewhat agree
- 03 - Somewhat disagree
- 04 - Strongly disagree
- 99 - DK/NA

b. Even if individuals are targeted because of their ethnic or racial background, they would still get a fair trial in Canada.

c. Over the last four years, you feel that you have been the target of racial profiling.

30. There is no official policy in Canada to racially profile and target anyone because of their ethnic, religious or racial origin. To what extent do you think that racial profiling still goes on unofficially? Does it happen all the time, sometimes, rarely or never?

- 01 – All the time
- 02 – Sometimes
- 03 – Rarely
- 04 – Never
- 99 – DK/NA

31. In general, What do you think are the main causes of racial profiling? DO NOT READ...CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- 01 - Racism and prejudice
- 02 - Fear
- 03 - The anti-terrorism legislation
- 04 - Terrorist activities (e.g., September 11, 2001 attacks)
- 05 - Lack of training of Law enforcement and national security agencies
- 06 – Some religious or ethnic groups are more likely to commit crimes
- 98 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

D. Impact – ASK ALL



32. Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, governments in Canada and around the world have increased their security measures in a number of areas. To what extent have you been personally affected by any of these measures? Have you been affected a great deal, somewhat, a little or not affected at all?

- 01 – Affected a great deal
- 02 – Affected somewhat
- 03 – Affected a little
- 04 – Not affected at all SKIP TO Q. 34
- 99 – DK/NA

33. In what ways do you feel you have been affected? DO NOT READ PROBE FOR UP TO THREE RESPONSES

- 01 – Increased security at airports, delays in air travel
- 02 – Increased checks at customs, delays in travel across borders
- 03 – Increased security at work
- 04 – Increased fear of arrest/detention
- 05 – Less fear of terrorist attack
- 06 – Feel targeted due to ethnic/racial/religious origin
- 07 – Violation of rights
- 08 – Loss of privacy
- 09 – Feel safer now/good measures
- 98 – Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 – DK/NA

ASK ALL

E. Crossing border and airport experiences etc.

Your reply to the following questions should be based on your own first hand experiences.

34. Over the last four years, have you traveled in any of the following ways? READ..

a. By air within Canada

- 01 – Yes ASK Q. 35-37 AND Q. 50-52
- 02 – No
- 99 – DK/NA

b. By air between Canada and the US

- 01 – Yes ASK Q. 38-40 AND Q. 44-46 AND Q. 50-52
- 02 – No
- 99 – DK/NA

c. By air between Canada and countries outside of North America

- 01 – Yes ASK Q. 41-43 AND Q. 47-49 AND Q. 50-52
- 02 – No
- 99 – DK/NA

d. Between Canada and the US by other means (i.e.: car, train, boat)

01 – Yes ASK Q. 44-46 AND Q. 50-52

02 – No

99 – DK/NA

IF NO TO ALL OF 34 A, B, C AND D, SKIP TO Q. 53

Experiences with airport security

I am going to ask you some questions about your experiences dealing with airport security. Please note that this does NOT include customs or immigration personnel, but just the security you go through before boarding a plane.

IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED YES TO Q. 34 A AND HAS TRAVELLED BY AIR WITHIN CANADA, ASK:

35. In the last four years, while passing through Canadian airport security, aside from the typical security checks that everyone goes through, did you ever get taken aside and given additional screening by Canadian airport security personnel?

01 - Yes

02 – No SKIP TO Q. 38

99 - DK/NA

36. What was the nature of the additional screening? DO NOT READ...CODE ALL THAT APPLY

01 - Personally searched

02 - Property searched (e.g., luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)

03 - Documentation was questioned

04 – Removed shoes, belt etc..

05 – Questioned about travel plans

97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)

99 - DK/NA

37. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?

01 - Yes

02 - No

99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL WHO ANSWERED YES TO Q. 34 B

38. In the last four years, while passing through American airport security, aside from the typical security checks that everyone goes through, did you ever get taken aside and given additional screening by American airport security personnel? (NB: HERE WE ARE ASKING ABOUT AIRPORT SECURITY, NOT CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION!)

01 - Yes

02 – No SKIP TO Q. 41

99 - DK/NA



39. What was the nature of the additional screening? DO NOT READ

- 01 - Personally searched
- 02 - Property searched (e.g., luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)
- 03 - Documentation was questioned
- 04 - Removed shoes, belt etc..
- 05 - Questioned about travel plans
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

40. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL WHO ANSWERED YES TO Q. 34 C

41. In the last four years, while passing through airport security in a foreign country other than the US, aside from the typical security checks that everyone goes through, did you ever get taken aside and given additional screening by foreign airport security personnel? (NB: HERE WE ARE ASKING ABOUT AIRPORT SECURITY, NOT CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION!)

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No SKIP TO Q. 44
- 99 - DK/NA

42. What was the nature of the additional screening? DO NOT READ

- 01 - Personally searched
- 02 - Property searched (e.g., luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)
- 03 - Documentation was questioned
- 04 - Removed shoes, belt etc..
- 05 - Questioned about travel plans
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

43. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

Experiences with border officials

Now I'm going to ask some questions about your experiences dealing with customs and immigration while crossing borders. Please note that this does NOT include airport security, but just the contact with border officials.

IF YES TO Q. 34 B OR D, ASK:

44. While crossing the border into the United States from Canada, aside from the typical checks at the border that everyone gets, did you receive additional screening by U.S. border officials? (NB: HERE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT US IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, NOT AIRPORT SECURITY)

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No SKIP TO Q. 47
- 99 - DK/NA

IF YES TO Q. 44, ASK:

45. What was the nature of the additional screening by US border officials? DO NOT READ

- 01 - Personally searched
- 02 - Property searched (e.g., luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)
- 03 - Documentation was questioned
- 04 - Picture and finger print was taken
- 05 - Was taken to an office and questioned
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

46. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

IF YES TO Q. 34 C, ASK:

International Travel (other countries besides US)

47. While crossing the border into another country other than the United States from Canada, aside from the typical checks at the border that everyone gets, did you receive additional screening by border officials? (NB: HERE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, NOT AIRPORT SECURITY)

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No SKIP TO Q. 50
- 99 - DK/NA

IF YES TO Q. 47, ASK:

48. What was the nature of the additional screening by the border officials of the country you were crossing into? DO NOT READ

- 01 - Personally searched
- 02 - Property searched (e.g., luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)
- 03 - Documentation was questioned
- 04 - Picture and finger print was taken



- 05 – Was taken to an office and questioned
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

49. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL WHO SAID YES TO ANY PART OF Q. 34

Returning to Canada

50. While crossing the border back into Canada from the US or another country, aside from the typical checks at the border that everyone goes through, did you receive additional screening by Canadian border officials? NB: HERE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, NOT AIRPORT SECURITY

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

IF YES TO Q. 50, ASK:

51. What was the nature of the additional screening by Canadian border officials? DO NOT READ

- 01 - Personally searched
- 02 - Property searched (e.g., luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)
- 03 - Documentation was questioned
- 04 - Picture and finger print was taken
- 05 – Was taken to an office and questioned
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

52. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

ASK ALL – FINAL THOUGHTS

53. What impact have each of the following had on you and your immediate family? A positive impact, a negative impact or no impact at all? READ AND ROTATE

a. The government's legislative response to terrorism through the Anti-Terrorism Act.

- 01 - Positive impact
- 02 - No impact
- 03 - Negative impact
- 99 - DK/NA

- b. The new security measures at borders and transportation centres
- c. Canadian law enforcement and national security agencies in Canada

DEMOGRAPHICS

Finally, a few questions for statistical purposes. Please be assured that all your responses will be kept entirely anonymous and absolutely confidential.

A. In what year were you born?

- 1 - SPECIFY _____
- 2 - DK/NA

B. What is the highest level of education that you have reached? DO NOT READ - SELECT ONE ONLY

- 01 - Some elementary (Grades 1-6)
- 02 - Completed elementary (Grade 7 or 8)
- 03 - Some high school (Grades 9-11)
- 04 - Completed high school (Grades 12 or 13)
- 05 - Some community college, vocational, trade school
- 06 - Completed community college, vocational, trade school
- 07 - Some university
- 08 - Completed university (Bachelor's Degree)
- 09 - Post graduate/professional school (Master's Degree, Ph.D., etc.)
- 10 - No schooling
- VOLUNTEERED
- 11 - Don't Know / Refuse

C. Which of the following best describes your own present employment status? Are you...? READ

- 01 - Working full-time
- 02 - Working part-time
- 03 - Unemployed or looking for a job
- 04 - Stay at home full-time
- 05 - Student
- or 06 - Retired
- VOLUNTEERED
- 07 - Disability pension
- 99 - REFUSAL/DK/NA



D. People living in Canada come from many racial and cultural groups. I am going to read you a list of racial and cultural groups. Which one do you belong to? Are you . . ? READ ALL CATEGORIES TO RESPONDENT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY. IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS “MIXED” OR “BIRACIAL” PROBE FOR SPECIFIC GROUPS (E.G., “WHITE”, “BLACK” AND “ABORIGINAL”.)

- 01 - White
- 02 - Chinese
- 03 - South Asian (for example, East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
- 04 – Black (for example African, Caribbean, Canadian-born)
- 05 - Filipino
- 06 - Latin American
- 07 - Southeast Asian (for example, Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, etc.)
- 08 - Arab
- 09 - West Asian (for example, Afghan, Iranian, etc.)
- 10 - Japanese
- 11 - Korean
- 12 - Aboriginal (that is, North American Indian, Métis or Inuit)
- 13 - Or another group (SPECIFY)_____
- 98 - Refused
- 99 – DK/NA

E. Were you born in...? READ

- 01 - Canada
- 02 - United States
- 03 - Great Britain
- 04 - Another European country, or
- 05 - Another country, outside Europe and North America?
- 99 - DK/NA

F. What is your current status in Canada? Are you a...? READ

- 01 - Canadian Citizen
- 02 - Permanent Resident
- 03 – On a Visa/Permit
- 97 - Other (SPECIFY _____)
- 99 - DK/NA

G Which language do you, yourself, usually speak at home? (If you speak more than one language, which one do you speak most often?) INSIST ON ONLY ONE ANSWER

- 01 - English
- 02 - French
- 03 - OTHER (SPECIFY)_____
- 99 - REFUSAL

H. Do you consider yourself to be a member of a visible minority group?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

I. Into which of the following categories would you put the total annual income in 2004 of all the members of your household, including yourself, before taxes and deductions?

- 01 - \$10,000 or less
- 02 - \$10,001 to \$20,000
- 03 - \$20,001 to \$30,000
- 04 - \$30,001 to \$40,000
- 05 - \$40,001 to \$50,000
- 06 - \$50,001 to \$60,000
- 07 - \$60,001 to \$70,000
- 08 - \$70,001 to \$80,000
- 09 - \$80,001 to \$90,000
- 10 - \$90,001 to \$100,000
- 11 - More than \$100,000
- 99 - DK/NA /Refused

J. DO NOT ASK - RECORD RESPONDENT'S SEX

- 01 - Male
- 02 - Female

K. Over the last four years, have you ever been questioned, detained or arrested by Canadian law enforcement officials?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

L. Have you yourself or a friend or relative of yours ever been convicted of a crime?

- 01 - Yes, friend
- 02 - Yes, relative
- 03 - Yes, friends and relatives
- 04 - Respondent has been convicted him/herself
- 05 - No
- 99 - DK/NA

M. Have you yourself or a friend or relative of yours ever been imprisoned?

- 01 - Yes, friend
- 02 - Yes, relative
- 03 - Yes, friends and relatives
- 04 - Respondent has been imprisoned him/herself
- 05 - No
- 99 - DK/NA



-
- N. DO NOT ASK - RECORD PROVINCE
 - O. DO NOT ASK - RECORD URBAN/RURAL AREA
 - P. DO NOT ASK - RECORD LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW

Thank you for your participation



Appendix B

TABLE 1: AWARENESS & CONCERN

	Total Sample		Comparison						p
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority				
			n	%	n	%			
1. How concerned are you personally about terrorism in Canada?									
Concerned	981	58%	221	57%	748	58%		NS	
Not concerned	718	42%	167	43%	545	42%			
DK/NA	4	0%	2	1%	2	0%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
2. Some people say that terrorism represents a major threat to the safety of Canada and that we need to take drastic steps to combat it. Other people say that the threat of terrorism in Canada is being exaggerated and that we need to be careful not to overreact to it. Which one of these views is closest to your own?									
Major threat	591	35%	141	36%	443	34%		NS	
Exaggerated	1068	63%	239	61%	819	63%			
DK/NA	44	3%	10	3%	33	3%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
3. In general, how informed do you feel you are about what the Canadian government is doing to combat terrorism?									
Informed	847	50%	200	51%	641	49%		NS	
Not informed	852	50%	188	48%	652	50%			
DK/NA	4	0%	2	1%	2	0%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
4. Do you approve or disapprove of the Canadian government's performance in taking steps to combat terrorism?									
Approve	994	58%	220	56%	766	59%		NS	
Disapprove	519	30%	122	31%	393	30%			
DK/NA	190	11%	48	12%	136	11%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
5. What are the main reasons why you answered approve of government performance?									
Lax immigration/too easy to cross border	55	6%	14	6%	41	5%		NS	
Don't know what gov't is doing/too secretive	57	6%	11	5%	46	6%		NS	
Spending too much money/tax payers money	9	1%	3	1%	6	1%		~	
Terrorism not a threat/exaggerated	64	6%	15	7%	49	6%		NS	
Gov't talks but does not act	4	0%	1	0%	3	0%		~	
Need harsher punishment/criminals or terrorists hiding in Canada	11	1%	3	1%	7	1%		~	
Not enough being done	52	5%	11	5%	41	5%		NS	
Doing too much/drastic/unfair treatment of innocent people	18	2%	5	2%	13	2%		NS	
Gov't does not know what it's doing/unprepared	3	0%	0	0%	3	0%		~	
Issues w/ US (various negative)	32	3%	5	2%	27	4%		NS	
Don't think Canada is a target	5	1%	1	0%	4	1%		~	
Violation of civil rights/freedoms	11	1%	1	0%	10	1%		~	

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample		Comparison					
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p	
			n	%	n	%		
Canadian gov't too laid back/lax	13	1%	5	2%	8	1%	NS	
Don't have strong enough military	8	1%	1	0%	7	1%	~	
Fairness/Justice	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	~	
Should be doing something, but not as much as US	78	8%	16	7%	61	8%	NS	
To be safe/safety (general)	67	7%	20	9%	47	6%	NS	
Terrorism is threat in Canada, have to be prepared	111	11%	20	9%	90	12%	NS	
Gov't doing good job/what needs to be done	266	27%	49	22%	216	28%	NS	
Somebody has to do something to protect Canada	40	4%	6	3%	33	4%	NS	
It's what I heard (media various positive)	13	1%	4	2%	9	1%	~	
Issues w/ US (various pos.)	28	3%	7	3%	21	3%	NS	
Good to do something/proactive/keep control	54	5%	11	5%	42	5%	NS	
Canada is liked/non-violent/peacekeeper/democratic	27	3%	7	3%	19	2%	NS	
Proximity to US/necessary to take further measures	9	1%	1	0%	8	1%	~	
Other	49	5%	15	7%	34	4%	NS	
DK/NA	101	10%	29	13%	70	9%	NS	
5. What are the main reasons why you answered disapprove of government performance?								
Lax immigration/too easy to cross border	97	19%	21	17%	75	19%	NS	
We don't know what gov't is doing/too secretive	71	14%	13	11%	58	15%	NS	
Spending too much money/tax payers money	10	2%	1	1%	9	2%	~	
Terrorism not a threat/exaggerated	33	6%	7	6%	26	7%	NS	
Gov't talks but does not act	18	3%	2	2%	16	4%	~	
Need harsher punishment/criminals or terrorists hiding in Canada	34	7%	5	4%	29	7%	NS	
Not enough being done	117	23%	22	18%	95	24%	NS	
Doing too much/drastic/unfair treatment of innocent people	29	6%	8	7%	21	5%	NS	
Gov't does not know what it's doing/unprepared	27	5%	8	7%	17	4%	NS	
Issues w/ US (various negative)	38	7%	11	9%	27	7%	NS	
Don't think Canada is a target	7	1%	0	0%	7	2%	~	
Violation of civil rights/freedoms	32	6%	5	4%	27	7%	NS	
Canadian gov't too laid back/lax	24	5%	5	4%	19	5%	NS	
Don't have strong enough military	7	1%	3	2%	4	1%	~	
Should be doing something, but not as much as US	2	0%	0	0%	2	1%	~	
Terrorism is threat in Canada, have to be prepared	5	1%	1	1%	4	1%	~	
Gov't doing good job/what needs to be done	1	0%	1	1%	0	0%	~	
Somebody has to do something to protect Canada	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	~	
Issues w/ US (various pos.)	5	1%	1	1%	4	1%	~	
Good to do something/proactive/keep control	3	1%	1	1%	2	1%	~	
Canada is liked/non-violent/peacekeeper/democratic	6	1%	1	1%	5	1%	~	
Proximity to US/necessary to take further measures	2	0%	0	0%	2	1%	~	
Other	29	6%	9	7%	20	5%	NS	
DK/NA	40	8%	16	13%	23	6%	**	
6. Do you think that the measures that Canada has taken to combat terrorism has gone...?								
Go too far	124	7%	28	7%	95	7%	NS	
Don't go far enough	611	36%	137	35%	468	36%		

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



	Total Sample		Comparison					
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p	
			n	%	n	%		
Are about right	843	50%	196	50%	641	49%		
DK/NA	125	7%	29	7%	91	7%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
7. As far as you know, what specific actions has the Canadian gov't taken in the last few years to combat terrorism?								
Anti-terrorism Act/Bill C-36	24	1%	4	1%	20	2%	~	
Passed new laws - unspecified	35	2%	10	3%	24	2%	NS	
Increased security measures borders/airports	899	53%	159	41%	737	57%	***	
Increased screening immigrants/refugees entering Canada	206	12%	35	9%	171	13%	*	
Increase screening individuals wanting to visit Canada	87	5%	13	3%	74	6%	NS	
Increase funding for intelligence collection	24	1%	7	2%	17	1%	NS	
More police	21	1%	6	2%	15	1%	NS	
More powers for CSIS	37	2%	4	1%	32	2%	~	
Working with U.S.	93	5%	17	4%	74	6%	NS	
Working with other countries	34	2%	7	2%	27	2%	NS	
Racial profiling/targeting people unfairly	24	1%	10	3%	14	1%	*	
Maher Arar case	7	0%	6	2%	1	0%	~	
More government security	10	1%	5	1%	5	0%	NS	
Increased awareness/dissemination of information	19	1%	5	1%	14	1%	NS	
Increased security measures	41	2%	16	4%	24	2%	*	
Peacekeeping/sent troops to Middle East	40	2%	10	3%	30	2%	NS	
Heighten police activity/arrests	35	2%	7	2%	27	2%	NS	
Update/improve training/military	20	1%	1	0%	19	1%	~	
Changes to passports/Visas/IDs	100	6%	21	5%	79	6%	NS	
Increased surveillance/investigations	22	1%	4	1%	18	1%	~	
Increased efforts to find/stop terrorists	12	1%	4	1%	8	1%	NS	
Forced committee/task force	10	1%	0	0%	10	1%	~	
Deported people	10	1%	4	1%	6	0%	~	
None	161	9%	53	14%	107	8%	**	
Other	336	20%	80	21%	253	20%	NS	
DK/NA	343	20%	85	22%	247	19%	NS	
	1703							
8. Are you aware of any laws passed by the gov't of Canada specifically to deal with terrorism? If yes, which laws? (asked of all those who did not mention Anti-Terrorism Act or Bill C-36 in Q.7)								
No, not aware of any laws	1084	65%	250	65%	825	65%	NS	
Yes, aware of law but unable to name it	234	14%	55	14%	177	14%	NS	
Yes, ATA	19	1%	6	2%	13	1%	NS	
Yes, Bill C-36	3	0%	3	1%	0	0%	~	
Yes, other	57	3%	13	3%	44	3%	NS	
DK/NA	291	17%	61	16%	223	17%	NS	
	1679		386		1275			

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample		Comparison						p
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority				
			n	%	n	%			
9. Have you ever heard of <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> (formerly known as Bill C-36)?									
Yes	698	42%	149	40%	542	43%			NS
No	946	57%	224	59%	712	56%			
DK/NA	13	1%	4	1%	8	1%			
	1657	100%	377	100%	1262	100%			
10a. As far as you know, what does the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> consist of? Are you aware of any specific provisions in it? (asked of all who were aware of the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> in Q.7, 8 or 9)									
Power to arrest/detain...w/o due process	92	12%	25	15%	67	12%			NS
Diminish rights of citizen/undemocratic	24	3%	6	4%	18	3%			NS
Power to inspect/restrict bank accounts and assets	8	1%	1	1%	7	1%			~
Increased security/tighten immigration security	42	6%	7	4%	35	6%			NS
Heighten search/surveillance/investigative powers	28	4%	2	1%	26	5%			~
Fight terrorism/protecting people	14	2%	1	1%	13	2%			~
Increased security measures (general)	7	1%	1	1%	6	1%			~
More power to police	5	1%	2	1%	3	1%			~
None	7	1%	2	1%	5	1%			~
Other	47	6%	14	9%	32	6%			NS
DK/NA	523	70%	112	69%	405	70%			NS
	744		162		575				
10b. How tough do you think Canada's <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> is? (asked of all who were aware of the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> in Q.7, 8 or 9)									
Tough	401	54%	83	51%	314	55%			NS
Not tough	236	32%	59	36%	175	30%			
DK/NA	107	14%	20	12%	86	15%			
	744	100%	162	100%	575	100%			
11. How familiar are you with the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> and its provisions?									
Familiar	307	18%	89	23%	216	17%			*
Not familiar	1393	82%	300	77%	1077	83%			
DK/NA	3	0%	1	0%	2	0%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
12a. Were you familiar with the fact the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> contained these provisions? (after being provided with a list of the provisions from the ATA)									
Familiar	605	36%	130	33%	471	36%			NS
Not familiar	1090	64%	258	66%	819	63%			
DK/NA	8	0%	2	1%	5	0%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
12b.a Do you think the Canadian <i>Anti-Terrorism</i> laws are tough...in relation to the US?									
Tougher	70	4%	22	6%	45	3%			*
Less tough	1368	80%	292	75%	1067	82%			
About the same	165	10%	48	12%	116	9%			

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



	Total Sample		Comparison				p
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		
			n	%	n	%	
DK/NA	100	6%	28	7%	67	5%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
12b.b Do you think the Canadian Anti-Terrorism laws are tough...in relation to the UK?							
Tougher	72	4%	19	5%	51	4%	NS
Less tough	755	44%	170	44%	581	45%	
About the same	460	27%	95	24%	362	28%	
DK/NA	416	24%	106	27%	301	23%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
13a. As far as you know, under the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> , is there any obligation for federal and provincial governments to publish annual reports related to the use of preventative arrests and investigative hearings?							
Yes	580	34%	147	38%	427	33%	NS
No	825	48%	182	47%	637	49%	
DK/NA	298	17%	61	16%	231	18%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
13b. Are there any safeguards in the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> intended to protect Canadians' rights and freedoms?							
Yes	909	53%	185	47%	716	55%	*
No	360	21%	98	25%	260	20%	
DK/NA	434	25%	107	27%	319	25%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
14. Is Parliament required to review all aspects of the <i>Act</i> at some point?							
Yes	1240	73%	290	74%	937	72%	NS
No	163	10%	34	9%	129	10%	
DK/NA	300	18%	66	17%	229	18%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
15. In fact there is a review of the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> underway right now. Were you aware of that?							
Yes	196	12%	50	13%	145	11%	NS
No	1501	88%	337	86%	1148	89%	
DK/NA	6	0%	3	1%	2	0%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
16. As part of the review process, the Dep. of Justice has established an Internet website for the general public. Were you aware of that?							
Yes	80	5%	23	6%	54	4%	NS
No	1622	95%	367	94%	1241	96%	
DK/NA	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
17. A year ago, in April 2004, the government announced the establishment of the Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security. This is meant to engage Canada's diverse communities and get their input on security matters. Had you heard of this?							
Yes	138	8%	34	9%	104	8%	NS
No	1561	92%	355	91%	1188	92%	

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample		Comparison					
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p	
			n	%	n	%		
DK/NA	4	0%	1	0%	3	0%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
18. Would you be interest in getting more information on the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> ?								
Interested	1123	66%	279	72%	834	64%	**	
Not interested	577	34%	109	28%	460	36%		
DK/NA	3	0%	2	1%	1	0%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
19. How would you like to receive information on the above issues?								
(If answered interested to Q.18)								
Internet/Web	403	36%	92	33%	306	37%	NS	
Household mailing/pamphlet	592	53%	146	52%	442	53%	NS	
Ads in local/community/ethno-cultural news papers	67	6%	19	7%	46	6%	NS	
Ads in ethno-cultural magazines	5	0%	3	1%	2	0%	~	
Television and radio ads (general/specialty)	149	13%	41	15%	106	13%	NS	
Newspaper/magazine articles	153	14%	41	15%	111	13%	NS	
News programs	93	8%	25	9%	66	8%	NS	
Public meetings	4	0%	1	0%	3	0%	~	
Media/report unspecified	5	0%	2	1%	3	0%	~	
Through MP/Parliament/government	8	1%	2	1%	6	1%	~	
Other	37	3%	9	3%	27	3%	NS	
DK/NA	10	1%	2	1%	7	1%	~	
	1123		279		834			

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



TABLE 2: APPLICATION

	Total Sample		Comparison					
			Minority		Non-minority		p	
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
20. Some people say the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> was necessary in the wake of the 9/11 attacks in the US. Other people say that Canada already had adequate laws to deal with terrorism before Sept. 11 and the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> was not necessary. Which of these views is closest to your own?								
<i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> was necessary	1272	75%	270	69%	989	76%	*	
<i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> was not necessary	366	21%	104	27%	261	20%		
DK/NA	65	4%	16	4%	45	3%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
21. To what extent do you think the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> has made Canada safer from terrorist activity?								
Safer	1027	60%	204	52%	812	63%	*	
Has not made a difference	609	36%	167	43%	437	34%		
Made Canada less safe	4	0%	2	1%	2	0%		
DK/NA	63	4%	17	4%	44	3%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
22. Some people sat that the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> has been applied to everyone fairly and equally and that no one has been singled out for scrutiny just because of their ethnic, racial or religious background. Other people say that the application of the <i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> has led to people being unfairly targeted for security purely on the basis of their ethnic, religious or racial background. Which of these views is closest to your own?								
<i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> has treated everyone fairly	696	41%	138	35%	551	43%	*	
<i>Anti-Terrorism Act</i> has led to many people being unfairly targeted	885	52%	220	56%	657	51%		
DK/NA	122	7%	32	8%	87	7%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
23. Do you think that having Canadian law enforcement and security officials investigate individuals in Canada and abroad is vital to combating terrorism?								
Vital	1519	89%	337	86%	1168	90%	NS	
Not Vital	158	9%	47	12%	109	8%		
DK/NA	26	2%	6	2%	18	1%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
24. Do you agree or disagree with definition of "terrorist activity"?								
Agree	1436	84%	314	81%	1107	85%	NS	
Disagree	205	12%	58	15%	146	11%		
DK/NA	62	4%	18	5%	42	3%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

TABLE 3: RACIAL PROFILING

	Total Sample		Comparison					
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p	
			n	%	n	%		
25. First of all, how familiar are you with the term "racial profiling"?								
Familiar	1169	69%	279	72%	883	68%	NS	
Not Familiar	525	31%	108	28%	406	31%		
DK/NA	9	1%	3	1%	6	0%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
26. What is "racial profiling". How would you describe it?								
Stereotyping/make assumptions b/c of race/religion	289	17%	52	13%	236	18%	*	
Lumping/categorizing groups/people on race/religion	62	4%	18	5%	44	3%	NS	
Unfair treatment/arrests based on background/religion	76	4%	24	6%	52	4%	NS	
Stereotyping/Typecasting	45	3%	9	2%	36	3%	NS	
Unfair treatment of Muslims post 9/11	9	1%	0	0%	9	1%	~	
Pulling/Stopping a car b/c of race	15	1%	5	1%	8	1%	NS	
Single people out b/c of race	132	8%	33	8%	99	8%	NS	
Racism/racist general	41	2%	10	3%	31	2%	NS	
Associating certain crimes with race/religion	89	5%	6	2%	83	6%	***	
Labelled "terrorist" because of Race/religion	51	3%	10	3%	41	3%	NS	
Targeting individuals based on race/religion	191	11%	44	11%	147	11%	NS	
Looking at/investigating...based on statistics/background	132	8%	25	6%	106	8%	NS	
Categorizing groups/people based on race	98	6%	20	5%	76	6%	NS	
Discrimination	27	2%	6	2%	21	2%	NS	
One race against another	10	1%	2	1%	8	1%	~	
Your race/where you...people/ethnicity/religion	111	7%	38	10%	71	5%	**	
Other	81	5%	20	5%	60	5%	NS	
DK/NA	387	23%	96	25%	281	22%	NS	
	1703							
27. Racial profiling is when there is an official policy to target and scrutinize individuals solely based on their race, ethnicity, or religion. As far as you know, is there a policy in Canada to do racial profiling?								
Yes	358	21%	94	24%	258	20%	*	
No	975	57%	200	51%	770	59%		
DK/NA	370	22%	96	25%	267	21%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
28. Some way that screening a person for potential involvement in terrorist activity solely on the basis of their perceived race, ethnicity or religion is inappropriate. Others say that screening a person on the basis of their perceived race, ethnicity or religion is a necessary step to counter terrorist activities. Which view is closer to your own.								
Screening based on race/ethnicity/religion is inappropriate	1002	59%	235	60%	760	59%	NS	
Screening based on race/ethnicity/religion is necessary	644	38%	140	36%	496	38%		
DK/NA	57	3%	15	4%	39	3%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
29a. Do you agree/disagree that racial profiling goes against the principles of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms?								
Agree	1349	79%	311	80%	1028	79%	NS	
Disagree	288	17%	68	17%	216	17%		

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



	Total Sample		Comparison					
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p	
			n	%	n	%		
DK/NA	66	4%	11	3%	51	4%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
29b. Do you agree/disagree that even individuals targeted because of their ethnic/racial background, they would still get a fair trial?								
Agree	1338	79%	275	71%	1047	81%	***	
Disagree	331	19%	103	26%	227	18%		
DK/NA	34	2%	12	3%	21	2%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
29c. Do you agree/disagree that over the last 4 years, you have been the target of racial profiling?								
Agree	159	9%	77	20%	77	6%	***	
Disagree	1523	89%	309	79%	1203	93%		
DK/NA	21	1%	4	1%	15	1%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
30. There is no official policy in Canada to racially profile and target anyone because of their ethnic, religious or racial origin. To what extent do you think that racial profiling still goes on unofficially?								
All the time	344	20%	105	27%	235	18%	***	
Sometimes	1061	62%	225	58%	827	64%		
Rarely	213	13%	31	8%	179	14%		
Never	39	2%	12	3%	26	2%		
DK/NA	46	3%	17	4%	28	2%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
31. In general, what do you think are the main causes of racial profiling?								
Racism and prejudice	559	33%	144	37%	409	32%	*	
Fear	198	12%	43	11%	154	12%	NS	
The ATA	38	2%	9	2%	28	2%	NS	
Terrorist activity	217	13%	36	9%	179	14%	*	
Lack of training of law enforcement/national security agencies	60	4%	19	5%	40	3%	NS	
Some religious/ethnic groups more likely to commit crimes	245	14%	31	8%	214	17%	***	
Religion	37	2%	9	2%	28	2%	NS	
Media	68	4%	18	5%	49	4%	NS	
Lack of integration of racial/cultural groups	28	2%	5	1%	22	2%	NS	
Depends on individual/group	7	0%	0	0%	7	1%	~	
Ignorance/lack of education	178	10%	40	10%	137	11%	NS	
Common sense/because it works	25	1%	8	2%	16	1%	NS	
Human nature	8	0%	1	0%	7	1%	~	
Colour of skin	20	1%	5	1%	15	1%	NS	
Someone's background/nationality/race/ethnicity	37	2%	5	1%	32	2%	NS	
Stereotypes	23	1%	2	1%	20	2%	~	
Personal/past experience	14	1%	3	1%	11	1%	~	
History	17	1%	2	1%	15	1%	~	
Upbringing/how raised	19	1%	7	2%	12	1%	NS	

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample		Comparison				
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p
			n	%	n	%	
Suspicious/unusual behaviour	12	1%	1	0%	11	1%	~
Immigrants/immigration	14	1%	6	2%	8	1%	NS
Cultural/community	14	1%	2	1%	12	1%	~
Pressure from external influence/war	19	1%	2	1%	17	1%	~
None	3	0%	0	0%	3	0%	~
Other	541	32%	127	33%	409	32%	NS
DK/NA	239	14%	63	16%	171	13%	NS
	1703						

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



TABLE 4: IMPACT

	Total Sample		Comparison					
			Minority		Non-minority		p	
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
32. Since the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, governments in Canada and around the world have increased their security measures in a number of areas. To what extent have you been personally affected by these measures?								
Affected	445	26%	120	31%	321	25%	*	
Not affected	1248	73%	269	69%	965	75%		
DK/NA	10	1%	1	0%	9	1%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		
33. In what ways do you feel you have been affected? (based on responses from Q. 32)								
Increased security at airports/delays in air travel	239	54%	53	44%	184	57%	*	
Increased checks at customs/delays crossing borders	196	44%	48	40%	147	46%	NS	
Increased security at work	21	5%	5	4%	16	5%	NS	
Increased fear of arrest/detention	5	1%	3	3%	2	1%	~	
Less fear of terrorist attack	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	~	
Feel targeted due to ethnic/racial/religious origin	18	4%	11	9%	7	2%	NS	
Violation of rights	10	2%	5	4%	5	2%	NS	
Loss of privacy	10	2%	5	4%	5	2%	~	
Feel safer now/good measures	9	2%	3	3%	6	2%	~	
Higher taxes/costs	13	3%	3	3%	10	3%	~	
Change in media coverage	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	~	
Change in process to get passport	10	2%	4	3%	6	2%	~	
Affected someone I know	4	1%	3	3%	1	0%	~	
More nervous about travelling	2	0%	1	1%	1	0%	~	
Increased security (various)	7	2%	1	1%	6	2%	~	
Affected my job	16	4%	3	3%	13	4%	~	
Affected travelling/problems travelling	17	4%	4	3%	13	4%	~	
Need/necessary to get a passport	3	1%	1	1%	2	1%	~	
Emotionality/the grief	4	1%	2	2%	2	1%	~	
Lack of personal security	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%	~	
Need passport to enter US	4	1%	1	1%	3	1%	~	
Increased bureaucracy to get ID/passport	10	2%	2	2%	8	2%	~	
Restricted access to certain areas/lack of freedom of movement	2	0%	0	0%	2	1%	~	
More scared/concerned/increased paranoia	5	1%	2	2%	3	1%	~	
Other	110	25%	31	26%	78	24%	NS	
DK/NA	11	2%	0	0%	10	3%	~	
	445		120		321			
53a. What impact has the government's legislative response to terrorism through the ATA had on your immediate family?								
Positive impact	293	17%	83	21%	205	16%	***	
No impact	1268	74%	251	64%	1006	78%		
Negative impact	108	6%	42	11%	65	5%		
DK/NA	34	2%	14	4%	19	1%		
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%		

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample				Comparison				p
			Minority		Non-minority				
	n	%	n	%	n	%			
53b. What impact have the new security measures and transportation centres had on your immediate family?									
Positive impact	361	21%	95	24%	263	20%		*	
No impact	1074	63%	220	56%	844	65%			
Negative impact	235	14%	65	17%	168	13%			
DK/NA	33	2%	10	3%	20	2%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			
53c. What impact has Canadian law enforcement and national security agencies in Canada had on your immediate family?									
Positive impact	329	19%	85	22%	239	18%		***	
No impact	1249	73%	255	65%	985	76%			
Negative impact	98	6%	40	10%	57	4%			
DK/NA	27	2%	10	3%	14	1%			
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%			

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



TABLE 5: CROSSING BORDER AND AIRPORT EXPERIENCES

	Total Sample		Comparison				
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p
			n	%	n	%	
34a. Over the last four years, have you travelled by air within Canada?							
Yes	765	45%	170	44%	585	45%	NS
No	934	55%	219	56%	708	55%	
DK/NA	4	0%	1	0%	2	0%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
34b. Over the last four years, have you travelled by air between Canada and the US?							
Yes	559	33%	125	32%	428	33%	NS
No	1142	67%	265	68%	866	67%	
DK/NA	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
34c. Over the last four years, have you travelled by air between Canada and countries outside of North America?							
Yes	499	29%	132	34%	362	28%	NS
No	1202	71%	258	66%	932	72%	
DK/NA	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
34d. Over the last years, have you traveled between Canada and the US by other means (i.e. car, train, boat)?							
Yes	769	45%	176	45%	587	45%	NS
No	932	55%	214	55%	707	55%	
DK/NA	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%	
	1703	100%	390	100%	1295	100%	
<i>Follow-up to 34a.</i>							
35. In the last four years, while passing through Canadian airport security, aside from the typical security checks that everyone goes through, did you ever get taken aside and given additional screening by Canadian airport security?							
Yes	162	21%	36	21%	124	21%	NS
No	599	78%	132	78%	459	78%	
DK/NA	4	1%	2	1%	2	0%	
	765	100%	170	100%	585	100%	
36. What was the nature of the additional screening?							
Personally searched	32	20%	6	17%	25	20%	NS
Property searched (e.g. luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)	106	65%	20	56%	84	68%	NS
Documentation was questioned	4	2%	1	3%	2	2%	~
Removed shoes, belt, etc.	29	18%	6	17%	23	19%	NS
Questioned about travel plans	10	6%	3	8%	6	5%	~
Put through metal detector	7	4%	2	6%	5	4%	~
Randomly selected	7	4%	3	8%	4	3%	~
Was Questioned (various)	6	4%	3	8%	3	2%	~
Other	23	14%	8	22%	15	12%	NS
DK/NA	4	2%	2	6%	2	2%	~
	162		36		124		
37. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?							
Yes	114	70%	28	78%	85	69%	NS
No	47	29%	8	22%	38	31%	

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample		Comparison				
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p
			n	%	n	%	
DK/NA	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	
	162	100%	36	100%	124	100%	
<i>Follow-up to 34b.</i>							
38. In the last four years, while passing through American airport security, aside from the typical security checks that everyone goes through, did you ever get taken aside and given additional screening by American airport security personnel?							
Yes	142	25%	28	22%	112	26%	NS
No	416	74%	97	78%	316	74%	
DK/NA	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
	559	100%	125	100%	428	100%	
39. What was the nature of the additional screening?							
Personally searched	39	27%	6	21%	33	29%	NS
Property searched (e.g. luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)	74	52%	11	39%	63	56%	NS
Documentation was questioned	14	10%	4	14%	9	8%	~
Removed shoes, belt, etc.	49	35%	4	14%	45	40%	~
Questioned about travel plans	17	12%	5	18%	12	11%	~
Put through metal detector	6	4%	0	0%	6	5%	~
Randomly selected	4	3%	2	7%	2	2%	~
Was questioned (various)	5	4%	2	7%	1	1%	~
Scanned/test for explosive materials	2	1%	0	0%	2	2%	~
Harassment/racism	1	1%	1	4%	0	0%	~
Other	17	12%	3	11%	12	11%	~
DK/NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	~
	142		28		112		
40. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?							
Yes	102	72%	18	64%	83	74%	NS
No	39	27%	10	36%	28	25%	
DK/NA	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	
	142	100%	28	100%	112	100%	
<i>Follow-up to 34c.</i>							
41. In the last four years, while passing through airport security in a foreign country other than the U.S., aside from the typical security checks that everyone goes through, did you ever get taken aside and given additional screening by foreign airport security personnel ?							
Yes	62	12%	15	11%	46	13%	NS
No	436	87%	117	89%	315	87%	
DK/NA	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	
	499	100%	132	100%	362	100%	
42. What was the nature of the additional screening?							
Personally searched	17	27%	4	27%	13	28%	~
Property searched (e.g. luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)	31	50%	9	60%	21	46%	NS
Documentation was questioned	5	8%	2	13%	3	7%	~
Removed shoes, belt, etc.	6	10%	2	13%	4	9%	~
Questioned about travel plans	4	6%	1	7%	3	7%	~

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.



	Total Sample		Comparison					p
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority			
			n	%	n	%		
Randomly selected	1	2%	1	7%	0	0%	~	
Was questioned (various)	4	6%	0	0%	3	7%	~	
Other	7	11%	2	13%	4	9%	~	
DK/NA	2	3%	0	0%	2	4%	~	
	62		15		46			
43. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?								
Yes	46	74%	9	60%	37	80%	NS	
No	16	26%	6	40%	9	20%		
DK/NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		
	62	100%	15	100%	46	100%		
47. While crossing the border into the another country other than the U.S. from Canada, aside from the typical checks at the border that everyone gets, did you receive additional screening by border officials ?								
Yes	23	5%	6	5%	17	5%	NS	
No	472	95%	126	95%	341	94%		
DK/NA	4	1%	0	0%	4	1%		
	499	100%	132	100%	362	100%		
48. What was the nature of the additional screening by U.S. border officials?								
Personally searched	3	13%	1	17%	2	12%	~	
Property searched (e.g. luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)	10	43%	4	67%	6	35%	~	
Documentation was questioned	6	26%	0	0%	6	35%	~	
Picture and fingerprint was taken	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	~	
Was taken to an office and questioned	2	9%	0	0%	2	12%	~	
Was questioned (various)	3	13%	3	50%	0	0%	~	
Other	5	22%	3	50%	2	12%	~	
DK/NA	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%	~	
	23		6		17			
49. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?								
Yes	15	65%	4	67%	11	65%	NS	
No	7	30%	2	33%	5	29%		
DK/NA	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%		
	23	100%	6	100%	17	100%		
<i>Follow-up to 34b and 34d.</i>								
44. While crossing the border Aside from the typical checks at the border that everyone gets, did you receive additional screening by U.S. border officials ?								
Yes	170	18%	44	20%	125	17%	NS	
No	790	82%	174	79%	608	82%		
DK/NA	7	1%	2	1%	5	1%		
	967	100%	220	100%	738	100%		
45. What was the nature of the additional screening?								
Personally searched	15	9%	5	11%	9	7%	NS	

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.

The *Anti-Terrorism Act* and Security Measures in Canada :
Public Views, Impacts and Travel Experiences

	Total Sample		Comparison				
	n	%	Minority		Non-minority		p
			n	%	n	%	
Property searched (e.g. luggage, handbag, computer, etc.)	81	48%	24	55%	56	45%	NS
Documentation was questioned	52	31%	14	32%	38	30%	NS
Picture and fingerprint was taken	3	2%	1	2%	2	2%	~
Was taken to an office and questioned	26	15%	8	18%	18	14%	NS
Criminal record/security background check	6	4%	2	5%	4	3%	~
Randomly selected	1	1%	1	2%	0	0%	~
Was questioned (various)	19	11%	6	14%	13	10%	NS
Screened for taxes/duty	3	2%	0	0%	3	2%	~
Harassment/racism	2	1%	1	2%	1	1%	~
Other	35	21%	10	23%	25	20%	NS
DK/NA	3	2%	1	2%	2	2%	~
	170		44		125		
46. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?							
Yes	86	51%	23	52%	63	50%	NS
No	83	49%	21	48%	61	49%	
DK/NA	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	
	170	100%	44	100%	125	100%	
RETURNING TO CANADA							
50. While crossing the border back into Canada from the U.S. or another country, aside from the typical checks at the border that everyone goes through, did you receive additional screening by Canadian border officials?							
Yes	91	8%	25	10%	65	8%	NS
No	986	89%	226	88%	751	89%	
DK/NA	31	3%	7	3%	24	3%	
	1108	100%	258	100%	840	100%	
51. What was the nature of the additional screening?							
Personally searched	8	9%	2	8%	5	8%	~
Property searched (e.g. luggage/handbag/computer/etc.)	50	55%	14	56%	35	54%	NS
Documentation was questioned	26	29%	8	32%	18	28%	NS
Picture and fingerprint was taken	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	~
Was taken to an office and questioned	12	13%	3	12%	9	14%	~
Was questioned (various)	4	4%	1	4%	3	5%	~
Screened for taxes/duty	2	2%	0	0%	2	3%	~
Harassment/racism	2	2%	2	8%	0	0%	~
Other	11	12%	4	16%	7	11%	~
DK/NA	3	3%	0	0%	3	5%	~
52. Do you think the additional screening was justified to ensure public safety?							
Yes	50	55%	13	52%	37	57%	NS
No	39	43%	12	48%	26	40%	
DK/NA	2	2%	0	0%	2	3%	
	91	100%	25	100%	65	100%	

NS = not significant; * p <.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001; ~ = not appropriate for analysis due to small n.