

Exploring Canadians' Attitudes Towards Safety and Security

Final Report

**FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS CANADA**

Project # OD160-053853/001/CY



March 2005

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	Research Methodology.....	3
3.0	Highlights	5
4.0	Views on Emergency Preparedness	7
5.0	Attitudes Towards Public Safety and Security	15
6.0	An American Perspective	29
7.0	Conclusions.....	37
	Appendix A: Moderator’s Guide for the Canadian Groups (English & French)	43
	Appendix B: Moderator’s Guide for the American Groups	63

1.0 Introduction

The public safety and security landscape in Canada and around the world has undergone dramatic changes since 2001. Indeed, since September 11, issues of safety and security have dominated many aspects of the public agenda in Canada.

To date, public opinion research has shown that Canadians lean strongly to seeing security as a pinnacle issue, one that is beginning to eclipse the more traditional goals of health and the environment. Further, despite lowered levels of perceived personal or national risk, the public increasingly leans towards a more, not less aggressive stance on security. Indeed, even as we move further away from September 11, the desire for a greater emphasis security continues to grow rather than recede.

It was within this context that the Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada (PSEPC) Portfolio was established in December 2003. As the Department responsible for protecting public safety and security, PSEPC is dedicated to minimizing potential risks to Canadians' health and safety, which may arise from a variety of sources, ranging from natural disasters to terrorist attacks. In fulfilling its mandate, part of PSEPC's role is to find the appropriate balance between ensuring the safety and security of the public and upholding the rights of all Canadians. Given this mandate, one crucial need of the Department is to have an assessment of the Canadian public's perceptions of personal risk and their attitudes towards measures taken to improve their safety and security.

PSEPC commissioned EKOS Research Associates in late Winter 2004 to undertake a qualitative research study to help the Government of Canada obtain an understanding of Canadians' views on emergency preparedness, safety, and security. The findings from this research initiative will enable PSEPC to tailor future messages to raise Canadians' awareness of the measures being taken to improve their safety and security. This report presents the findings from the focus groups EKOS undertook on behalf of PSEPC between January and March 2005.

2.0 Research Methodology

In order to gain insight into issues identified as being of importance to PSEPC's mandate, EKOS undertook a series of focus groups between January 26, 2005 and March 2, 2005.

- A total of 16 focus groups were conducted with the general public across Canada. Two groups were held in each of the following eight centres: Toronto, Windsor, Vancouver, Edmonton, Quebec City, Regina, Montreal, and Halifax. The focus groups in Quebec City and Montreal were conducted in French. Elsewhere, the focus groups were conducted in English.
- Participants in the Canadian focus groups were divided into two segments: visible minorities and "informed" Canadians¹. With the exception of Regina, one group was conducted with each of these two segments. In Regina, both focus groups involved the participation of "informed" Canadians.
- Two additional groups were conducted with Americans in Washington, D.C. These groups were conducted with "informed" Americans² and were segmented according to political affiliation (one group with self-identified Democrats and one group with self-identified Republicans).
- The groups lasted two hours and all but one was held in a dedicated focus group facility³. Canadian participants were offered an honorarium of \$50.00 for participating in the research. American participants were offered an honorarium of \$75.00, reflecting the going rate for participating in this type of research in Washington, D.C.

Moderator's guides were developed, in consultation with PSEPC, for the Canadian and the American focus groups. Quotes illustrating the key opinions and attitudes represented in the groups are shown throughout the report. The moderator's guides are included in Appendix A (Canadian groups) and Appendix B (American groups).

¹ This group was composed of Canadians of higher than average socioeconomic status and level of involvement/interest in public affairs. Given the separate focus groups with visible minorities, individuals of Arabic, West Asian, or South Asian descent were not included in these groups.

² These groups were composed of Americans of higher than average socioeconomic status and level of involvement/interest in public affairs.

³ The Windsor focus groups were held in a hotel meeting room because focus group facilities do not exist in this centre.

3.0 Highlights

- Canada is seen as most capable of handling an emergency/disaster with which we have experience; less confidence in ability to prepare for and react to new and unprecedented events (e.g., large scale earthquakes, terrorist attacks).
 - Frontline personnel (e.g., doctors, nurses, police, firefighters) most commonly associated with emergency/disaster response; federal response less recognized.
 - Personal levels of preparedness low to moderate; threats seen as either manageable or something that one cannot prepare for (e.g., nuclear attack).
 - However, high levels of interest in learning about how to prepare for an emergency/disaster.
- World is seen as a more dangerous place than in the past, and outside threats seen as potentially encroaching on the safety of Canada.
 - Though there is potential for terrorist attacks to occur, Canada is not really believed to be a target, especially when compared to the United States.
 - There is nonetheless support for measures aimed at protecting Canada from the threat of terrorism.
 - Neutrality, diversity, and tolerance regarded as the best way to insulate Canada from terrorism.
- Increased security measures seen as necessary given context of “changing world”.
 - Strong perception that Canada improved security following the attacks of September 11.
 - Despite low recognition of actual measures that have been taken, government believed to be doing a “good job” in the area of national security.
 - There exists support for greater measures, but within reason; racial profiling rejected outright as a security strategy.

4.0 Views on Emergency Preparedness

Most able to recall recent disasters/emergencies that have occurred in Canada...

For the most part, participants did not have any trouble pointing to examples of large-scale disasters or emergencies that have happened in Canada in recent years. Examples included mainly weather-related phenomenon, such as massive snowstorms, flooding, hurricanes, forest fires, avalanches, ice storms, as well as widespread hydroelectric failures and the SARS epidemic.

“We’ve been off the hook here [in British Columbia], but OUT East, they’ve been hit hard.”

Not surprisingly, top-of-mind responses tended to be incidents that took place in the participant’s region of the country. For example, participants in Ontario were quick to cite the power blackout that affected their province in the summer of 2003, whereas participants in Halifax would mention Hurricane Juan as an initial response. Similarly, participants in British Columbia thought of the recent mudslides, while those in Quebec tended to think of the flooding that had occurred in the Saguenay region.

Despite the fact that the top-of-mind images tended to focus on local events/incidents, when probed, participants across the country were also able to name most major events that have occurred in the rest of Canada in the recent past.

Participants able to evoke a range of possible disasters/emergencies...

When asked, participants were also able to name other types of potential disasters/emergencies that they thought could happen in Canada. Some focused on things that could occur naturally (e.g., earthquakes, floods, tsunamis, outbreak of a new disease), while others thought of manmade incidents (e.g., nuclear meltdowns, chemical spills, pipeline leaks). Concerns about the potential contamination of the blood, food or water supplies also figured prominently in participant’s responses.

Naturally, participants were initially more concerned with local risks and with things they felt could affect them. For example, many in the Toronto groups were worried about the nuclear power plants in Pickering: “Those reactors are getting pretty old. I wouldn’t be surprised if something happened there.” However, when pressed, participants came up with potential incidents that could happen outside their immediate area: “I’ve heard that they could be hit with a tsunami out West. Now that’s something to worry about.”

“Generally, you don’t prepare until it’s happened before – it’s human nature.”

In most groups, at least few participants included a terrorist attack on their initial list of potential disasters/emergencies. Probing on this subject revealed that others around the table also thought that a terrorist attack on Canadian soil was a real possibility. The same was true for cyber attacks; though not always a top-of-mind concern, when probed, many thought this was also very possible.

General sense that Canada is prepared to deal with disasters/emergencies that have occurred before...

“We can only be prepared for things that have happened before.”

There was a consensus among participants that Canada, including governments, non-governmental organizations and citizens are better prepared for and would react more effectively to disasters and emergencies with which the country has had “experience”. These include mainly weather related phenomenon, such as massive snowstorms, flooding, forest fires, and ice storms. However, many acknowledged that there are regional differences when it comes to dealing with certain things: “It depends on the local capacity. In Regina, we can easily deal with a snowfall. In Toronto, they have to call in the army.”

“I think the government is doing a good job; but we can only base it on disasters that have happened before.”

There was also a sense that Canada has learned from past emergencies/disasters: “We learn from what we’ve done before and from what others have done in similar situations.” There was the strong belief, particularly in Ontario, that some valuable lessons were learned from episodes like the SARS epidemic: “We’d be more prepared to deal with another outbreak of SARS because we’ve been there before.” Overall, many believed that having first hand knowledge of a situation is the best way to be prepared for an emergency or disaster.

“Government looks out for us – it’s their job.”

In contrast, Canada was assumed to be relatively ill prepared to cope with other rare or unprecedented disasters and emergencies. For example, many were unsure how something like a nuclear attack would be handled: “How prepared can you be for something like that?” There was also a strong belief that, regardless of what has happened in the past, Canada should still take precautions for things that could happen: “We should be prepared for even the worst case scenarios.” However, this was often coupled with the sense that you simply cannot prepare for everything: “Some things you can prepare for, other things you can’t. That’s just the way life is.”

“How could we be ready for an earthquake?”

“I assume that we are more prepared because we’ve learned from what’s happened before.”

“Governments are
steps further than they
were before
9/11.”

As for Canada’s preparedness to prevent or deal with a terrorist attack, many wavered, often noting that they lacked the information necessary to make a judgment: “I’m not really sure. We’ve never been attacked, so I guess we must be doing something right.” Others hoped that steps had been taken since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001: “I assume that governments have reserve funds for dealing with these types of things now.” In the end, most reiterated the view that Canada would have more difficulty dealing effectively with unprecedented events.

Frontline personnel dominate top-of-mind mentions for responding to disasters/emergencies...

Participants were asked to generate a list of groups, organizations, and agencies that might respond to a disaster or emergency. As could be expected, frontline personnel, such as fire departments, police, paramedics, doctors, nurses, city maintenance workers, and assorted municipal and provincial coordinating agencies were included on most lists. Of note is the fact that many participants accorded a large role to non-governmental organizations, such as the Red Cross: “They are always involved in [responding to] any kind of disaster. That is what they do.”

When probed more specifically about the federal government’s role in responding to emergencies/disasters, almost everyone mentioned the military (particularly the army) as the key player. The visible nature of the army’s activities in responding to many of Canada’s emergencies in recent years (e.g., the ice storm, floods) made them an obvious choice for many participants. Similarly, many in the groups cited the activities of the Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) following the tsunami in Southeast Asia as a topical example of the Canadian Forces role in responding to emergencies.

Probing here, as well as elsewhere in the discussions, also revealed that the military was assigned a key role in dealing with the threat of terrorism. The exact nature of this role was only vaguely defined by most participants, particularly as they began to ponder internal security responsibilities: “I’m not sure how exactly, but I know that they would have something to do with it.” Some noted that the military was probably tasked with patrolling the air and seas off of Canada’s coasts to prevent terrorists from infiltrating the counties, while others pointed to Canada’s role in Afghanistan as an example of the military working to prevent terrorism. Inevitably, a few participants in each group spoke of military under-funding and of the negative impact this likely has on Canada’s ability to deal with the threat of terrorism.

“With ‘Canada’ in the name, they [PSEPC] must be federal.”

“[PSEPC] should advertise more – make Canadians know that they are out there, protecting our safety.”

When asked in general terms about the existence of a federal department or agency with specific responsibilities in the event of an emergency or disaster, most were unable to think of any such organization: “If there is one, we’re not aware of them.” Indeed, very few participants had heard of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada (PSEPC), and even fewer were aware of who headed this agency. Similarly, no one explicitly linked other security organizations, like the RCMP, CSIS, or the Canadian Border Security Agency, to PSEPC.

“I’d imagine that they [PSEPC] would be involved in preventing terrorism somehow.”

“Like Canada’s version of homeland security.”

However, probing revealed that participant’s assumptions about PSEPC roles and responsibilities were generally in line with the activities of the Department. In fact, many assumed that PSEPC was involved in emergency planning and coordination, particularly with respect to other federal agencies and departments and junior levels of government. Some also imagined that PSEPC was involved conducting emergency/disaster simulations. While response to the knowledge that such an organization existed was very positive across all of the groups, many felt that low levels of awareness of PSEPC were a real detriment to the organization: “Canadians would feel more secure if they knew about this Department.” It would appear that PSEPC would benefit from raising its profile/visibility.

“If I knew more about [PSEPC], I’d feel better.”

Although most say they have thought about what to do in the event of an emergency/disaster, few have taken concrete steps to prepare...

“We can only prepare to a certain extent.”

Participants’ personal level of preparedness to deal with an emergency or disaster was low to moderate. Some, particularly in Toronto and Halifax, described how, in the aftermath of the blackout and Hurricane Juan, they had created an emergency response kit, usually consisting of non-perishable food, bottled water, candles, flashlights, batteries, matches, and sometimes a gas stove. A few had even bought gas-powered electrical generators or kept a bag of clothes and some supplies packed in their car in the event that they needed to evacuate on short notice. Reinforcing some of the communications challenges involved in encouraging Canadians to prepare, a number of the participants who indicated that they had taken steps to prepare, admitted that they had not revisited their preparations/plans in a number of years (i.e., they did not know if what they had packed was still useful or in good order).

“You hope it won’t happen, so you don’t prepare for it.”

Although a few participants indicated that they had done some things, most admitted that they had done little to prepare for an emergency, besides having a few candles around the house. They explained that they simply did not see a compelling need to prepare, given that they felt “secure” in Canada and that the most likely forms of emergencies (e.g., snow storms, power failures, flooding) were usually short-lived and something they could cope with relatively easily. Interestingly, visible minority participants, particularly recent immigrants to Canada, would share stories about how being prepared for disasters/emergencies (e.g., earthquakes, conflict and war, water contamination) was a “way of life” in their home countries. However, now that they live in Canada, they do not feel that there are any imminent or serious threats for which they need to be prepared.

“Perceived threats versus real threats – now that’s the issue.”

Another factor explaining the limited steps taken to prepare for emergencies was a strong sense among many participants that it was unlikely that they would personally be directly affected by a disaster/emergency. Accordingly, some felt that there was no use devoting a lot of time preparing for these types of events: “I am not going to live my life, day-to-day, thinking about this kind of stuff.” A few participants went so far as to suggest that there are some things, particularly acts of terrorism, which you simply cannot prepare for: “Things like 9/11 – you can’t be ready for something like that.”

Despite their relatively low level of preparedness, or perhaps because of it, most participants expressed a desire to have information that would tell them how to prepare for a range of emergencies. The Internet was identified as the source that most participants would turn to first for this type of information, and many indicated that they had visited a Government of Canada website. Quite a few participants were also familiar with the Government’s 1-800-O-Canada general information telephone number, but few had called it.

5.0 Attitudes Towards Public Safety and Security

Mixed reactions to safety of neighbourhoods...

In order to get participants to start thinking about how things may or may not have changed since September 11, 2001, they were first asked about whether or not they felt that their neighbourhoods had become more or less safe over the past few years. Generally speaking, participants were divided; while some believed that things were no different, others felt that their neighbourhood was more dangerous than in the past. Overall, the perceived safety of neighbourhoods was based mostly on an assessment of local (e.g., break-ins, drugs, and organized crime) rather than global risks (e.g., terrorism, war).

General sense that the world has become a more dangerous place...

“[The attacks] opened my eyes to a world of issues/Middle East issues.”

As might be expected, the perceptions of changes to the safety of participant’s neighbourhoods were seen through a different lens than the discussion of the world. Consistent with the findings of the *Security Monitor*, most participants felt that the world has become “more dangerous” than in the recent past. The tragic events of September 11 and the response of the United States (e.g., Afghanistan and the on-going conflict in Iraq) were the most obvious indication that the world has changed, and for the worse. Some felt that an ideological and/or religious rift was taking place, with the United States juxtaposing the fundamentalist Islamic world against Western interests and values. Indeed, quite a few felt that the United States, and George Bush in particular, were a leading cause of instability and conflict in the world: “Global society is at greater risk because of the political response of the U.S.” This was coupled with the commonly held belief that, given the results of the recent U.S. election, things could get even worse over the next four years.

It is also important to note that many people suggested that the world was no more dangerous than before, but that heightened awareness of conflict made the world appear to be more dangerous to people: “The world has shrunk. We are more aware of what goes on in other parts of the world, especially in the Middle East. We can see more easily how things relate to each other and to us.” Nonetheless, the prevailing sense was that there was a great deal of instability in the world, and this was troubling to participants. Others pointed to the need for a more nuanced answer, suggesting that, while some threats may be down (e.g., the Cold War, security in Ireland), others are up (e.g., terrorism around the world, Iraq).

In comparison, Canada seen as safer, but not invulnerable...

In the context of an increasingly dangerous world, Canada was felt by most to be at least as safe as it was a few years ago. Inevitably, comparisons to the United States were made that reinforced this sense: "Canada is safer than the U.S, that's for sure. You can raise a family here." Similar to the quantitative research in this area, the perceived safety of Canada was seen as largely unchanged, and leaned perhaps to being even safer than in the past. In fact, some indicated that the enhanced security measures they saw at points of entry and some government buildings allowed them to feel safer than before: "New projects, like more security at airports, have made Canada safer."

It should also be noted that Canada's very proximity to the United States was a concern to some, largely reflecting the sense that terrorism is now something that could potentially happen in this country: "We're a target just because we have a relationship with the U.S." Indeed, many expressed concerns that, in the current global context, Canada was de facto a more dangerous place to live than it was in the past.

Perceived risk of terrorist attacks obviously greater in the United States, though concerns about Canada still exist...

Similar to the findings of the *Security Monitor*, the perceived likelihood of a terrorist attack was seen as much higher in the United States than in Canada. Given current American foreign policy, most expected that there was, at the very least, a 50 per cent chance that the United States would suffer a terrorist attack within its borders at some point over the next two years: "We know from the Bin Laden tapes that the U.S. is still a target." On the other hand, the chances of Canada suffering a similar fate were deemed much lower: "[Canada] is not a target in the same way the U.S. is." Many estimated that the risk for Canada was somewhere between zero and 20 per cent, with most pegging the odds at no more than one in 10. A few, however, were aware that Osama Bin Laden had also identified Canada as a potential target, and this raised their level of concern.

"In the back of our minds, we know it is something that could happen here."

"George Bush has made enemies."

For the most part, it was felt that, if Canada were to be affected by terrorism, it would likely be indirectly. For example, some thought that Canada could be used as a staging point for an attack in the United States. Related to this was the possibility that accidental victimization could occur: "You could have a guy going across the bridge into Detroit with a huge bomb and it goes off here." Some, particularly those living along the international border, felt that they could suffer collateral damage from an attack in the U.S.: "If they were to attack that nuclear plant outside of Detroit, I don't think the radiation would stop at the border."

"There are likelier targets than Canada."

"Canada is more accepting of origin."

One of the key findings of the research was the widely held view that Canada's best defence against a terrorist attack lies much more with its foreign policy than it does with anti-terrorist security measures. Participants agreed that Canada was not a prime target for terrorists because the Government's foreign policy, particularly the decision not to join the United States' "Coalition of the Willing" in the war against Iraq: "We didn't go to Iraq – that alone makes us safer." Some participants drew comparisons with Spain, which they felt had suffered a terrorist attack (i.e., the train bombings in Madrid) because of its support of the American efforts in Iraq.

"Canada is not a target because we still have a good reputation around the world."

More broadly, people felt that Canada's international reputation as peacemaking and multicultural society also lessened its potential as a target: "Tolerance, diversity and accepting others is the best way to prevent terrorism." Sharp contrasts were drawn between what most characterized as Canada's quasi-"neutral" and America's neo-colonial and belligerent foreign policy: "We don't rock the boat."

Uncertainty regarding level of preparedness for a potential terrorist attack...

When specifically prompted to do so, participants were able to visualize potential terrorist targets within Canada (e.g., the Parliament buildings, the CN tower, the upcoming Olympics in Vancouver, bombs in major cities, power supplies across the country, border checkpoints, urban transport systems). However, as with the earlier discussion on Canada's level of preparedness for unprecedented events, most had a hard time judging whether or not they felt that Canada would be prepared for these types of incidents: "Can you really prepare for something like that?"

Similarly, few were able to say whether they thought they would personally be directly affected by an attack on Canadian soil: “Depends. If it’s water contamination, then yes, probably.” Others felt that it was a distinct possibility that they could be affected: “Who knows? You could just end up in the wrong place, wrong time.” Most, however, felt that, if they were affected, it would be indirectly (e.g., hearing about it through someone else, seeing it unfold on television).

Within this context, some also raised the potential for “home-grown terrorism”. Similar to the findings of the *Security Monitor*, quite a few participants thought that it was possible that terrorists had slipped through our borders and were operating in Canada. Some were even under the mistaken impression that the September hijackers had primarily come from Canada: “Most of the September 11 terrorists lived in and passed through Canada.” However, some also suggested that terrorists or a terrorist organization could evolve within Canada (e.g., the FLQ crisis), and it was apparent that participants accepted the possibility that terrorists could include Canadian-born.

Many things believed to have changed since the attacks of September 11...

There was general sense among participants that the world was simply a different place following the attacks against the United States on September 11. Accordingly, many things were seen to have changed in Canada as well. For participants, the perceived enhancement of security measures across the country was the most obvious change to have occurred. Increased security at the airports, particularly stricter screening measures, featured prominently in participant’s responses: “There is better checking of luggage and documents now.” In fact, airport security was indisputably the most recognized security measure the federal government had taken since the attacks of September 11.

There was also a belief that the police and security agencies had a more pronounced role to play in Canada, as elsewhere, in a post-September 11 world. It was assumed by most that the Government of Canada had likely increased police budgets to investigate terrorist threats. Some also felt that police were perhaps using existing powers more frequently, as opposed to making use of new powers: “There is more police now and they are being given more training.”

"[Americans] see us as bleeding heart liberals."

Canada's relationship to the United States was also seen as having changed since the attacks. Some suggested that ties between the two countries had been strained, mainly because of Canada's decision not to join the Americans in Iraq. Many, particularly those in Western Canada, thought that, because of decisions like these, Canada was being punished by the United States. For those who held this view, this was most clearly exemplified by the ongoing trade embargos on Canadian beef: "This is just payback."

"I have no sense of the checks and balances, but it would be foolish to entirely trust the system."

Some participants also voiced concerns about the restriction of personal freedoms because of September 11. More specifically, the rights of visible minorities were seen as particularly subject to infringement: "Right after 9/11, I think that certain races were viewed differently." Further, similar to what we have seen in the *Security Monitor*, concerns about privacy were heightened, particularly with respect to personal privacy versus the privacy of others: "On the one hand, we want to protect our privacy, but at the same time, we want to know others' business." In the end, however, many participants said they were willing to give up certain safeguards if it would improve security: "If it guarantees my safety, then they can do whatever."

"People don't feel as secure as they did prior to 9/11."

Participants also felt that they, like other Canadians, had changed following the September 11 attacks, and had perhaps become more cosmopolitan in outlook: "We are more aware of the outside world now. We know the differences between different cultures and ethnicities." There was also a sense, however, that Canadians were more fearful than they were before the attacks: "We're more alert, more paranoid because of what happened on September 11." Because of this fear, many participants felt that Canadians were more willing "accept anything in the name of security". Although this notion bothered many participants, they nonetheless thought that most of the changes in security were warranted.

"I have blind faith that the government is doing something here; they are taking care of us."

In light of these perceived changes, participants were asked how they thought the government was doing in the area of national security. Consistent with the quantitative findings, most participants in the groups agreed that, from what they knew, the Government of Canada had generally done "good job" in responding to the threat of terrorism. Some pointed out that Canada seemed to be taking a different approach to security than the United States, and took comfort in this: "I'm glad we're not overreacting like the Americans."

"How are they [police] supposed to make things safer if they can't invade your privacy?"

"We're next door to the 'invincibles'. Who is going to touch them? But guess what? They did."

"I am sure that appropriate resources are going to the problem, but I am not sure if it's being done in an efficient manner."

There were others, however, who felt that they did not have enough information to make a judgment: “I haven’t heard anything about the government’s accomplishments in this area.” As such, many participants expressed a desire to know more, not only about what the government is doing, but also about the types of threats that exist. Many noted that they would feel more comfortable if they knew how issues of public safety and security were being addressed, and it was felt that greater transparency in this area would serve to make the government more accountable.

“Whatever steps they are taking, I hope they are well thought out.”

Though awareness of legislative changes is low, reaction to specific examples is generally positive...

Despite acknowledging a number of changes that have occurred in Canada since September 11, few, if any, participants mentioned changes to legislation. In fact, most guessed that there had not been legal changes or additions made in the aftermath of the attacks. Rather, it was assumed that the Government had generally just “beefed-up” security in Canada. Participants nonetheless expressed a great deal of interest in knowing about some of the legislative changes that had been made.

Reaction to specific examples of changes was generally positive (in the sense that they seemed appropriate given the perceived threat), with only a few participants voicing outright opposition. Most, however, did have some concerns about aspects of the legislative changes and everyone had questions. At the most positive end of the spectrum, people said that their understanding of the legislation “comforted” them, as it indicated that the government was taking action in addition to the obvious security measures implemented at airports and border crossings. They also tended to express relatively little concern that the new laws would be abused or undermine civil liberties.

As noted, strenuous opposition was rare. When it did surface, it tended to come from sophisticated participants who had been following the issues more than most. For some, opposition was based mainly on the view that the legislative changes were symptomatic of what they considered to be the “Republicanization” of Canada; a combination of cow towing to the Americans and the military-industrial complex lobby, coupled with a gradual move to a “law and order” society and concomitant undermining of civil liberties. Others, particularly visible minorities, worried a great deal about the potential for abuse by the police, especially with respect to Muslims and people of Middle Eastern heritage.

“I’m not sure about the checks and balances...”

In terms of the specific measures examined, the power to detain without warrant (“preventative arrests”) stood out as a significant measure, evoking in some images of dictatorships and George Orwell’s *1984*: “This seems a bit extreme, doesn’t it?” Despite concerns, this power was deemed acceptable by most because of the prominent role played by the judiciary and from the knowledge that this measure had only been used once: “As long as it isn’t just up to the police. The judge can act as a safeguard here.” Many also noted that that the requirement to present evidence before a judge as soon as possible, would help to ensure that people are not detained indefinitely. On this last point, however, a few explained how they had difficulty reconciling what they now knew of the law with media stories of people being detained without charge for significant periods of time.

“You said that it had only been used once. Well, that tells me that they aren’t abusing it.”

The Advanced Passenger Information System was also deemed by most to be reasonable, but some concern was expressed and questions asked about whether or not the data was being collected systematically (i.e., all flights or just some). More significantly, many wanted to know whether Government security officials would scan the lists with profiles in mind (i.e., ethnic profiling) or simply compare the passenger lists with their own internal lists of people know or suspected to be involved in terrorist activity. Most were uncomfortable with the broad profiling approach.

In essence, support for the increased security measures appears to be based on the following four factors:

“I think that these changes are reasonable, given the context.”

1. *Potentially dire consequences*: While the risk of a terrorist attack within Canada was seen as relatively low, the consequences of a successful major attack (e.g., against a nuclear power plant) were understood to be so dire as to warrant measures, legislative and otherwise, that might seem unnecessary, overly expensive and burdensome to some: “Better safe than sorry I say.” “We don’t want to be saying: ‘If only we had done this or that.’”
2. *U.S.-Canada relations*: Participants, particularly those living in close proximity to the Canada-U.S. border, viewed the maintenance of Canada-U.S. relations as important, mainly for obvious economic and trade reasons. Given that Canada had not joined the U.S. in Iraq and appeared unlikely to join in missile defence, there was a pragmatic acceptance that it behoved Canada to enhance its internal security. Moreover, while participants did not view Canada as a primary target for a terrorist attack, people did consider it to be a jumping off point for terrorists bent on staging an attack south of the border: “We may not be a target, but the Americans are, so we owe it to them to do what we can up here to try to stop those people, like the guy who had a bomb in his car on the way to L.A. Airport.”

“We increased out security because of what happened on 9/11. If we didn’t, we’d be accused of letting in terrorists.”

3. *General sense of trust:* Security and law enforcement agencies are generally trusted to do “what is right”. That said, there was an underlying concern among some participants about “bad apples”. While many participants believe that “bad apples” can exist in any organization, it is far more troubling to think about the potential for these types of individuals in security and law enforcement agencies given the immense powers that they wield. It is noteworthy that, at the time of the focus groups, there was considerable media coverage of the firing of the Edmonton Chief of Police over alleged involvement in an incident where officers had targeted a journalist who was known to be an outspoken critic of the police. Overall, however, most participants assumed that security and law enforcement agencies would not abuse their powers.

4. *Existing concerns are global, not specific:* A more subtle reason for support, or lack of opposition, may lie in the abstract and philosophical nature of the legislations’ potential long-term impacts on civil liberties and rights. In this sense, for example, few spoke about principles or the legislations’ potential for undermining basic Canadian values. Rather concern centered on the pragmatic considerations of implementation, specifically of arrests without warrants, potential for police abuse, the importance of judicial oversight and public accountability. Despite existing concerns, however, most participants tended to believe that there had been a better balance between civil liberties and national security in Canada than there had been in the United States.

Overall, the vast majority of people thought the legislative changes were that had occurred since September 11 were a “necessary evil”, warranted by the Government’s responsibility to prevent a terrorist attack at home and in the United States. At the same time, few were willing to give the Government and law enforcement agencies a blank check in this regard, and wanted safeguards and accountability to help ensure that mistakes and abuse were kept to a minimum: “These new powers seem reasonable, but it will depend on how they are applied.”

Strong sense of eroding personal privacy...

Before participants were asked to consider some of the specific changes that have occurred in Canada since September 11, 2001, there was a brief discussion of personal privacy. Consistent with EKOS' own research in this area, most participants believed that there had been an erosion of their privacy, stemming from factors such as the proliferation of new technologies (e.g., the Internet) and the use of personal information (e.g., by telemarketers). And while the privacy implications of many of the measures that have been put in place were difficult to visualize/fully assess, participants nonetheless tended to assume that their privacy had somehow been eroded over this timeframe.

It is important to take into consideration that privacy is an area where attitudes are very complex and context driven. Thus, given the complexity of these issues and the brevity of the discussion devoted to the subject matter, it was felt that it would not be appropriate to draw more conclusive findings.

Some support for increasing security measures under certain circumstances...

Most participants indicated that they were cautiously open to the possibility of granting security agencies increased power through additional legislative changes: "I wouldn't say no without hearing what they have in mind first."

The desire on the part of the Government to modernize communication intercept laws to include new technologies like the Internet and cellular phones was provided as an example of a potential legislative change. Initial reaction was sometimes mixed, as many participants wondered if updating this law would allow police to systematically monitor Internet activity. Other participants were often quick to counter, pointing out that a warrant was required in order to monitor communications. Once this point was understood, almost everyone expressed support for amending the relevant legislation, particularly in an effort to fight child pornography: "Update it. We need to keep up with the criminals."

Racial profiling stands out as the most controversial area of discussion...

“On what basis do they decide to invade your privacy? If its because you have a Muslim-sounding name, then that’s not fair.”

If some of the more subtle and lofty potential ramifications of changes since September 11 appeared to be lost on many participants, the potential negative impacts of racial profiling were not. Indeed, this segment of the focus groups often produced the most discussion. In short, the idea of singling out individuals with certain characteristics for additional security-related scrutiny was rejected outright by almost everyone: “Country of origin should not create suspicion, and neither should religious background.”

Many argued that such an approach was tantamount to state sanctioned racism, and as such, was simply unacceptable: “You’ve got to draw the line somewhere. I was okay with stuff until this point.” While most felt that racial profiling was an unfortunate fact of life, particularly with respect to city police forces, the crucial difference between that and what was perceived to have been occurring across Canada since the attacks against the United States lay in the fact that racial profiling was a product of individual perceptions and decision-making, not an approach that was endorsed and imparted by law enforcement and security agencies: “Look, there’s a big difference between a racist cop harassing me because I’m a black man, and having it [be a] part of the official way of doing things.”

Other participants rejected the approach primarily on the grounds that it would not be effective, because “a terrorist can be anyone”. In the end, many participants suggested that if security agencies wanted to increase the scrutiny given to some people, they should simply raise the level of scrutiny for all: “If they want to ask the Muslim guy in front of me more questions, fine. But they should ask me the same ones too.”

It should be noted that the focus groups reinforce the findings of the *Security Monitor* in that racial profiling is something that causes concern among the Canadian public. However, the quantitative findings also suggest that some (albeit declining) support for ethnic profiling does exist. While some focus group participants did express their views, it is worth noting that views on this subject may have been muted given the social psychology of the group setting (i.e., participants do not want to appear to hold socially undesirable or racist views).

“Because of September 11 we’ve all been conditioned to think that terrorists come from certain countries or are only people from certain backgrounds, and that’s just not true.”

“I don’t believe that people of particular nationalities should be singled out. If security measures were good enough, all people would be checked equally.”

6.0 An American Perspective

Overview

As witnessed throughout the Canadian focus groups, any discussion of national security and public safety inevitably turns to the topic of Canada's relationship to the United States. Indeed, it is within this context that most participants frame their attitudes about issues of safety and security. In light of the strong preoccupation with the United States, it was important to explore some of the same issues with Americans and to probe them about their attitudes towards Canada in this area.

In order to get a preliminary sense of what some of these attitudes might be, two focus groups were held with Americans in Washington, D.C. Given the current political divisions within the United States, the groups were segmented according to self-identified affiliation with either the Democratic or the Republican national parties. It should be noted that, the findings from this portion of the study are by no means conclusive. Nonetheless, they provide a good initial overview of the some of the attitudes that exist about Canada in the area of national security, and should be helpful in shaping future research.

Imagery/Broad Perceptions

Before getting into the topic of national security, the discussion began with top-of-mind imagery and perceptions of Canada (in order to test untainted views). A significant number of participants based their perceptions on travels to Canada (albeit not necessarily recently). Despite having an appreciation of current tensions between the two countries, participants had decidedly positive views of Canada (although some negative imagery did arise).

- Top-of-mind images included "friend"/"ally"/"economic partner"/"neighbour"; the terms "liberal", "tolerant" and "peaceful" also frequently evoked.
- Some negative associations as well (e.g., "draft dodgers", "free-riders" in reference to national defence/national security).

Surprisingly, participants also had a good appreciation of Canada-U.S. relations. Overall, Democratic participants tended to have a more positive evaluation of Canada, whereas Republican supporters tended to be slightly more critical.

- The economic and trade relationship (e.g., lumber, energy, wheat, automobiles) stood out as being particularly salient to participants.
- Other issues of importance ranged from things like health care and prescription drugs to educations and the environment.

"[Canada] is caught somewhere between European sensibility and U.S. policy."

"[Canada] is struggling for independence, but [they are] dependent on us for trade and defence."

- While not necessarily rated as the most important, security issues (e.g., borders, terrorism, missile defence, immigration, the “War on Terror”) were also commonly cited as a key issue among Democrats and Republicans alike.

The Post-September 11 World

“Before 9/11, most Americans were sleepwalking.”

While many participants felt that the world had become “more dangerous” following the attacks of September 11, 2001, others insisted that things had not really changed. Rather, it was suggested that everyone just had a different outlook: “We are just more aware now.” Interestingly, some participants suggested that the United States had been “naive before 9/11”, and that the attacks just made Americans aware of what others around the world (e.g., those in Europe and the Middle East) have already experienced. This greater appreciation of world events in the Washington groups was also evident in the earlier Canadian focus groups.

Despite uncertainty regarding whether or not things had become more dangerous, there was almost a virtual consensus that it was “very likely” that the United States would be attacked again in the next couple of years (even though no events of any significance had occurred since September 11). Participants felt that a wide range of attacks were possible (e.g., suicide bombers, water contamination, economic attack, bombs on public transit). Some things, however, were considered far less possible than others (e.g., nuclear attack was regarded as fairly unlikely).

“Homeland security is a joke.”

As for whether or not the United States would be prepared for another attack, the opinions of participants were strongly divided:

- Republicans tended to take the view that the United States was “more prepared than last time.”
- Democrats, on the other hand, were far more critical, suggesting that the United States would only be prepared for something that has already happened (e.g., another attack using airplanes). This is very similar to the position adopted by most in the Canadian groups.

While all participants recognized the need for greater security measures, those in the Democrat group tended to feel that current measures threatened civil liberties. Even some Republican participants agreed that “some stupid things” had been introduced to fight terrorism (e.g., reporting suspicious things about your neighbours).

“Bush tells us that it is more dangerous.”

“American priorities have changed because of September 11.”

“We’re spending money left, right, and centre.”

Low awareness of assistance provided by Canada following September 11...

“Canada
would help us
out...”

Although there was little initial recollection of the assistance Canada provided the United States following the events of September 11, after probing, a number of participants remembered some of what Canada had done (e.g., diversion of airplanes, increased cooperation at the border).

“[Canada]
would help
out for any
reasonable
need.”

Despite low awareness levels of specific efforts, participants still felt that Canada could be relied upon for assistance. Most participants thought that Canada would do anything “within its capacity” to help in the event of another attack/disaster (e.g., would offer health care treatment). As might be expected, there was a stronger sense that Canada would be much more involved in assisting with an emergency near the Canada/U.S. border (i.e., as opposed to an event that occurred deeper south).

Still, others criticized Canada, saying that any offer of help would be more “lip service” than actual assistance. Some indicated that they believed that Canada would only be willing to do things deemed “reasonable” by their standards. For instance, many participants cited Iraq as an example of how Canada is not willing to help the United States when it goes against Canadian principles. There was also recognition that Canada’s role would be limited given its smaller size, and more limited capacity.

No consensus on U.S. response to threat of terrorism...

“We’ve spent a
lot of money
on colour
codes and
duct tape.”

Unlike the Canadian groups, most participants in Washington were highly cognizant of the major changes that the United States had taken since September 11 to improve national security (e.g., Patriot Act, Department of Homeland Security). As for whether or not these changes had been appropriate, there was little consensus between participants (with striking differences between the Democrat and Republican participants).

“We’ve tightened
security.”

- Democrats tended to be more likely to criticize the effectiveness of the measures that had been taken: “The Department of Homeland security...is in disarray.”

A particularly interesting finding was that, many participants felt that, compared to other countries, America was behind in terms of its national security efforts. Indeed, many described the security measures taken in since September 11 as the United States “playing catch up” to other countries who have been dealing with these issues long beforehand (e.g., Israel seen as taking steps to address threats for decades, European countries have had strict security at airports for a long time).

Canada's Security Response

"[Canada] has a strong reliance on the U.S. when it comes to security."

Most participants felt that, from what they knew, Canada had a fairly balanced response to national security. While there had been comments among some participants about Canada not taking the military seriously enough, there were no top-of-mind perceptions where Canada was seen as negligent on the national security front.

Broadly speaking, it was felt that Canada takes security seriously, but there was also recognition that Canada has different threats/risks than the United States: "[Canada] has very few enemies." As a result, participants expected that Canada would have a different balance of actions to risks. For some participants, this meant that there was not the same urgency as in the United States to act on national security.

Canada's immigration policy was the one area that many participants, regardless of political affiliation, cited as being problematic. This is supported by the findings in the *Security Monitor*, which indicates that immigration may be a growing area of tension between Canada and the United States. While opposition to immigration has reached a record low in Canada, a growing majority of Americans believes that there are too many immigrants coming to their country. In fact, most in the Washington groups suggested that the United States has its own problems related to immigration.

Canada not a "safe haven for terrorists" ...

Consistent with the findings noted previously, Canada was not seen as a "safe haven for terrorists" (a view often put forward in the American media). Some participants suggested that there are always threats when you live in a free and democratic country, but that this would apply to both the United States and Canada. Equally important, some interpreted "safe haven" as making it easy for terrorists to stay within the country – in the way that Osama Bin Laden may have been able to stay within certain countries. These participants said that you simply could not compare these types of countries to a free and democratic society such as Canada.

One of the most interesting findings of the American groups related to a question about where participants thought that terrorists in the United States were most likely to have originated. Participants were read four possibilities: coming directly into the United States from a variety of countries around the world, coming from within the United States (e.g., "home grown" terrorism, "sleeper cells"), crossing the Canada-United States border, or crossing the Mexico-United States border.

"I've never thought that Canada would be a target."

Overwhelmingly, participants saw the greatest threat as coming either from terrorists entering the United States through Mexico or those already within the United States. No participants identified entry from Canada as being the greatest threat.

Little awareness of Canada-U.S. cooperation, but impressed by discussion of current efforts...

Not surprisingly, most of the participants knew little or nothing about the specific initiatives where the Canadian and American governments have been working together on the national security front.

After being told about some of these initiatives, most participants were impressed. In fact, some participants felt that some of these initiatives addressed weaknesses within the United States itself, including port security. Overall, these measures were seen as being practical and dealing with some of the real issues facing security in the United States. Looking forward, most participants viewed the joint initiatives (current and future) through a generally positive lens.

7.0 Conclusions

The Bottom Line – Emergency Preparedness

Although awareness of emergency preparedness measures is low, there is a general sense of types of emergencies/disasters that have and could happen.

- Very limited awareness of PSEPC. When asked, department assumed to be involved in planning/coordination, and possibly conducting emergency/disaster simulations. The Armed Forces seen as being at the centre of federal role.
- No connections were made between PSEPC and the six agencies that report to Public Safety Minister (e.g., RCMP, CSIS, and CBSA).

There were mixed views regarding Canada's level of preparedness for emergencies/disasters.

- General sense that country/governments are more prepared than in the past. This perception is based primarily on the belief that Canadians in general have become more aware of the potential for disasters to strike as opposed to first-hand knowledge. Consensus on reacting more effectively to disasters/emergencies with which we have had "experience" (e.g., weather-related disaster, power blackout).
- In contrast, assumed to be relatively ill prepared to cope with rare or unprecedented disasters/emergencies (e.g., earthquakes, nuclear accidents, terrorism). Similarly unprepared for really large-scale events (e.g., whole province rather than one city).

Despite low levels of personal preparedness, significant interest in learning how to prepare for such events. Internet is seen as key vehicle for obtaining such information.

- A key challenge for PSEPC is that the perceived low likelihood of being directly affected by a disaster/emergency makes it less likely for individuals to follow through and become informed on how to prepare for such events.

The Bottom Line — Public Safety and Security

Findings mirror the results from EKOS' ongoing Security Monitor study. That is, we are living in a more threatening world today and support for action far outweighs the opposition. Overall, strong lean to seeing the Government of Canada's response to the threat of terrorism as being both appropriate and necessary.

Strong lean towards seeing the world as having become more dangerous.

- The 9/11 attacks and the ongoing situation in Iraq are the most obvious indications of this trend. Serious concerns that U.S. foreign policy, and George Bush in particular, are the leading causes of instability and conflict in the world.

Canada viewed much differently.

- Perceived safety of Canada largely unchanged from a few years ago, although some concern that country is becoming more dangerous exists (largely reflecting the fact that terrorism is something that does happen today).
- Improved security measures at points of entry and in some government buildings enhance feelings of safety.

The perceived likelihood of a new terrorist attack in the U.S. high, but considered far less likely on domestic soil.

- American foreign policy is thought to be largely behind the perceived high likelihood of another terrorist attack on the U.S.
- There is a widely held view that Canada's best defence against a terrorist attack lies much more with its foreign policy than it does with anti-terrorism/security measures.
- The chances of Canada suffering a similar fate deemed to be much lower (although some concern exists). Rather, it is felt that if Canada were to be affected, it would be indirectly (e.g., Canada as a staging point for an attack on the U.S.).
- Some concern about the potential for "home grown terrorism"; "terrorism" not seen as only an al-Qaeda/Muslim extremist problem (e.g., FLQ crisis, Oklahoma bombers, religious right).

Canada seen as having changed in many ways since the September 11th attacks.

- While awareness of legislative changes was very low/non-existent, there was a strong perception that the Government had "beefed-up" security to deal with new threats (e.g., enhanced security at points of entry, police given more powers), as well as police using existing powers more frequently, as opposed to making use of new powers.
- For many, airport security is the personification of federal measures to date.
- Relations with U.S. having seen as having deteriorated.

For the most part, the legislative changes were seen as necessary (although there are those who do not hold this view).

- Regarded as a “necessary evil” in today’s world, warranted by the Government’s responsibility to protect Canadians and to help prevent a terrorist attack either at home or in the United States.
- Reaction to specific examples of some of these changes was generally positive, with only a few vocal participants expressing outright opposition. Discussion of examples, however, leads to questions/desire for clarification about these changes.
- At the same time, this is not a blank check. Rather, safeguards/recourse mechanisms are seen as critical. Prominent role of judiciary and knowledge that new measures have been used with restraint is comforting – key to acceptance.

Support for increased security measures, including anti-terrorism legislation, appears to be based on four factors.

- Potentially dire consequences: Consequences of a successful attack (e.g., against a nuclear power plant) serious enough to warrant measures, legislative and otherwise.
- Canada-U.S. Relations: Given that Canada had not joined the U.S. in Iraq and that, to date, there has been no commitment on missile defence, there was a pragmatic acceptance that it behoves Canada to enhance its internal security.
- General sense of trust: Law enforcement and security agencies generally trusted to do “what is right”. Despite having “trust” in the organizations, some concern about the “bad apples” that can exist.
- Concerns that exist are not global, but specific: Concern centered on the pragmatic considerations of implementation (e.g., arrests without warrants, potential for police abuse, importance of judicial oversight, public accountability), and not on the potential for a general undermining basic Canadian values.

Overall, there is conditional support for increased powers (e.g., changes to lawful access legislation). Support increase once provisions of law are understood, reinforcing the importance of emphasizing safeguards, role of judiciary, extremely limited use.

“Racial-profiling” is an extremely sensitive issue, and considered unacceptable (although not a universally held view).

- Singling out individuals with certain characteristics for additional security-related scrutiny is rejected by most; viewed as outright racism if the same level of scrutiny is not applied to everyone equally. Also viewed as not being particularly effective.

The Bottom Line – The American Perspective

As might be expected, Canada is simply not on the American participants’ radar in relation to national security.

- The large number of participants who had completely forgotten about the different ways in which Canada had helped the United States following the September 11 attacks exemplified this point.

While there was very limited awareness of what Canada has been doing on the national security front, participants did not share the same views as some American media (e.g., that Canada is a “safe haven for terrorists”).

- In fact, for the most part, views of Canada lean positive, although there is appreciation of some of the irritants (e.g., military, missile defence).
- At the same time, there is recognition that the United States has its own challenges with national security.

While not having given the issue much thought before the focus groups, virtually all participants believe that Canada takes national security seriously. However, participants acknowledged the fact that Canada is likely facing different threats than the United States. As a result, Canada was thought to have a different set of responses.

- The initiatives that have been undertaken are also seen positively and reassuring for most participants.
- The key challenge is that there is virtually no awareness.

**Appendix A: Moderator's Guide for the Canadian Groups
(English & French)**

PSEPC FOCUS GROUPS

Exploring Canadians Attitudes Towards Safety and Security

Note to reader: the use of legal language in this guide has been minimized to allow for better understanding of the issues among respondents from a variety of backgrounds.

Introduction (5 minutes)

- Purpose of the discussion: groups are being conducted on behalf of the Government of Canada.
- Explanation of format and “ground rules”:
 - Discussions are being audio taped and observed by members of the research team. Your comments will remain confidential.
 - Please try to speak one at a time.
 - There aren’t any right or wrong answers to the things we’ll be talking about — we’re just looking for your honest opinions.
 - It’s okay to disagree. Please speak up even if you think you’re the only one who feels a certain way about an issue. It’s also okay, though, if you change your mind based on things you hear or new information.
 - Moderator’s role: raise issues for discussion, watch for time and make sure everyone has a chance to participate.
- If the composition of groups is raised, the moderator will explain that, in order to better understand the views of different sub-groups we are conducting a total of 16 groups across the country that represent Canada’s multicultural diversity.
- Participant introductions: First name, nature of work, etc.

Emergency Preparedness (25 minutes)

1. I'm sure that you all remember the recent Tsunami disaster in South East Asia. While Canada has never had to deal with that type or scope of a disaster, can you think of any large-scale emergencies or disasters we have had in this country over the years?

- BC forest fires
- Saguenay flooding
- Red River flooding
- Ice storm
- Ontario power failure
- Hurricane Juan
- Cyber systems failure
- Space object impact
- Strom surge
- Tornado
- Avalanche
- Critical infrastructure failure (e.g., impairment of sectors like telecoms, financial services, transportation, environmental)
- Other

• Can you think of other types of emergencies or disasters that could happen in Canada?

- Chemical spill
- Nuclear accident
- Terrorist attack
- Earthquake
- Tsunami

2. How prepared do you think the country is to assist people in the event of an emergency/disaster? What do you base this view on?

- Specifically, how prepared do you think the country is for:
 - Weather-related emergencies (e.g., hurricanes, ice storms)
 - Chemical spills
 - Earthquakes
 - Terrorist attacks (e.g., cyber-terrorism)
 - A health emergency such as SARS

- Compared to a few years ago, do you think that your local government is more or less prepared for these types of events or has there been no change?
- And what about your provincial government? How prepared do you think they are to assist in the event of similar types of emergencies or disasters?
- And what about the Government of Canada? How prepared do you think they are to assist in the event of similar types of emergencies or disasters?

3. Can you think of any local, provincial or federal agencies that you believe would respond to an emergency or disaster?

- Do you know if there is a federal department or agency that has specific responsibilities in the event of an emergency or disaster?
- Have you ever heard of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada?
 - Do you know what level of government PSEPC belongs to?
 - Who heads up PSEPC?
- What would you say this department does?

4. How prepared are you/your family for some of the emergencies and disasters we have discussed?

- What have you done to prepare (e.g., bought a generator, have an emergency kit/supplies, have a plan for evacuating, etc.)?
- Some of you have said that you haven't really taken steps to prepare for an emergency or disaster. Why is that (e.g., not sure what to do, no need, will not make a difference, government can protect us)?

- Have you ever tried to obtain information on what to do in the event of a disaster?
 - How did you/would you go about finding this type of information? Where?
 - Internet
 - Library
 - Community centre
 - 1-800 number
 - Federal offices
 - Is there any particular reason why you chose this source?
 - Was the information useful?
 - Are you interested in this type of information?

Personal Risk Assessment (20 minutes)

5. When we were discussing emergencies/disasters, some of you mentioned the possibility of a terrorist attack in Canada. Let's talk a little more about that. How do you think the world has changed since September 11, 2001 (3.5 years ago)?
- Is your **neighbourhood** generally safer or more dangerous today than five years ago? Why do you say that?
 - What about **the world**? Is it generally safer or more dangerous today than five years ago? Why do you say that?
 - What about **Canada**? Is it generally safer or more dangerous today than five years ago? Why do you say that?
 - How likely is it that there could be another terrorist attack in the United States over the next couple of years?
 - What makes you think that?
 - Why do you feel that the U.S. is more/less likely to experience this type of attack?

- How likely is it that there could be a terrorist attack in Canada over the next couple of years?
 - What makes you think that?
 - Why do you feel that Canada is more/less likely to experience this type of attack?
 - Do you think Canada is prepared for this type of attack?

- While it may be unpleasant and difficult to imagine, if Canada did suffer a terrorist attack, what would be a likely scenario (e.g., city/region, nature, scope, scale)? What do you base your view on?

- How likely do you think it is that you/your family will ever be personally affected by a terrorist attack? NOTE: The moderator will probe on direct (death, injury) vs. indirect (e.g., economic) impacts

Perceptions of Personal Privacy (10 minutes)

6. What does personal privacy mean to you?

- How has your level of privacy changed – if at all – over the past 10 years?

The Evolution of Canada Since September 11 (20 minutes)

7. Please take a few minutes to think about and write down the ways in which you think **Canada** has changed since September 11. Think of things like:

- Laws/legislation
- The Government of Canada
- Law enforcement and security agencies
- People's rights (e.g., the right to personal privacy, the rights of visible minorities)
- Canada's relationship with the United States
- Canadian attitudes to issues such as laws, rights, privacy, immigration/immigrants, the U.S.
- Other

NOTE: The moderator will probe on each of the issues listed above

8. How, if at all, have your **personal views** on these issues (e.g., laws, rights, privacy, immigration/immigrants, the U.S.) changed? Do you view Canada and the world differently today than you did prior to September 11?

Federal Government Performance (40 minutes)

9. We talked about how Canada and Canadians have changed since September 11. How would you characterize the Government of Canada's response to the threat of terrorism (e.g., appropriate/about the right pace, not far enough/too slow, too far/too fast)?
- Overall, how well do you think the Government of Canada is responding to the threat of terrorism?
 - Why do you say that?
 - What do you base this view on?
10. In fact, the Government of Canada has implemented a number of measures in response to the threat of terrorism. For example, the government has introduced the following legislative changes:
- **Recognizance with conditions order** – under the Criminal Code, a peace officer may arrest an individual if they can convince a judge that they have reasonable grounds to suspect that the imposition of conditions or the arrest of the person is required to prevent the commission of a terrorist activity. The consent of the Attorney General must be obtained before an order is sought. This power has never been used.
 - **Preventative arrests** - in exceptional circumstances, a peace officer may arrest and detain an individual without a warrant in order to prevent the carrying out of a terrorist activity. An individual arrested in this manner must be taken before a provincial court judge within 24 hours or, if none is available, as soon as possible.
 - **Investigative hearings** - The investigative powers in the Criminal Code were amended to allow a peace officer to request that a judge compel a person to appear and respond to questions. This procedure is supervised by a judge and is limited to investigations of terrorism offences. This power has been used once since September 11 (Air India case). In June 2004, the Supreme Court of Canada held that this provision is constitutional.

- **List of entities** – the Government of Canada has created a list of organizations for which there are reasonable grounds to believe they have knowingly participated in or facilitated a terrorist activity. There are currently 35 entities on this list, and the process is continuing. The legislation requires that the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness review those on the list every two years. The first review has taken place.
- **Advance Passenger Information System/Passenger Name Record** – Under this system, basic information about passengers (e.g., full name, date of birth, gender, citizenship or nationality) is collected during the check-in process for air travel and put in a government database. Canadian Passenger Analysis Units will be able to use this information to verify whether anyone on the flight is cause for concern, and passengers who are will be referred for an in-depth interview. The Government of Canada has also undertaken a similar initiative with U.S. counterparts on flights between Canada and the United States.
- What do you think about these changes?
- Are these changes appropriate? Have they gone too far? Not far enough?
- Note: Moderator will probe in issue of trust in law enforcement and other government agencies “to do what is right” as a factor in supporting opposing changes?
 - E.g., CSIS, RCMP, Local/provincial police, Borders, Immigration, Transport Canada, CATSA, PSEPC

11. As we have just discussed, there have been a number a changes in Canada September 11. Some people argue that these changes have undermined Canadians rights (e.g., the right to privacy). Others say that these changes have been necessary in order to protect the safety and security of Canada. How do you personally feel about this issue?

- Some people are concerned that, under these conditions, law enforcement agencies, such as the RCMP, could their powers. Others believe that these agencies will apply their powers responsibly and according to the rule of law. To what extent are you concerned about the possibility of abuse?
- Do you think that you, or someone you care about would be unfairly affected by these enhanced security measures?
- What about certain groups in Canada (e.g., visible minorities)?
- How would you compare Canada to the U.S.?

12. Would you say that you support increasing measures to improve safety and security in Canada?

- For example, the Government of Canada is looking to update legislation regarding the monitoring of communications technologies to give law enforcement and security agencies the power to monitor Internet, email, and cellular phone communications when investigating criminal activities after obtaining a warrant to do so.
- Based on surveys that we do, we know that many Canadians do not feel that they are personally at risk for a terrorist event, however, they still support increasing measures to improve safety and security.
- Why do you think that is? Why do you feel the way you do?

13. How acceptable do you think it is for police, security, airline, and borders officials to give special attention to persons with certain characteristics or of a specific ethnic origin? For example, how acceptable is it for them to pay special attention to individuals of Arabic origin or people of the Muslim faith? Why do you say that?

14. Is there anything else you would like to say before we end the discussions?

Thank You

DISCUSSIONS DE GROUPE - SPPCC

Explorer les attitudes des Canadiens touchant la sûreté et la sécurité

Avis au lecteur : nous avons limité l'utilisation du langage juridique dans ce document pour favoriser la meilleure compréhension possible des sujets traités de la part de répondants issus de milieux variés.

Introduction (5 minutes)

- But de la discussion : les discussions de groupe sont organisées pour le compte du gouvernement du Canada.
- Explication du format et « règles de base » :
 - Les discussions sont enregistrées sur bande sonore et observées par des membres de l'équipe de recherche. Vos commentaires vont demeurer confidentiels.
 - Efforcez-vous d'intervenir à tour de rôle.
 - Il n'y a pas de bonne ou de mauvaise réponse aux questions que nous allons aborder – nous cherchons seulement à connaître le fond de votre pensée.
 - Il est permis de diverger d'opinion. Exprimez-vous même si vous vous croyez la seule personne à être d'un certain avis. Il est aussi permis de changer d'opinion après avoir entendu celle de quelqu'un d'autre ou reçu de nouveaux renseignements.
 - Rôle du modérateur : susciter les questions à débattre, surveiller l'heure et donner à chacun la chance de s'exprimer.
- Si on demande des précisions sur la composition des groupes, le modérateur expliquera que, pour mieux comprendre les points de vue de différents sous-groupes, nous avons constitué un total de seize groupes à travers le pays pour représenter la diversité multiculturelle canadienne.
- Présentation des participants : prénom, nature du travail, etc.

Protection civile (25 minutes)

1. Vous vous rappelez sans aucun doute le récent désastre du tsunami, survenu en Asie du sud-est. Bien que le Canada n'ait jamais eu à faire face à ce type de cataclysme, vous souvenez-vous de situations d'urgence ou de désastres qui sont arrivés au pays au fil des années ?

- Feux de forêt en Colombie-Britannique
- Inondations au Saguenay
- Débordement de la Rivière Rouge
- Tempête de verglas
- Panne d'électricité en Ontario
- Ouragan Juan
- Panne de systèmes informatiques
- Impact d'un objet provenant de l'espace
- Onde de tempête
- Tornade
- Avalanche
- Crise touchant des infrastructures cruciales (p. ex. : contraintes sérieuses affectant des secteurs comme les télécommunications, les services financiers, le transport, l'environnement)
- Autres situations

• Y a-t-il d'autres situations d'urgence ou des catastrophes qui pourraient, selon vous, se produire au Canada ?

- Déversement de produits chimiques
- Accident nucléaire
- Attaque terroriste
- Tremblement de terre
- Tsunami

2. Comment évaluez-vous le niveau de préparation du Canada pour faire face à une situation d'urgence ou à un désastre naturel ? Sur quoi basez-vous votre évaluation ?

- Plus précisément, comment évaluez-vous le niveau de préparation du Canada face à :
 - Des situations dues à la météorologie (ouragans, verglas)
 - Des déversements de produits chimiques
 - Des tremblements de terre
 - Des attaques terroristes (p. ex. : cyber-terrorisme)
 - Une situation d'urgence touchant la santé, comme le SRAS

- Comparativement à il y a quelques années, trouvez-vous votre **gouvernement municipal** mieux préparé ou moins bien préparé pour faire face à ce genre de crise - ou ne voyez-vous aucun changement ?

- Et votre **gouvernement provincial** ? Comment évaluez-vous son niveau de préparation pour faire face à ce genre de désastres ou de situations d'urgence?

- Et le **gouvernement du Canada** ? Quelle est votre évaluation de son niveau de préparation pour faire face à de tels désastres ou situations d'urgence?

3. Pouvez-vous identifier un ou des organismes municipaux, provinciaux ou fédéraux qui pourraient, selon vous, réagir à une catastrophe ou à une situation d'urgence?

- Savez-vous s'il existe un ministère ou un organisme fédéral ayant des responsabilités propres en cas de situation d'urgence ou de désastre ?

- Avez-vous déjà entendu parler de Sécurité publique et Protection civile Canada ?
 - Savez-vous de quel niveau de gouvernement relève SPPCC ?
 - Qui dirige SPPCC?

- Quel est le rôle de ce ministère, à votre avis ?

À NOTER : Le modérateur fournit aux participants une brève description de SPPCC (p. ex. : raison d'être, responsabilités, initiatives majeures, rendement, etc.) ? Il demande ensuite aux participants leur réaction à la création de SPPCC.

4. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous prêts, vous-même et votre famille, à faire face à une situation d'urgence ou à une catastrophe du genre dont nous avons parlé ?

- Qu'avez-vous fait pour vous préparer (p. ex. : acheter un générateur, posséder une trousse ou des fournitures d'urgence, avoir un plan d'évacuation, etc.) ?
- Certains d'entre vous ont dit ne pas avoir vraiment fait de démarches pour se préparer en cas de situation d'urgence ou de désastre. Pourquoi (p. ex. : vous ne savez pas quoi faire, pas besoin de rien faire, cela ne changera rien, le gouvernement peut nous protéger) ?
- Avez-vous déjà essayé de vous renseigner sur les mesures à prendre en cas de désastre ?
 - Qu'avez-vous fait ou que feriez-vous pour trouver de tels renseignements ? Quelle a été ou quelle serait votre source ?
 - Internet
 - Bibliothèque
 - Centre communautaire
 - Numéro 1-800
 - Bureaux fédéraux
 - Y a-t-il une raison particulière pourquoi vous avez choisi cette source de renseignements ?
 - Les renseignements étaient-ils utiles ?
 - Ce genre de renseignement vous intéresse-t-il ?

Évaluation du risque personnel (20 minutes)

5. Pendant que nous discutons de situations d'urgence et de désastres, certains d'entre vous ont évoqué la possibilité d'une attaque terroriste au Canada. Continuons notre discussion sur cette question. En quoi trouvez-vous que le monde a changé depuis le 11 septembre 2001 (il y a déjà 3 ans et demi) ?

- Dans l'ensemble, votre milieu de vie est-il plus sécuritaire ou plus dangereux aujourd'hui qu'il y a cinq ans ? Pourquoi dites-vous cela ?
- **Et le monde ?** Est-il dans l'ensemble plus sécuritaire ou plus dangereux aujourd'hui qu'il y a cinq ans ? Pourquoi dites-vous cela ?
- **Et le Canada ?** Est-il dans l'ensemble plus sécuritaire ou plus dangereux aujourd'hui qu'il y a cinq ans ? Pourquoi dites-vous cela ?

- Croyez-vous qu'il pourrait y avoir une autre attaque terroriste aux États-Unis au cours des deux prochaines années ?
 - Sur quoi repose votre opinion ?
 - Pourquoi croyez-vous que les États-Unis sont plus susceptibles ou moins susceptibles de subir une autre attaque du genre ?

- Croyez-vous qu'il pourrait y avoir une attaque terroriste au Canada au cours des deux prochaines années ?
 - Sur quoi repose votre opinion ?
 - Pourquoi croyez-vous que le Canada est plus susceptible ou moins susceptible de subir une attaque de ce genre ?
 - Pensez-vous que le Canada est préparé pour faire face à ce genre d'attaque ?

- C'est peut-être désagréable et difficile à imaginer mais, si le Canada subissait une attaque terroriste, quel pourrait en être, selon vous, le scénario (p. ex. : ville/région, nature, étendue, ampleur) ? Sur quoi repose votre opinion ?
- Selon vous, quelle est la probabilité que vous ou votre famille soyez personnellement touchés par une attaque terroriste ? À NOTER : Le modérateur suscite des opinions sur les effets directs (décès, blessures) et indirects (p. ex. : économiques).

Perceptions relatives au droit à la vie privée (10 minutes)

6. Que signifie pour vous la protection de la vie privée ?
 - En quoi la protection de votre vie privée a-t-elle changé – le cas échéant – au cours des 10 dernières années ?

Évolution du Canada depuis le 11 septembre 2001 (20 minutes)

7. Prenez maintenant quelques minutes de réflexion avant de noter par écrit en quoi vous croyez que le Canada a changé depuis le 11 septembre. Considérez par exemple certains éléments :
- Lois et règlements
 - Le gouvernement du Canada
 - Organismes/agences qui doivent veiller à l'application des lois ou assurer la sécurité
 - Droits individuels (p. ex., droit à la protection de la vie privée, droits des minorités visibles)
 - Rapports entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis
 - Les attitudes des Canadiens touchant les lois, les droits, la protection de la vie privée, l'immigration/les immigrants, les Etats-Unis
 - Autres éléments

À NOTER : Le modérateur sonde les participants à propos de chacun des éléments identifiés ci-dessus.

8. En quoi, le cas échéant, votre **opinion personnelle** sur ces questions (p. ex., les lois, les droits, la protection de la vie privée, l'immigration/les immigrants, les États-Unis) a-t-elle changé ? Votre perception du Canada et du monde est-elle différente aujourd'hui de celle que vous aviez avant le 11 septembre ?

Rendement du gouvernement fédéral (40 minutes)

9. Nous avons discuté de la façon dont le Canada et les Canadiens ont changé depuis le 11 septembre. Comment qualifieriez-vous la réponse du gouvernement du Canada face à la menace du terrorisme (p. ex. appropriée/suffisamment rapide, pas suffisamment rapide/trop lente, excessive/trop rapide) ?
- Dans l'ensemble, croyez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada réagit correctement à la menace du terrorisme ?
 - Pourquoi dites-vous cela ?

- Sur quoi basez-vous cette affirmation ?

10. Dans les faits, le gouvernement du Canada a mis en place un certain nombre de mesures pour répondre à la menace terroriste. À titre d'exemple, le gouvernement a établi les changements législatifs suivants :

- **Ordonnance d'un engagement assorti de conditions** – le Code criminel prévoit qu'un agent de la paix peut arrêter une personne s'il peut convaincre un juge qu'il a des motifs raisonnables de soupçonner *que l'imposition d'un engagement assorti de conditions ou l'arrestation de la personne est nécessaire pour éviter la mise à exécution d'une activité terroriste*. La demande d'ordonnance est subordonnée au consentement préalable du Procureur général. Cette disposition du Code n'a jamais été utilisée.
- **Arrestations sans mandat** – dans des circonstances exceptionnelles, un agent de la paix peut, sans mandat, *arrêter une personne et la faire mettre sous garde afin de l'empêcher de mettre à exécution une activité terroriste*. La personne ainsi arrêtée doit être conduite devant un juge de la cour provinciale dans les 24 heures ou si aucun juge n'est disponible dans ce délai, le plus rapidement possible.
- **Interrogatoire d'investigation** – les pouvoirs d'investigation prévus au Code criminel ont été amendés afin de permettre à un agent de la paix de demander à un juge d'ordonner à une personne de se présenter à un interrogatoire et de répondre à des questions. Cette procédure est effectuée sous la supervision d'un juge ; elle *ne s'applique qu'à l'investigation d'infractions de terrorisme*. Ces pouvoirs ont été utilisés une seule fois depuis le 11 septembre (dans l'affaire Air India). En juin 2004, la Cour suprême du Canada a reconnu la constitutionnalité de cette disposition législative.
- **Inscription des entités** – le gouvernement du Canada a établi une liste d'organismes pour lesquels il existe des motifs raisonnables de croire qu'ils *ont sciemment participé à, ou facilité, une activité terroriste*. Il y a actuellement 35 entités inscrites sur cette liste et le processus se poursuit. La loi prévoit que le Ministre de la Sécurité publique et de la Protection civile examine tous les deux ans les entités inscrites sur la liste. Le premier examen a déjà eu lieu.
- **Système d'information préalable sur les voyageurs/Données sur les passagers** – Ce système permet de recueillir lors de l'enregistrement à l'aéroport des renseignements sur les voyageurs aériens (p. ex., nom et prénom, date de naissance, sexe, citoyenneté ou nationalité) et de les consigner dans une base de données gouvernementale. Des Unités canadiennes d'analyse de renseignements sur les voyageurs pourront utiliser ces informations pour vérifier si un passager sur un vol précis constitue un risque potentiel. Si tel est le cas, cette personne sera soumise à une interrogation en profondeur. Le gouvernement canadien a convenu d'une approche comparable avec ses vis-à-vis américains pour des vols entre le Canada et les États-Unis.
- Que pensez-vous de ces changements?

- S'agit-il de changements appropriés ? Trouvez-vous qu'ils vont trop loin ? Ou, au contraire, qu'ils ne sont pas suffisamment exigeants ?
- À noter : Le modérateur sonde l'opinion des participants sur leur **confiance** dans la capacité des organismes gouvernementaux, notamment ceux qui sont chargés de l'application de la loi, « d'agir correctement », comme facteur justifiant l'appui/l'opposition à ces changements.
 - Par exemple : le SCRS, la GRC, la police municipale/provinciale, la police des frontières, Immigration, Transport Canada, ACSTA, SPPCC

11. Comme nous venons de le voir, il y a eu des changements au Canada depuis le 11 septembre. Certaines personnes font valoir que ces changements ont affaibli les droits fondamentaux des Canadiens (par exemple, le droit à la protection de la vie privée). D'autres affirment que ces changements étaient nécessaires pour protéger et assurer la sécurité du Canada. Quel est votre propre point de vue sur cette question ?

- Certaines personnes craignent que dans ces conditions, des organismes d'application de la loi, comme la GRC, abusent de leurs pouvoirs. D'autres estiment que ces organismes vont se prévaloir de leurs pouvoirs de façon responsable et dans le respect de la primauté du droit.
- Dans quelle mesure craignez-vous la possibilité de l'abus de ces pouvoirs ?
- Croyez-vous que vous pourriez, vous-même ou l'un de vos proches, être touché de façon injuste par ces mesures de sécurité plus contraignantes ?
- Qu'en est-il de certains groupes au Canada, comme les minorités visibles ?
- Comment voyez-vous la situation au Canada, comparativement à celle des États-Unis ?

12. Diriez-vous que vous êtes en faveur de mesures plus contraignantes pour améliorer la sûreté et la sécurité au Canada ?

- Par exemple, le gouvernement du Canada envisage de mettre à jour la législation touchant la surveillance des technologies de communication afin de permettre aux organismes chargés de l'application de la loi et de la sécurité de surveiller les communications sur Internet, par courriel, et par téléphone cellulaire lors d'investigations criminelles, après obtention d'un mandat.
- Les sondages que nous effectuons indiquent que beaucoup de Canadiens ne croient pas qu'ils courent le risque d'être personnellement touchés par un événement terroriste. Ils sont cependant en faveur de mesures pour améliorer la sûreté et la sécurité.

- Comment expliquez-vous cette réaction ? Et comment justifiez-vous votre propre réaction?

13. Dans quelle mesure trouvez-vous acceptable que des policiers, des agents de sécurité, des agents de compagnies aériennes ou des autorités frontalières portent une attention particulière à des personnes ayant certaines caractéristiques ou qui sont d'une origine ethnique particulière ? Par exemple, est-il acceptable que ces responsables portent une attention particulière aux personnes d'origine arabe ou de foi musulmane ? Pourquoi êtes-vous de cet avis ?

14. Y a-t-il autre chose que vous voudriez ajouter avant de clore notre discussion ?

Merci beaucoup

Appendix B: Moderator’s Guide for the American Groups

PSEPC FOCUS GROUPS

Exploring American Attitudes Towards Canada-U.S. Security

Note to reader: the use of legal language in this guide has been minimized to allow for better understanding of the issues among respondents from a variety of backgrounds.

Introduction (5 minutes)

- Purpose of the discussion: groups are being conducted on behalf of the Government of Canada.
- Explanation of format and “ground rules”:
 - Discussions are being audio taped and observed by members of the research team. Your comments will remain confidential.
 - Please try to speak one at a time.
 - There aren't any right or wrong answers to the things we'll be talking about — we're just looking for your honest opinions.
 - It's okay to disagree. Please speak up even if you think you're the only one who feels a certain way about an issue. It's also okay, though, if you change your mind based on things you hear or new information.
 - Moderator's role: raise issues for discussion, watch for time and make sure everyone has a chance to participate.
- Participant introductions: First name, nature of work, etc.

Perceptions of Canada & the Relationship to the U.S. (30 minutes)

1. How many of you have visited Canada before?
 - When?
 - How did you get there (mode of transportation)?

2. I would like you to take a few minutes and think about Canada and then write down a list of words, phrases or images that spring to mind when you think about this country.
 - Would you say that you have mostly positive, neutral, negative attitudes towards Canada?
 - Why is that?

3. Have you heard anything recently (over the past few years) about Canada or about Canada's relationship with the United States?
 - What is it that you have heard?
 - Trade disputes (softwood lumber, beef)
 - Decision not to go to Iraq
 - Security issues (e.g., BMD, U.S.- Canada border)
 - Etc.

 - Where have you heard this information? (Newspapers, television, politicians)

4. When you think about the relationship between United States and Canada, what are some of the issues that come to mind? Take a few moments and write down the issues that you believe are most important in terms of this relationship.
- If you were to rank these, what do you think is the single most important issue between the United States and Canada right now?
 - Security
 - Trade
 - Immigration
 - U.S.- Canada border
 - Defence (continental military cooperation)
 - “War on Terror”
 - Etc.

Fallout from Another Attack (45 minutes)

5. How do you think the world has changed since September 11, 2001 (3.5 years ago)?
- Is the **world** generally safer or more dangerous today than five years ago? Why do you say that?
 - What about the **United States**? Is it generally safer or more dangerous today than five years ago? Why do you say that?
6. How likely is it that there could be another terrorist attack in the United States over the next couple of years?
- What makes you think that?
 - Why do you feel that the U.S. is more/less likely to experience this type of attack?
 - Do you feel that the U.S. is more prepared for a terrorist attack than before September 11?

7. While it may be unpleasant and difficult to imagine, let's pretend for a moment that another mass casualty terrorist attack has happened on U.S. soil.

- What kind of attack do you think is most likely to occur?
 - Dirty bomb
 - Chemical/biological attack
 - Another attack using airplanes

- To what extent do you think that the U.S. can count on Canada to help if something like this were to happen again? What do you think Canada would do?

- What if the attack were to occur someplace close to Canada? For example, let's say that terrorists have detonated a "dirty bomb" in Detroit, Michigan (which is very close to Windsor, Canada). What do you think would happen in this situation?
 - Would there be cooperation and coordination between the two countries?
 - Would you expect that Canadian hospitals would help with the casualties?
 - Would you expect Canada to open its borders to Americans in need of emergency accommodation?

8. Thinking back to the events of September 11, 2001, do you remember hearing anything about what Canada did to help Americans respond to this situation?

- What do you recall hearing?
 - Canadians opening their homes to stranded travelers
 - Permitting international flights en route to the U.S. to land in Canada
 - Firefighters/emergency workers going to New York
 - Money raised for the victims
 - Participated in "War on Terror" (e.g., role in Afghanistan, Canadian Navy in the Persian Gulf)
 - Etc.

Perceptions of Canada and National Security (40 minutes)

9. Since September 11, 2001 the U.S. government has made a number changes to improve national security in the United States, and deal with different types of threats.

- Can you name any of these changes?
 - Patriot Act
 - Department of Homeland Security
 - Etc.

- Would you say that these changes have gone too far, not far enough or have they been about right?

- Do you think that other countries have taken similar measures to address national security and various threats since September 11th?
 - Which countries?
 - What do you think they have done?

10. I would like you to take a few minutes and think about Canada again. This time, I would like you to write down a list of words, phrases or images that spring to mind when you think about national security in Canada.

- Would you say that you have mostly positive, neutral, or negative attitudes regarding national security in Canada? Why do you say that?

- Do you think that Canada takes national security as seriously as the United States? Why or why not?

- Is Canada competent in protecting national security?

- Is Canada “pulling its weight” in terms of the security of North America?

11. It has been suggested that Canada is not serious when it comes to security. Have you ever heard this?

- What have you heard?
 - Where did you hear this information?
 - Do you think it is correct?

- Some people have said that Canada is a safe haven for terrorists?
 - Do you think that this is true?
 - Why do you think that is?

12. When you think about terrorists in the United States, how do you think they get into the country?

- Coming directly into the U.S.?
- Coming from within the U.S. (e.g., "homegrown" terrorism vs. "sleeper cells")?
- Crossing the U.S.-Mexico border?
- Crossing the U.S.- Canada border?
- All equally?

13. From what you have heard, do you think Canada has done anything to improve national security since September 11th?

- What have they done?
 - Smart Border Action Plan
 - Passenger information systems
 - Development of PSEPC (agency similar to Homeland Security)
 - New legislation (Anti-Terrorism Act)
 - Greater intelligence and police cooperation
 - Closer working relationship with the U.S.
 - NOTE: Moderator will prompt about these changes.

- After hearing about some of the changes Canada has made, what is your reaction?
- Do you think that Canada is doing enough? What more do you think Canada could be doing?
- How closely do you think the United States and Canada work together on matters of national security?
 - Police and intelligence
 - Joint crisis management (e.g., electrical blackout)
 - Border security
 - Continental defence
 - NOTE: Moderator will prompt about these areas.

14. Reflecting on our discussion today, would you say that you are more optimistic or pessimistic about national security in North America?

- Comment expliquez-vous cette réaction ? Et comment justifiez-vous votre propre réaction?
- Do you think that there will be greater cooperation between Canada and the U.S. when it comes to issues of national security?
- Why is that?
- Should there be?

15. Is there anything else you would like to say before we end the discussions?

Thank You