



NIAGARA REGIONAL POLICE SERVICE

Police Services Board Report

PUBLIC AGENDA

Subject: Annual Report – Use of Force – January 1 to December 31, 2022
Report To: Chair and Members, Niagara Police Services Board
Report Date: 2023-03-02

Recommendation(s)

The Niagara Regional Police Services Board receive this report for information.

Key Facts

- The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with the necessary and required information pursuant to the By-Law relating to procedures and processes on police Use of Force.
- By-Law 346-2014 - Use of Force, was enacted in response to the Provincial Adequacy Standards AI-012 Use of Force.
- By-Law 346-2014 contains provisions requiring the Chief of Police to report specific information in order to ensure compliance with the legislative guidelines.

Financial Considerations

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation in this report.

Analysis

This By-Law details specific requirements that are to be reported as follows:

The Chief shall develop for the Board's review an annual study on the use of force/training issues, which shall disclose the following information and be made available to the community:

- a) Use of force trends and the Service response to such trends, as disclosed by the procedures referred to in 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 above and in accordance with Appendix A;
- b) all matters in which Part B of the Use of Force Report was retained for more than 30 days in accordance with 4.2.1 above, the reasons therefore, and the action taken in respect of Members in connection with the retained report;

- c) in respect of training whether use of force training meets or exceeds Ministry standards as amended from time to time;
- d) in respect of training the number of members who did not successfully complete the required training, the reasons for not so doing, and the remedial action taken;
- e) a summary of all reports made pursuant to 4.4.1. and 4.4.2 regarding the discharge of firearms;
- f) a summary of Service policy reports and follow-ups in accordance with 4.6 above;
- g) a summary of the disposition of revolvers made pursuant to 4.7 above;
- h) the nature of critical incident trauma aftercare available pursuant to 4.8 above, and the number of Members using the aftercare arrangements;
- i) Service compliance with equipment standards of the Ministry as amended from time to time;
- j) a summary of Service policy regarding disposition of old equipment and comment on Service compliance with the policy, and;
- k) anticipated changes in the cost of any of the above matters to be considered in the budget for the ensuing year, which information shall also be included in the training program budget submitted to the Board.

The following is a detailed response to each of the above noted requirements:

- a) *Use of force trends and the Service response to such trends, as disclosed by the procedures referred to in 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 above and in accordance with Appendix A;*

Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 mandates written procedures to ensure that the following incidents involving the use of force are documented, when used outside of a training environment:

- the discharge of a firearm;
- the drawing of a handgun in the presence of members of the public;
- use of a weapon other than a firearm, including aerosol weapons, conducted energy weapons and batons; and,
- applications of force which result in injury requiring medical attention

The Service's General Order 053.23 governs all use of force by members. All reporting requirements are contained within this order. These procedures are in compliance with the Police Services Act, Regulation 926, and the Policing Standards Manual AI-012.

Use of Force Analyst Report

In 2022, officers of the Niagara Regional Police Service responded to over 148,000 calls for service. Of those incidents, 162 encounters between officers and members of the public occurred in circumstances that required the completion of a Use of Force Report, as mandated by Ontario Regulation 926.

Use of Force Reports are broken into two classifications: Individual Reports and Team Reports. Individual Report refers to the submission of a Use of Force Report by an individual officer and may include reports prepared by an immediate supervisor in cases

where the officer is incapable of submitting a report. Each officer who administers force, meeting the threshold in Regulation 926, must submit an individual report, unless they qualify as a member of a team. A Team Report is completed by a leader of a specialist team, such as the Tactical Team, in place of individual reporting by each member. Therefore, one incident (call for service) can result in multiple Use of Force Reports being submitted. Out of the 162 identified encounters resulting in submission of Use of Force Reports, 34 were Team Reports.

In 2022, there were 162 Use of Force Report submissions. For comparison purposes, there were 186 Use of Force Report submissions in 2021, 168 in 2020, and 137 in 2019.

The amount of Use of Force Reports has paralleled the rise in armed persons, which has been a trend for the last four years and continued in 2022 with 141 armed subjects compared to 139 armed persons in 2021, and 127 in 2020. In 2022, there was a rise in subjects armed with firearms, and a drop in the number of subjects with edged weapons with 30 in 2022, compared to 52 in 2021.

Upon review of 141 use of force incidents which led to the submission of a Use of Force Report, 78 incidents (55.4%) originated as a call for service generated by a member of the public. 30 incidents (21.2%) involved dispatching injured and suffering animals (ie. deer struck by vehicle). 21 incidents (14.9%) were generated through service of high-risk warrants. 12 incidents (8.5%) of incidents were generated as a result of officers' patrol duties, (incidents that officers come across while on patrol).

The last several years have seen a rise in suspected gang activity and violent incidents throughout the Region. The number of times that officers had to use force or draw and point their Service firearms or long guns, correlates with the violent situations that have occurred in the Region and the number of armed subjects they encountered.

In 2022, there was an increase in subjects with firearms over 2021. In 2022, there were 71 firearm related reports, compared to 54 in 2021. It is important to note these numbers have remained high since 2020, when Niagara first experienced a significant increase in the number of subjects armed with firearms. In 2020, the number rose dramatically to 80 reported incidents, compared to only 5 instances in 2019 and 13 in 2018. In 2022, the 71 firearms were identified as: 39 semi-automatics, 7 rifles, 12 shotguns, 11 revolvers, and 2 unknown types of firearms. Further, the use of replica firearms/airsoft weapons used by subjects during incidents was reported on two occasions, which has continued a downward trend as there were 6 reports in 2021, and 7 in 2020. Often these replica firearms and airsoft weapons look identical to real firearms, which result in police drawing their firearm and responding as if the weapon is a real firearm.

Situations with subjects who are known to be armed, result in heightened vigilance when it comes to the execution of search warrants. Any time a subject has been identified as being armed, or possibly armed, the Emergency Tactical Unit must be involved in the entry to a premise. In 2022, they were involved in 34 use of force incidents.

The Niagara Regional Police Service Training Unit continues to monitor trends in the community that result in the use of force and report as required in accordance with the

Police Services Act. The Training Unit is committed to developing and delivering training that is relevant, realistic, repeatable, and responsible to ensure police officers are confident and competent in their commitment to ensuring public safety.

Race

In 2020, the Ministry of The Solicitor General implemented a new Use of Force Report. The goal was to capture statistics on use of force across the province through electronic submission of the use of force reports.

One of the changes to the report was an identified need to capture statistics regarding race involved in use of force encounters. The statistics are based on the “perceived subject race”, from the officer’s observations. The following were identified by the Ministry as the race categories: Black, East/Southeast Asian, Indigenous, Latino, Middle Eastern, and South Asian.

In 2022, Niagara Regional Police officers encountered 179 subjects in 162 reported incidents of use of force. The subjects were identified as follows:

Race Data	2022	2021	2020
Black	46	39	58
East/Southeast Asian	1	1	5
Indigenous	2	4	5
Latino	6	8	8
Middle Eastern	9	11	21
South Asian	1	1	2
White	114	175	141

*This race-based data is further explained in Appendix A

Empty Hands Techniques

The use of empty hands skills can be broken down into soft and hard techniques. Soft techniques are used to control a subject who exhibits behaviour ranging from passive resistance to serious bodily harm or death. They include techniques such as: joint locks and manipulation, restraint techniques during handcuffing, and grounding techniques that are used to bring a subject to the ground. Hard techniques are those that involve striking a subject and can include: punches, kicks, elbows, knees, and brachial stuns. The goal in using these and other use of force options is always to stop a threat or potential threat as quickly as possible, with minimal injury to all involved parties.

In 2022, empty hands techniques were reported 28 times compared with 45 times in 2021. Empty hands "hard" techniques were utilized in 9 occurrences and were only 44.4% effective. Empty hands "soft" techniques accounted for the remaining 19 usages and were effective 63.2% of the time.

Aerosol Weapon

Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray has been an approved use of force option of the Niagara Regional Police Service since 1994. OC spray is 100% organically based and is classified as an inflammatory agent designed to psychologically, and physically, impair a subject with no long-lasting effects. The degree of effectiveness varies greatly and ranges from mild discomfort to total incapacitation. These factors are dependent on the subject's mindset and physical condition. Factors such as: intoxication by alcohol or drugs, excited delirium, or mental health illness may also reduce its effectiveness. Police officers using OC spray also must be aware of cross-contamination (officers being affected by the OC back-spray), de-contamination (the need to flush the affected areas of the subject), and the ability of a subject to overcome the effects if they close or cover their eyes to decrease exposure.

In 2022, there was one reported deployment of OC spray by police officers in the course of their duties, which was reported to be 100% effective. In 2021, OC was used two times, with 50% effectiveness. The last reported use of OC spray prior to 2019 was in 2015, where there were seven deployments with 86% effectiveness. This marked decrease in usage may be attributed to the concerns mentioned above or may be due to another use of force option being used as a more appropriate tool given the situation.

Impact Weapon

The Impact Weapon, or ASP baton, may be used when a subject displays a minimum of assaultive behaviour. Sworn officers are issued with an expandable metal baton. These tools are used to strike major muscle groups, where large bundles of nerves respond by causing temporary muscle dysfunction. This eliminates or reduces a subject's ability to use their hands and feet in an assaultive manner. The pain that results will also assist in achieving compliance. When a subject is holding onto an object to resist, the Impact Weapon may be used to pry the subject loose. This is referred to as a soft application.

In 2022, the Impact Weapon was used one time in a soft application, used to pry a person's arms out from underneath their body, and it was effective. There were no reported uses of the Impact Weapon in a hard or striking fashion during 2022. For comparison purposes, there were two uses of the Impact Weapon in a soft application in 2021. It is anticipated that the Impact Weapon usage will remain low as other options, such as the CEW, are proving to be more effective.

Conducted Energy Weapon (C.E.W.)

In 2015, all front-line police officers within the Service received C.E.W. training to be able to carry the C.E.W. as a use of force option. C.E.W.'s are intended for use on subjects exhibiting behaviour that ranges from assaultive, to serious bodily harm, or death. The C.E.W. may also be used when taking into account the totality of circumstances, and the officer believes there is an imminent need to control a subject.

The C.E.W. can be used in three different ways:

1) Demonstrated Force Presence (DFP)

The C.E.W. is drawn in the presence of a subject and is either sparked or the laser light is pointed at them. This type of application can be used towards subjects exhibiting resistant behaviour. DFP is utilized in attempts to gain subject compliance and de-escalate situations.

2) Dart Probe

The C.E.W. utilizes a cartridge that contains two probes. When fired, the two probes travel to the intended target, tethered by two insulated wires designed to deliver an electrical charge that affects both the sensory and motor neurons of the central nervous system. This type of deployment is very effective, resulting in neuromuscular incapacitation. A larger probe spread will often result in greater effectiveness. A failed deployment may be the result of one or more probes missing the target, thick or heavy clothing, small probe spread or device malfunction.

3) Drive-Stun

The drive-stun involves direct contact between the C.E.W. and subject. Due to the short distance between the contacts on the C.E.W., the drive-stun relies primarily on pain compliance as it only targets the sensory neurons. As with any technique that relies on pain compliance, the drive-stun may be ineffective on subjects that are intoxicated by drugs or alcohol, emotionally disturbed, suffering from excited delirium, or simply impervious to pain.

In September 2022, the Service commenced the migration of all front-line officers to the newly purchased Taser 7. As of this date, nearly 460 officers have been converted with the remaining to be completed by June 2, 2023. C.E.W. in-service training incorporates enhanced academic and practical scenario training, supplemented by material from the Ontario Police College and Master C.E.W. working committee. Training also addresses common and uncommon deployment issues identified in C.E.W reports.

In 2022, the C.E.W. was drawn and utilized 71 times in relation to 52 incidents. This is due to multiple officers choosing the C.E.W. as an option at the same incident. This is up from 2021, where the C.E.W. was drawn and utilized 61 times.

The 71 usages are broken down accordingly: 42 were Dart Deployments, 23 were Demonstrated Force Presence, and 6 were used in a Drive-Stun mode. There was a variety of types of calls where the C.E.W. was used, 22 of them involving subjects armed with weapons. Of these 22 incidents involving weapons: 5 were a domestic, 4 were armed person(s), 1 was a B&E, 1 was unknown, 1 a pursuit, 3 unwanted persons, and 7 were Mental Health Act related calls.

Weapons were involved in 43% of the calls where a C.E.W. was utilized. Eight of those incidents involved knives, one sword, one machete. The other incidents involved a variety

of weapons such as a box blade, scissors, forks, broom, razors, needles, screwdrivers, and a crowbar. There was one incident in which a C.E.W. was successfully used against an aggressive dog.

C.E.W. Data

YEAR	DART DEPLOYMENT	DRIVE STUN	DEMONSTRATED FORCE PRESENCE
2022	42	6	23
2021	31	9	21
2020	18	5	23
2019	24	9	23

Historical (usage) Success Rate

The CEW has a high historical success rate of 90-93 %. The success rate for 2022 CEW usages is 90% and within historical norms.

Firearm

In 2022, there were 55 Use of Force Report submissions where police drew their handgun in the presence of the public during the course of their duties. In 2021, there were 77 Use of Force Report submissions where police officers drew their handgun in the presence of the public during the course of their duties. As stated above, the reporting criteria in these instances require a police officer to submit a Use of Force Report when a handgun is drawn in the presence of the public. Police officers reported 80 incidents where a firearm was pointed at a subject. The criteria for reporting in these incidents require police officers to submit a Use of Force Report whenever a firearm is pointed at a person and includes: a handgun, shotgun, or rifle. It should be noted that the 80 incidents where officers pointed their firearms were not all separate incidents, and some involved multiple officers pointing their handguns at the same subject or multiple subjects. There were 18 occurrences of police officers discharging their firearm in 2021. Seventeen of those incidents involved police officers discharging their firearm to end the suffering of a critically wounded animal. There was one occurrence that involved an officer discharging their firearm at a subject causing a fatal injury to the subject. This matter was investigated and cleared by the SIU.

Firearm Data

YEAR	FIREARM DRAWN	FIREARM POINTED	FIREARM DISCHARGED
2022	55	70	26
2021	77	80	18
2020	66	85	12
2019	27	39	19
2018	19	44	20

Use of force reporting captures data concerning weapon use by subjects during interactions with police officers when force is used. In these instances, police officers document the type of weapon, nature of any injuries, and where the weapon was located during the interaction. In 2022, officers encountered 141 armed subjects, compared to 139 in 2021. Of the 141 armed subjects: 30 were armed with a knife or edged weapon, 71 were in possession of a firearm, 2 subjects utilized motor vehicles as weapons, and 1 had a baseball bat. Police officers also encountered subjects who were armed with weapons of opportunity. These included a broken wine glass, chair, crowbar, metal fork, can of gasoline, syringe, skateboard, and a broom. Lastly, police officers reported 2 encounters with subjects armed with replica handguns.

In many of the calls for service, police officers received information that a subject was armed and were able to plan and act accordingly to diffuse the situation safely. However, police officers also responded to many incidents with limited information, only to encounter an armed subject on arrival. For these reasons, police officers always need to remain vigilant and cautious, for their own safety and the safety of others, during any community interaction.

One trend that remains constant is the rise in calls related to mental health. Officers often encounter armed subjects at mental health/suicide related calls. Twenty-three Use of Force Reports were submitted in relation to mental health calls in 2022, up from 17 in 2021. These incidents are particularly challenging in that police are tasked with trying to de-escalate a potentially dangerous situation, while trying to extend help to a person in crisis. De-escalation tactics have varied effectiveness depending on the situation, but they do not eliminate the use of force when it is justified and necessary. Annual In-Service Training has evolved to address these concerns and incorporates specific use of force skills training, as well as judgment and de-escalation scenarios, to deal with the increasing number of mental health calls for service.

b) all matters in which Part B of the Use of Force Report was retained for more than 30 days in accordance with 4.2.1 above, the reasons therefore, and the action taken in respect of Members in connection with the retained report;

As per section 4.2.1 there were no incidents in the reporting period where Part B of the Use of Force Report was retained for more than the 30 days due to a determination that a member required additional training.

c) in respect of training whether use of force training meets or exceeds Ministry standards as amended from time to time;

Use of force training is scheduled and conducted in a manner that meets or exceeds Ministry Standards. Officers participate in use of force certification/recertification at least once every 12 months. The members of the Training Unit regularly review and amend their prepared lesson plans pertaining to instruction and evaluation of members involved in use of force certification/re-certification. This ensures that all of the training standards meet, or exceed, the Ministry standards.

- d) *in respect of training the number of members who did not successfully complete the required training, the reasons for not so doing and the remedial action taken;*

Every year, a small number of members are unable to participate in use of force training due to medical restrictions. In accordance with section 4.3.5 of the By-Law, and the Police Service Act, those members are not deployed to positions that require use of force capabilities until their medical conditions allow them to receive the required use of force training. Of all those members who participate annually in use of force training, there is generally a small percentage, typically in the firearms requalification, that are required to make a second attempt to achieve the training standard. They are afforded that opportunity to do so as soon as possible, usually the same day. During the reporting period all active-duty members were able to achieve the training standard at first attempt or following remedial opportunities.

- e) *a summary of all reports made pursuant to 4.4.1. and 4.4.2 regarding the discharge of firearms;*

Section 4.4.1 states that "*The Chief shall ensure that all reports on investigations of death or injury resulting from the discharge of a firearm made pursuant to section 13(1) of Regulation 926 are submitted to the Board within thirty (30) days of such incident occurring*".

Section 4.4.2 states that "*The Chief shall immediately cause an investigation and file a report to the Board where a member, by the discharge of a firearm in the performance of his or her duty, kills or injures another person*"

In 2022, an incident involving the tactical team and a subject resulted in one Service firearm being discharged with the subject being fatally wounded. This matter was investigated by the SIU and cleared.

- f) *a summary of Service policy reports and follow-ups in accordance with 4.6 above;*

Section 4.6 of Police Services Board By-Law 346-2014 refers to issuing firearms to auxiliary members. Section 11(1) of Regulation 926 of the Police Services Act permits "*the chief of police or a superior officer, a member of an Ontario police force.... who is accompanying and supervising an auxiliary member of the police force may issue to the auxiliary member a firearm, except a revolver, if he or she believes, on reasonable grounds, that they are entering into a situation in which it is necessary that the auxiliary member be armed to protect against loss of life or serious bodily harm.*"

There were no incidents during this reporting period where an auxiliary member was issued a firearm.

g) a summary of the disposition of revolvers made pursuant to 4.7 above;

During the reporting period no revolvers were destroyed.

h) The nature of critical incident trauma aftercare available pursuant to 4.8 above and the number of Members using the aftercare arrangements;

General Order 009.10 entitled Psychological Wellness Programs sets out policy and procedures with respect to the Critical Incident Response Team and Peer Support Team. The teams provide support to any member and their families who have experienced the negative effects of stress from an employment related critical incident.

Further, General Order 254.03 entitled Reintegration Program sets out policy and procedure for supporting members in dealing with the natural stress of critical incidents and exposure to stressful events. Support is provided through delivery of a program integrating exposure, drills, and scenarios that have been individualized to the needs of each participating officer and their situation.

For statistics on their responses please refer to the Board report submitted by Member Support.

i) Service compliance with equipment standards of the Ministry as amended from time to time;

There were no amendments to equipment standards during this reporting period.

j) a summary of Service policy regarding disposition of old equipment and comment on Service compliance with the policy;

The disposal of Service firearms is initiated by the Training Unit, or Quartermaster Stores. Disposal is conducted by the Firearms Officer and the procedure is consistent with that prescribed for seized or received firearms, as set out in General Order 035.13 entitled Evidence and Property Management.

k) anticipated changes in the cost of any of the above matters to be considered in the budget for the ensuing year, which information shall also be included in the training program budget submitted to the Board;

The Police Services Act has been modified to address changes to the current Use of Force Report as of January 1, 2023, which will be reflected in the 2023 report. Other policies are being reviewed for amendments and may contain changes to the use of force model and training regime with respect to situational de-escalation. At this point the impact on training costs is not fully known, but it is anticipated that regulated training time will be increased.

Alternatives Reviewed

Not applicable.

Relationship to Police Service/Board Strategic Priorities

To comply with the Board By-Law 346-2014.

Relevant Policy Considerations

- Police Services Board By-Law 346-2014 - Use of Force (revised)
- Police Services Act of Ontario Regulation 926.
- Provincial Adequacy Standard AI-012
- NRPS General Order 053.23.

Other Pertinent Reports

7.13.2021.03.25 – Annual Report – Use of Force – January 1 to December 31, 2021

This report was prepared by Constable Andrew Watson, Training Unit Instructor and Use of Force Analyst, in consultation with Staff Sergeant Chris Sirie, Training Unit, reviewed by Inspector Lou Greco, Labour Relations and Career Development, and Acting Superintendent Lynda Hughes, Executive Services, and recommended by Bill Fordy, Deputy Chief, Support Services.



Submitted by:
Brett Flynn, M.O.M. #9295
Acting Chief of Police

Appendices

Appendix A – Further Analysis of Race-Based Data

Appendix A

Further Analysis of Race-Based Data

An analysis was undertaken to delineate the use of force encounters by area of residence of each individual subject. This data was separated into four categories - by subjects whose home address is within the Niagara Region, described as “Local”, by subjects whose home address falls outside of the Niagara Region, described as “Out of Region”, by subjects who are unhoused, described as, “No Fixed Address”, and by subjects whose home address was unknown, described as “Unknown Address”.

It should be noted that the data contained in the table below is different than that on page four of this report. The numbers reflected on page four, indicate the number of Use of Force Reports submitted in relation to an incident. In some circumstances, multiple reports were submitted for an incident that only involved one subject. The data in the tables below was sorted through to show the actual number of subjects on whom force was used, irrespective of the number of reports that were submitted in relation to that specific incident.

Total Individuals on Whom Force Used	Local	Out of Region	No Fixed Address	Unknown Address
153	91	28	20	15
% Of Total Individuals	59.5%	18.3%	13.1%	9.8%

This data was further broken down by the perceived race of each individual subject on whom force was used:

Total Incidents by Perceived Race	Black	East Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
153	35	1	2	4	7	1	103
% Of Total Individuals	22.9%	0.7%	1.3%	2.6%	4.6%	0.7%	67.3%

This data was delineated further by the area of residence along with the perceived race of each individual subject on whom force was used:

Residence – Local	Black	East Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
91	11	1	2	3	3	1	70
% Of Total Individuals	7.2%	0.7%	1.3%	2.0%	2.0%	0.7%	45.8%

Residence – Out of Region	Black	East Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
28	20	0	0	0	3	0	5
% Of Total Individuals	13.1%	0%	0%	0%	2.0%	0%	3.3%

Residence –No Fixed Address	Black	East Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
20	2	0	0	0	0	0	17
% Of Total Individuals	1.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11.1%

Residence – Unknown Address	Black	East Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
15	2	0	0	1	1	0	11
% Of Total Individuals	1.3%	0%	0%	0.7%	0.7%	0%	7.2%

2021 Statistics Canada Population Census Data

The below table has been compiled from data provided by Statistics Canada from their 2021 Census. This data can be found on the link - [Profile table, Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population - Niagara, Regional municipality \(RM\) \[Census division\], Ontario \(statcan.gc.ca\)](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/92-627-x/2021001/article/00001-eng.htm)

Total Population of Niagara Region	Black	East Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
469,455	13,305	*15,870	13,960	**6,975	***3,580	13,845	****407,060
% Of Total Individuals	2.8%	3.4%	3.0%	1.5%	0.8%	2.9%	86.7%

*Statistics Canada does not provide census data for the category of, “East Asian”. They separate that population into “Chinese” (6,675), “Filipino” (6,505),

“Korean” (1,920), and “Japanese” (770). For the purposes of this analysis, those numbers were combined and included in the “East Asian” column in this appendix.

**Statistics Canada does not provide categories for “Latino” individuals in the 2021 Census. The Statistics Canada data for “Latin American” were included in the “Latino” column in this appendix.

***Statistics Canada does not provide census data for the category of, “Middle Eastern” in the 2021 Census. The Statistics Canada data for “Arab” were included in the “Middle Eastern” column in this appendix.

****Statistics Canada does not provide categories for “White” individuals in the 2021 Census. The Statistics Canada data for “Not a visible minority” were included in the “White” column in this appendix.

***** Statistics Canada includes a category called, “Visible minority, n.i.e”, which Statistics Canada describes as a category that includes, “persons who provide responses that are classified as a visible minority, but that cannot be classified within a specific visible minority group. Such responses include, for example, “Guyanese,” “Pacific Islander,” “Polynesian,” “Tibetan” and “West Indian”. None of this data was included in this appendix.