

Catalogue no. 85-228-X

Child and Spousal Support: Maintenance Enforcement Survey Statistics



2009/2010



Statistics
Canada

Statistique
Canada

Canada

How to obtain more information

For information about this product or the wide range of services and data available from Statistics Canada, visit our website at www.statcan.gc.ca, e-mail us at infostats@statcan.gc.ca, or telephone us, Monday to Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at the following numbers:

Statistics Canada's National Contact Centre

Toll-free telephone (Canada and the United States):

Inquiries line	1-800-263-1136
National telecommunications device for the hearing impaired	1-800-363-7629
Fax line	1-877-287-4369

Local or international calls:

Inquiries line	1-613-951-8116
Fax line	1-613-951-0581

Depository Services Program

Inquiries line	1-800-635-7943
Fax line	1-800-565-7757

To access this product

This product, Catalogue no. 85-228-X, is available free in electronic format. To obtain a single issue, visit our website at www.statcan.gc.ca and browse by "Key resource" > "Publications."

Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner. To this end, Statistics Canada has developed *standards of service* that its employees observe. To obtain a copy of these service standards, please contact Statistics Canada toll-free at 1-800-263-1136. The service standards are also published on www.statcan.gc.ca under "About us" > "Providing services to Canadians."

Statistics Canada
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics

Child and Spousal Support: Maintenance Enforcement Survey Statistics

2009/2010

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2010

All rights reserved. The content of this electronic publication may be reproduced, in whole or in part, and by any means, without further permission from Statistics Canada, subject to the following conditions: that it be done solely for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary, and/or for non-commercial purposes; and that Statistics Canada be fully acknowledged as follows: Source (or "Adapted from", if appropriate): Statistics Canada, year of publication, name of product, catalogue number, volume and issue numbers, reference period and page(s). Otherwise, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form, by any means—electronic, mechanical or photocopy—or for any purposes without prior written permission of Licensing Services, Client Services Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

September 2010

Catalogue no. 85-228-X

ISSN 1708-0436

Frequency: Annual

Ottawa

Cette publication est également disponible en français.

Note of appreciation

Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a long-standing partnership between Statistics Canada, the citizens of Canada, its businesses, governments and other institutions. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued cooperation and goodwill.

User information

Symbols

The following standard symbols are used in Statistics Canada publications:

- . not available for any reference period
- .. not available for a specific reference period
- ... not applicable
- 0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
- 0^s value rounded to 0 (zero) where there is a meaningful distinction between true zero and the value that was rounded
- p preliminary
- r revised
- x suppressed to meet the confidentiality requirements of the *Statistics Act*
- E use with caution
- F too unreliable to be published

Table of contents

Highlights	5
Introduction	6
A description of maintenance enforcement services	7
Related products	10
Statistical tables	
1 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by interjurisdictional support order status, by fiscal year	12
2 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, at month end	14
3 Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by new enrolments, re-enrolments and closed cases, by fiscal year	16
4 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by length of enrolment, by fiscal year	18
5 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by authority of order/agreement and type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2010	20
6 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by sex of payor and recipient, at March 31	21
7 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by median age of payor, recipient and children, at March 31	22
8 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by assignment status, at March 31	23
9 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due, at March 31	24
10 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled and regular monthly median payment due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2010	26
11 Maintenance enforcement cases administered with a regular amount due, by amount due and received, by fiscal year	27
12 Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by total amount due and received, 2009/2010	28
13 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due and proportion in compliance, at March 31	29
14 Maintenance enforcement cases in compliance with regular payments due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2010	31
15 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by compliance on regular monthly payments due, at month end	32
16 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled for entire fiscal year, by regularity of monthly compliance	34
17 Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by arrears history and status, at March 31, 2010	35
18 Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by amount owing, at March 31	36
19 Maintenance enforcement cases, by amount of arrears owing, at March 31	38
20 Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by percentage received of regular monthly payment due, at March 31	39

Table of contents – continued

21	Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by elapsed time since last payment, at March 31	41
22	Number and type of reported enforcement actions for maintenance enforcement cases administered, 2009/2010	43

Data quality, concepts and methodology

	Methodology	44
--	-------------	----

Appendix

I	Glossary of terms	48
II	References	56

Highlights

- On March 31, 2010, nearly 408,000 cases, most involving children, were registered in Maintenance Enforcement Programs (MEPs) in the nine provinces and two territories reporting data (Table 2) (excludes Manitoba and Nunavut). In most jurisdictions, the number of cases enrolled with a MEP has been gradually declining over the last several years.
- In March 2010, for those cases with a regular support payment due, the majority of cases (61%) had an amount due of between \$1 and \$400. Just over 5% of cases had regular payments owing of more than \$1,000 (Table 9).
- In any given month in 2009/2010, just over two-thirds of cases were in full compliance with their regular child or spousal support payments due for the month (Table 15).
- On March 31, 2010, 64% of cases had arrears (money owing from earlier missed payments). Total arrears owing was \$2.7 billion for the 11 reporting jurisdictions (Table 18).

Introduction

During the 1980s and 1990s, all provincial and territorial governments created Maintenance Enforcement Programs (MEPs) to provide administrative support to payors and recipients of child and spousal support, and to improve compliance with support payments (Statistics Canada 2002). Through provincial/territorial and federal legislation, the programs were given a number of administrative enforcement powers to secure payments before turning to the courts.

This report provides data on the characteristics of cases that are registered with the MEPs.¹ The results presented in this report are based on child and spousal support data for nine provinces and two territories, representing 96% of Canada's population. Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia provide data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey (MES), while Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report to the newer, more detailed Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs (SMEP).² Manitoba and Nunavut currently do not report data to either survey. Some data tables do not include all participating jurisdictions because the data are not available.

1. Readers should be cautious in using the survey data to evaluate specific Maintenance Enforcement Programs or to generalize the results to all support orders in Canada. The MEPs across Canada differ in a number of important aspects because of different local needs and policies. These differences include client profile, enforcement powers in legislation, enforcement practices, the enrolment process, how payments are handled and registered, the responsibilities of clients, and how cases are closed.
2. For more information about the differences between the two surveys, refer to the Methodology section.

A description of maintenance enforcement services

by Chantal Steeves

The task of processing and ensuring that child and spousal support is paid is essentially the same for all maintenance enforcement programs (MEPs) across Canada. MEPs register cases, process payments, and monitor and enforce cases (Statistics Canada 2002). Once the order terms expire and cases are fully paid, they no longer need to be in a program and are closed. However, beyond the processing steps, each jurisdiction has developed its own maintenance enforcement policies and procedures to address local needs. The following provides an overview of these jurisdictional differences.

Registration

All support recipients with an enforceable court order or agreement¹ can utilize the services of a maintenance enforcement program. Just over a third of persons who separated or divorced between 2001 and 2006, and who had an agreement for spousal or child support, or both, enrolled in a MEP (General Social Survey 2006).

Six jurisdictions have adopted an automatic or “opt-out” registration system (Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba). In these jurisdictions, maintenance orders are automatically enrolled or filed with a maintenance enforcement program at the time of the order. To be removed from the caseload of a MEP, a recipient must ask to be withdrawn from the program.² In many jurisdictions, the payor has to agree to the withdrawal. This request can be denied if the recipient is collecting social assistance.³

Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut have an “opt-in” program, whereby registration is at the option of either the recipient or payor. The only exception is cases where the recipient is entitled to social assistance, in which case enrolment in the MEP is mandatory.

“Opt-in” jurisdictions tend to have a higher proportion of cases already having arrears when they first register, or where there has been some difficulty in securing payments. Conversely, “opt-out” jurisdictions tend to have relatively more cases to administer and enforce because all new court orders in the jurisdiction are automatically enrolled.

Payment processing

Much of the visible activity of MEPs involves the processing and disbursement of payments to recipients. In most jurisdictions, payors can make payments by cheque, money order, credit card, telephone or Internet banking, or by pre-authorized payment. Payments may also come directly from an attachment of wages, a garnishment and attachment of assets (e.g. bank account), or a federal interception of federal monies owed to the payor, such as an income tax refund.

Eight MEPs use a “pay-to” system to process payments, where the payor makes their payment payable to the MEP, which functions as a clearinghouse for the payment before disbursing it to the recipient. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut use this approach. The remaining jurisdictions use both “pay-to” and “pay-through”. The “pay-through” approach refers to a system where payors forward their payment to the MEP; the MEP records the payment and forwards it to the recipient.

1. Domestic contracts that meet jurisdictional requirements for enforcement include paternity agreements and separation agreements filed in court.

2. Data on the number of individuals who opt-out of programs are not available.

3. Provinces and territories treat child support as income and deduct it in whole or in part from social assistance benefits to which recipients would be otherwise entitled.

Enforcement

MEPs are required by their legislation to monitor and enforce cases that are registered with them. They must enforce the terms and amount of the order or agreement, and they have no discretion to change the terms in any way. In the event that circumstances change, the parties are encouraged to seek legal advice. One option that might be considered is to pursue a variation in the order or agreement through the courts.

As an option to court variations, Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and Alberta offer a recalculation service. British Columbia offers a recalculation service through selected court registries as part of a pilot project. Recalculation services allow for a regular administrative review (usually annual) of the payor's financial circumstances and possible "recalculation" of the payment terms in the order, without going to court. As a result of this service court processes that may deter payors or recipients from seeking variations are avoided.

MEPs aim at securing regular and ongoing payments. The MEPs resort to enforcement activities when they are unable to secure support payments. A number of enforcement mechanisms can be used to collect support payments. Enforcement mechanisms can be seen as a graduated process that intensifies with the complexity of the case.

There are two distinct areas of enforcement: administrative and court enforcement. In general, most MEPs will first attempt to obtain payment through administrative means. Administrative enforcement can range from telephoning the payor and trying to informally negotiate a payment, to a more formal enforcement process whereby funds are garnished from the payor's wages. Court enforcement remedies range from a summons to appear, to a fine or jail.

The federal government provides assistance to the enforcement efforts of the MEPs to collect unpaid spousal or child support. Under the *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act*, the Family Law Assistance Services unit of the federal Department of Justice Canada can conduct searches of federal databases to help MEPs locate payors,⁴ intercept federal funds⁵ destined for the payor and redirect them to the MEPs for disbursement to the recipient and deny or suspend federally administered licences including passports, if the payor is in arrears. Under the *Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act (GAPDA)*, federal employee salaries and pensions are subject to garnishment, with the garnished wages sent to the MEPs, who in turn would disburse the money to the recipients.

Because MEPs operate under unique provincial/territorial legislation, they differ in the nature and scope of their enforcement powers. Garnishments and attachments, for example, may be restricted by a provincial law that limits the percentage of a paycheque that can be attached. In some provinces and territories, this is set at a 50% maximum, while in others it may be 40%.

Deterrent penalties and service fees have been introduced by MEPs in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. Examples of these penalties include the following:

- Nova Scotia charges penalties and fees for non-sufficient funds (NSF) cheques, the issuance of a garnishment, and the revocation of motor vehicle privilege. There is also an annual administrative default fee of \$238.75.
- In New Brunswick, pursuant to the provincial *Support Enforcement Act* proclaimed in 2008, fees are charged to payors on some enforcement actions taken by the MEP, including tracing (both provincial and federal), issuing garnishments and holding a default hearing. A fee is also charged for NSF items and other dishonoured payments.
- In Quebec, the MEP charges for NSF cheques and applies collection charges for unpaid demands for payment.

4. Databases at the Canada Revenue Agency and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) can be searched for a payor's address, as well as their employer's name and address.

5. Federal funds that can be intercepted include income tax refunds, employment insurance benefits, old age security, Canada Pension Plan benefits, interest on regular Canada Savings Bonds.

- Deterrent penalties and service fees are being phased-in in Alberta. In the first phase, beginning November 2005, three penalties were introduced: a default penalty for late or missed payments, a penalty for NSF items and a penalty for failure to file a Statement of Finances. In October 2008, penalties were introduced for creditors failing to report direct payments, along with service charges for re-registering a closed file, third-party service of documents and for collection of interest on arrears.
- British Columbia has a default fee in which each year the payor is charged the equivalent of one month's maintenance, to a maximum of \$400, upon the second default of the year.

These types of provincial/territorial variations must be considered when assessing the information compiled in this report.

Case closure

Conditions for withdrawal from a MEP vary by jurisdiction. Cases can be withdrawn by the recipient (opt-out) or by the program. Recipients can withdraw from the program for a variety of reasons, for example, they do not feel they need to have the order enforced. In many jurisdictions, the payor's agreement is required in order for the recipient to withdraw from the program.

Payors can also withdraw from the program, but under limited circumstances. In particular, this is allowed in New Brunswick and Ontario, provided the recipient does not object; in British Columbia, if the payor was the one who registered the order and the recipient is in agreement; and in Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories, if the payor was the one who registered the order. In Quebec, the payor and the recipient can jointly apply to the Court for an exemption from having the MEP administer their case. In order for the Court to agree, the payor must provide the MEP with security (a sum of money, a letter of guarantee or a guarantee from a financial institution) covering payment of support for one month.

Generally, a case is closed or "terminated" if the terms of the order have expired, or either party dies. There may be situations where a MEP will close a case because it may be impractical to enforce, for example, if a recipient moves and cannot be located.

Related products

Selected publications from Statistics Canada

85-552-X Maintenance Enforcement Programs in Canada: Description of Operations

Selected surveys from Statistics Canada

3324 Maintenance Enforcement Survey

Statistical tables

Table 1
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by interjurisdictional support order status, by fiscal year

	Cases enrolled		Non-interjurisdictional support order	Interjurisdictional support order-in	Interjurisdictional support order-out
	number		percent		
Newfoundland and Labrador¹					
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009
2009/2010	7,251	100	75	6	19
Prince Edward Island^{1, 2}					
2005/2006	2,676	100	85	11	4
2006/2007	2,730	100	84	11	5
2007/2008	4,014	100	81	12	7
2008/2009	4,176	100	80	12	8
2009/2010	4,299	100	80	12	8
Nova Scotia¹					
2005/2006	20,580	100	82	6	12
2006/2007	19,968	100	82	6	12
2007/2008	19,482	100	81	6	13
2008/2009	17,994	100	80	7	13
2009/2010	17,370	100	80	7	13
New Brunswick¹					
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	14,028	100	84	6	10
2008/2009	14,097	100	83	7	10
2009/2010	13,914	100	83	7	10
Quebec³					
2005/2006	129,390	100	98	1	1
2006/2007	132,177	100	98	1	1
2007/2008	133,251	100	98	1	1
2008/2009	132,165	100	98	1	1
2009/2010	132,759	100	98	1	1
Saskatchewan¹					
2005/2006	9,366	100	69	13	19
2006/2007	9,156	100	70	13	18
2007/2008	9,159	100	69	14	17
2008/2009	8,976	100	68	14	17
2009/2010	9,087	100	67	16	18
Alberta¹					
2005/2006	50,271	100	75	16	9
2006/2007	48,897	100	75	17	9
2007/2008	48,558	100	74	17	9
2008/2009	47,742	100	74	18	9
2009/2010	48,255	100	74	16	9
British Columbia					
2005/2006	44,544	100	77	9	14
2006/2007	43,578	100	77	9	14
2007/2008	43,416	100	78	9	14
2008/2009	43,371	100	79	9	13
2009/2010	43,713	100	79	9	12
Yukon¹					
2005/2006	582	100	44	28	28
2006/2007	555	100	43	29	28
2007/2008	552	100	44	29	27
2008/2009	552	100	42	29	29
2009/2010	537	100	45	26	29
Northwest Territories¹					
2005/2006	816	100	50	27	23
2006/2007	858	100	51	26	23
2007/2008	870	100	54	25	21
2008/2009	903	100	56	24	20
2009/2010	927	100	55	25	20

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 1 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by interjurisdictional support order status, by fiscal year

	Cases enrolled		Non-interjurisdictional support order	Interjurisdictional support order-in	Interjurisdictional support order-out
	number		percent		
Total					
2005/2006	258,225	100	87	6	6
2006/2007	257,919	100	88	6	6
2007/2008	259,302	100	87	6	6
2008/2009	269,976	100	87	6	6
2009/2010	278,112	100	87	6	7

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 2. In March 2008, Prince Edward Island began reporting data through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs includes data not only on active cases in the Prince Edward Island system, but also on a substantial number of inactive cases. Prince Edward Island has a practice of making cases inactive rather than closing them, thus their inactive caseload is much higher than other jurisdictions. In most other tables in this report, with the exception of Table 3, only active cases are included.
 3. In Quebec, cases enrolled in the annual tables include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the Maintenance Enforcement Program. Furthermore, cases enrolled in the annual tables excludes inactive cases where the payor has no financial means or cannot be found. Other annual tables are Tables 3, 4, and 17.
- Note(s):** Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. The provinces and territories have enacted legislation to ensure that orders/agreements can be enforced beyond their borders. Non-interjurisdictional support order cases are typically cases where both parties live in the same province/territory. Interjurisdictional support order-in cases are cases that the province/territory has been asked by another jurisdiction to enforce because the payor lives and/or has assets inside their borders. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are cases that the province/territory has sent to another jurisdiction for enforcement because the payor lives and/or has assets outside their borders.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 2 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, at month end

	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Average ¹
	number												
Total													
2005/2006	411,135	411,702	412,932	412,821	412,635	412,824	413,178	413,769	414,054	414,177	413,343	407,790	412,530
2006/2007	405,396	402,225	400,656	399,555	399,126	399,867	399,846	399,687	399,786	401,073	400,887	401,706	400,818
2007/2008	401,991	402,147	402,426	389,700	390,060	390,414	390,282	390,891	390,477	390,387	390,927	404,187	...
2008/2009	404,739	405,258	404,757	405,081	405,177	404,973	405,378	405,327	404,436	402,102	400,623	400,269	404,010
2009/2010	399,861	399,900	399,627	398,052	399,051	399,582	400,017	399,867	400,428	400,623	401,343	407,907	400,522

1. The average monthly caseload for the year is calculated by taking the sum of the monthly figures and dividing by 12.
2. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
3. New Brunswick converted to a new information system in February 2008 and a new interface to the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs was built for the new system. Data collected the first few months of 2007/2008 was through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey. Data for March 2008 was collected through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 3
Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by new enrolments, re-enrolments and closed cases, by fiscal year

	Cases administered during fiscal year ¹		New enrolments		Re-enrolments ²		Closed cases ³	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
Prince Edward Island⁴								
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	3,735	171	5	0	0	0	21	1
2008/2009	3,876	204	5	0	0	0	36	1
2009/2010	4,032	210	5	0	0	0	81	2
Nova Scotia⁴								
2005/2006	20,718	2,166	10	612	3	3	2,547	12
2006/2007	20,430	1,953	10	561	3	3	2,859	14
2007/2008	19,629	1,818	9	537	3	3	2,664	14
2008/2009	19,674	1,872	10	768	4	4	4,017	20
2009/2010	18,060	1,869	10	687	4	4	2,949	16
New Brunswick⁴								
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009	14,355	1,728	12	117	1	1	1,668	12
2009/2010	14,178	1,458	10	171	1	1	1,677	12
Quebec⁵								
2005/2006	135,606	13,149	10	981	1	1	7,746	6
2006/2007	138,744	12,096	9	999	1	1	8,061	6
2007/2008	139,986	12,108	9	996	1	1	8,241	6
2008/2009	139,347	11,553	8	1,029	1	1	8,697	6
2009/2010	139,905	11,232	8	1,089	1	1	8,577	6
Saskatchewan^{4, 6}								
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009
2009/2010	8,541	1,002	12	345	4	4	1,047	12
Alberta⁴								
2005/2006	54,417	6,468	12	2,121	4	4	8,445	16
2006/2007	51,360	4,398	9	2,034	4	4	6,741	13
2007/2008	50,004	4,632	9	1,980	4	4	5,835	12
2008/2009	50,697	4,908	10	2,043	4	4	7,140	14
2009/2010	50,010	5,118	10	2,022	4	4	6,159	12
British Columbia								
2005/2006	43,455	4,107	9	642	1	1	5,109	12
2006/2007	42,357	3,555	8	558	1	1	4,797	11
2007/2008	41,955	3,774	9	588	1	1	4,422	11
2008/2009	42,711	4,182	10	642	2	2	4,800	11
2009/2010	43,047	4,362	10	654	2	2	4,575	11
Yukon⁴								
2005/2006	504	57	11	21	4	4	84	17
2006/2007	486	60	12	18	4	4	87	18
2007/2008	474	54	11	30	6	6	69	15
2008/2009	456	48	11	21	5	5	63	14
2009/2010	462	66	14	24	5	5	81	18
Northwest Territories^{4, 6}								
2005/2006	714	78	11	12	2	2	87	12
2006/2007	720	117	16	12	2	2	63	9
2007/2008	741	111	15	9	1	1	54	7
2008/2009	792	105	13	15	2	2	69	9
2009/2010	798	81	10	27	3	3	54	7

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 3 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by new enrolments, re-enrolments and closed cases, by fiscal year

	Cases administered during fiscal year ¹		New enrolments		Re-enrolments ²		Closed cases ³	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
Total								
2005/2006	255,414		26,025	10	4,389	2	24,018	9
2006/2007	254,097		22,179	9	4,182	2	22,608	9
2007/2008	256,524		22,668	9	4,140	2	21,306	8
2008/2009	271,908		24,600	9	4,635	2	26,490	10
2009/2010	279,033		25,398	9	5,019	2	25,200	9

1. This is the number of cases enrolled for all or part of the fiscal year. This figure may be undercounted, as it does not include non-interjurisdictional support order cases that become interjurisdictional support order-outs during the year.

2. Re-enrolments are cases that were not enrolled in the Maintenance Enforcement Program at the beginning of the fiscal year, but re-enrolled at some point during the year. Cases that were newly enrolled, withdrawn then re-enrolled all in the same year are categorized as re-enrolments only.

3. Closed cases are cases that terminated or withdrew from the Maintenance Enforcement Program during the fiscal year and did not re-enrol.

4. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.

5. In Quebec, cases enrolled in the annual tables include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the maintenance enforcement program. Furthermore, cases enrolled in the annual tables excludes inactive cases where the payor has no financial means or cannot be found. Other annual tables are Tables 1, 4, and 17.

6. In Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories, totals for closed cases and cases administered are undercounted.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 4
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by length of enrolment, by fiscal year

	Cases enrolled		Length of time enrolled (years)							
	number	percent	Less than	Greater than	Greater	Greater	Greater	Greater	Greater	
			or equal to 1 year	1 year to 3 years	than 3 to 5 years	than 5 to 7 years	than 7 to 10 years	than 10 to 15 years	than 15 years	
									percent of cases	
Newfoundland and Labrador¹										
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009
2009/2010	5,880	100	11	16	18	15	17	17	17	6
Prince Edward Island¹										
2005/2006	2,553	100	8	17	17	14	21	18	18	5
2006/2007	2,583	100	7	15	16	15	19	21	15	7
2007/2008	2,538	100	6	13	15	16	19	22	18	8
2008/2009	2,469	100	8	12	15	14	17	23	17	11
2009/2010	2,484	100	8	12	12	14	20	23	17	11
Nova Scotia^{1, 2}										
2005/2006	18,177	100	8	14	13	13	23	28	28	...
2006/2007	17,568	100	8	14	13	13	19	33	28	...
2007/2008	16,962	100	7	14	13	12	18	37	28	...
2008/2009	15,660	100	7	12	13	12	17	38	28	...
2009/2010	15,111	100	8	12	12	12	17	39	28	...
New Brunswick¹										
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	12,687	100	9	15	14	13	19	22	19	7
2008/2009	12,684	100	12	15	13	12	18	21	18	8
2009/2010	12,504	100	10	18	13	12	17	21	17	10
Quebec^{2, 3}										
2005/2006	127,860	100	10	20	20	23	27
2006/2007	130,683	100	9	18	18	19	28	7
2007/2008	131,745	100	9	18	16	17	27	14
2008/2009	130,650	100	9	17	15	15	25	19
2009/2010	131,325	100	9	16	15	14	22	25
Saskatchewan^{1, 4}										
2005/2006	7,620	100	8	19	13	13	24	20	20	3
2006/2007	7,554	100	9	16	15	12	17	27	17	4
2007/2008	7,602	100	10	16	15	11	16	26	16	5
2008/2009	7,422	100	8	18	14	13	16	26	16	6
2009/2010	7,488	100	13	19	14	12	14	19	14	9
Alberta¹										
2005/2006	45,969	100	9	17	15	12	17	21	17	10
2006/2007	44,613	100	9	17	14	12	16	21	16	11
2007/2008	44,169	100	9	16	15	13	15	20	15	12
2008/2009	43,557	100	10	15	15	12	15	20	15	13
2009/2010	43,851	100	10	16	13	12	15	20	15	13
British Columbia										
2005/2006	38,349	100	10	17	16	16	20	16	16	5
2006/2007	37,563	100	9	16	16	15	20	17	16	6
2007/2008	37,533	100	10	16	14	14	20	18	16	7
2008/2009	37,908	100	11	15	13	13	20	20	16	8
2009/2010	38,475	100	11	17	13	12	18	22	16	8
Yukon¹										
2005/2006	417	100	10	20	13	16	19	17	17	5
2006/2007	399	100	13	20	12	12	20	20	17	5
2007/2008	399	100	13	17	14	11	19	20	17	7
2008/2009	390	100	12	20	12	10	18	21	17	7
2009/2010	378	100	15	17	13	13	13	21	17	7
Northwest Territories¹										
2005/2006	630	100	12	23	19	15	15	15	15	1
2006/2007	654	100	17	22	15	15	15	16	15	1
2007/2008	690	100	15	21	17	13	13	17	15	3
2008/2009	726	100	13	24	17	10	16	15	15	5
2009/2010	744	100	10	23	17	13	14	16	15	6

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 4 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by length of enrolment, by fiscal year

	Cases enrolled		Length of time enrolled (years)						
	number	percent	Less than or equal to 1 year	Greater than 1 year to 3 years	Greater than 3 to 5 years	Greater than 5 to 7 years	Greater than 7 to 10 years	Greater than 10 to 15 years	Greater than 15 years
			percent of cases						
Total									
2005/2006	241,578	100	10	18	18	19	23	10	3
2006/2007	241,617	100	9	17	16	16	24	14	3
2007/2008	254,325	100	9	17	15	15	22	18	4
2008/2009	251,466	100	9	16	15	14	21	21	4
2009/2010	258,240	100	9	16	14	13	19	24	4

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
2. In Nova Scotia and Quebec, length of time enrolled does not exceed 14 years because in 1996 the Maintenance Enforcement Program information systems were implemented by the Nova Scotia Department of Justice and the Ministère du Revenu du Québec, and the date of enrolment for previously enrolled cases was set to 1996.
3. In Quebec, cases enrolled in the annual tables include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the maintenance enforcement program. Furthermore, cases enrolled in the annual tables excludes inactive cases where the payor has no financial means or cannot be found. Other annual tables are Tables 1, 3, and 17.
4. In Saskatchewan in 1997, an increase in staff, judges, and the introduction of the Child Support Guidelines may have increased the number of cases processed in that year. In 2006/2007 to 2009/2010, it corresponds with cases of 10 to 15 years duration.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 5
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by authority of order/agreement and type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2010

Province and type of beneficiary	Cases enrolled		Authority of order/agreement							
			<i>Divorce Act</i>		Provincial order		Provincial agreement		Unknown	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
Newfoundland and Labrador ^{1, 2, 3}										
Children only	4,911	100	1,071	22	3,465	71	96	2	279	6
Spouse only	195	100	90	46	90	46	6	3	9	5
Spouse with children	111	100	54	49	42	38	9	8	6	5
Unknown	672	100	54	8	57	8	0	0	561	83
Total	5,889	100	1,269	22	3,654	62	111	2	855	15
Nova Scotia ^{1, 4}										
Children only	13,533	100	3,405	25	10,128	75
Spouse only	759	100	438	58	321	42
Spouse with children	585	100	375	64	210	36
Unknown	234	100	39	17	195	83
Total	15,111	100	4,257	28	10,854	72
New Brunswick ¹										
Children only	11,199	100	2,163	19	7,245	65	222	2	1,569	14
Spouse only	498	100	288	58	162	33	3	1	45	9
Spouse with children	294	100	111	38	135	46	12	4	36	12
Unknown	510	100	57	11	147	29	3	1	303	59
Total	12,501	100	2,619	21	7,689	62	240	2	1,953	16
Saskatchewan ¹										
Children only	6,843	100	1,938	28	2,805	41	417	6	1,683	25
Spouse only	168	100	111	66	15	9	12	7	30	18
Spouse with children	384	100	240	63	57	15	12	3	75	20
Unknown	96	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	100
Total	7,491	100	2,289	31	2,877	38	441	6	1,884	25
Alberta ^{1, 3}										
Children only	30,855	100	10,929	35	16,899	55	3,027	10	0	0
Spouse only	1,203	100	1,044	87	159	13	0	0	0	0
Spouse with children	867	100	654	75	207	24	6	1	0	0
Unknown	10,926	100	45	0	51	0	6	0	10,824	99
Total	43,851	100	12,672	29	17,316	39	3,039	7	10,824	25
British Columbia										
Children only	35,583	100	6,921	19	26,136	73	2,481	7	45	0
Spouse only	909	100	453	50	360	40	93	10	3	0
Spouse with children	1,875	100	732	39	975	52	168	9	0	0
Unknown	105	100	45	43	45	43	12	11	3	3
Total	38,472	100	8,151	21	27,516	72	2,754	7	51	0
Yukon ¹										
Children only	267	100	63	24	186	70	18	7	0	0
Spouse only	15	100	9	60	6	40	0	0	0	0
Spouse with children
Unknown	96	100	12	13	15	16	3	3	66	69
Total	378	100	84	22	207	55	21	6	66	17
Total										
Children only	103,191	100	26,490	26	56,736	55	6,261	6	13,704	13
Spouse only	3,747	100	2,433	65	792	21	114	3	408	11
Spouse with children	4,116	100	2,166	53	1,416	34	207	5	327	8
Unknown	12,639	100	252	2	315	2	24	0	12,048	95
Total	123,693	100	31,341	25	59,259	48	6,606	5	26,487	21

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Yukon report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. For these jurisdictions, the authority of the support order is unavailable for cases that do not have an active regular payment obligation. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.

2. In Newfoundland and Labrador, for cases enrolled before 2006, 'spouse with children' cases are categorized as 'children only'.

3. In Newfoundland and Labrador and Alberta, the type of beneficiary is known only if there is an active regular payment obligation for the case.

4. In Nova Scotia, separate figures for provincial orders and agreements are not available. The combined figure is included in unknown.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 6
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by sex of payor and recipient, at March 31

	Cases enrolled		Sex of payor and recipient		
	number	percent	Male	Female	Unknown ¹
			payor / female recipient	payor / male recipient	
			percent of cases		
Newfoundland and Labrador²					
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	5,886	100	96	1	3
Prince Edward Island²					
2006	2,571	100	87	0	13
2007	2,598	100	87	0	13
2008	2,538	100	86	2	11
2009	2,469	100	86	2	12
2010	2,484	100	86	3	11
Nova Scotia²					
2006	18,171	100	96	3	1
2007	17,568	100	96	3	1
2008	16,962	100	96	3	1
2009	15,657	100	96	3	1
2010	15,111	100	96	3	1
Saskatchewan²					
2006	7,629	100	98	2	0
2007	7,551	100	98	2	0
2008	7,605	100	98	2	0
2009	7,425	100	98	2	0
2010	7,491	100	98	2	0
Alberta²					
2006	45,972	100	96	3	1
2007	44,619	100	96	3	1
2008	44,166	100	96	3	1
2009	43,554	100	96	3	1
2010	43,851	100	96	3	1
British Columbia					
2006	38,349	100	96	3	1
2007	37,566	100	96	3	1
2008	37,536	100	96	3	1
2009	37,911	100	96	3	1
2010	38,472	100	96	3	1
Yukon²					
2006	423	100	96	3	1
2007	399	100	97	2	1
2008	405	100	96	3	1
2009	390	100	96	3	1
2010	381	100	94	4	2
Northwest Territories²					
2006	630	100	91	3	6
2007	657	100	91	4	5
2008	687	100	92	4	4
2009	726	100	92	4	4
2010	744	100	93	4	3
Total					
2006	113,745	100	96	3	1
2007	110,961	100	96	3	1
2008	109,899	100	96	3	1
2009	108,132	100	96	3	1
2010	114,420	100	96	3	1

1. The "Unknown" category includes a small proportion of "Other" cases, which consists of male payor and male recipient, or female payor and female recipient.
2. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
- Note(s):** Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 7
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by median age of payor, recipient and children, at March 31

	Payor	Recipient	Children
	median age (years)		
Newfoundland and Labrador¹			
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	41	38	13
Prince Edward Island¹			
2006	42	40	15
2007	43	40	16
2008	43	41	16
2009	43	40	15
2010	43	41	16
Nova Scotia¹			
2006	42	39	14
2007	42	39	15
2008	42	40	15
2009	43	40	15
2010	43	40	15
New Brunswick¹			
2006
2007
2008	40	38	14
2009	41	38	14
2010	41	38	14
Saskatchewan^{1, 2}			
2006	42	39	14
2007	42	39	14
2008	42	39	14
2009	42	39	15
2010	42	39	15
Alberta¹			
2006	41	38	13
2007	41	38	13
2008	41	38	13
2009	41	39	13
2010	41	39	13
British Columbia			
2006	43	40	13
2007	43	40	13
2008	43	41	13
2009	44	41	14
2010	44	41	14
Yukon¹			
2006	43	39	13
2007	43	39	13
2008	43	40	13
2009	44	40	13
2010	43	40	13
Northwest Territories¹			
2006	40	37	14
2007	40	37	14
2008	41	38	14
2009	41	38	14
2010	41	38	15

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
2. Median age for children for Saskatchewan includes all children associated on the order, including an unknown number who may not be covered by the agreement.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 8
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by assignment status, at March 31

	Cases enrolled		Cases assigned ¹	
	number		number	percent
Newfoundland and Labrador ²				
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	5,883		549	9
Prince Edward Island ²				
2006
2007
2008	2,538		87	3
2009	2,463		66	3
2010	2,484		72	3
Nova Scotia ²				
2006	18,177		2,394	13
2007	17,577		2,370	13
2008	16,965		2,328	14
2009	15,651		2,244	14
2010	15,120		2,103	14
New Brunswick ^{2, 3}				
2006	12,807		2,913	23
2007	12,840		2,835	22
2008	12,687		2,817	22
2009	12,693		3,228	25
2010	12,498		3,390	27
Quebec				
2006	106,227		20,223	19
2007	107,070		19,164	18
2008	106,512		16,743	16
2009	104,505		13,908	13
2010	103,092		12,639	12
Ontario				
2006	175,005		16,356	9
2007	170,826		16,320	10
2008	175,062		16,725	10
2009	174,927		17,298	10
2010	177,891		18,270	10
Saskatchewan ²				
2006	7,635		315	4
2007	7,548		267	4
2008	7,614		267	4
2009	7,431		240	3
2010	7,500		261	3
Alberta ²				
2006	45,963		2,649	6
2007	44,619		2,370	5
2008	44,175		2,274	5
2009	43,554		2,304	5
2010	43,845		2,679	6
British Columbia ⁴				
2006	38,355		5,205	14
2007	37,572		4,806	13
2008	37,536		4,956	13
2009	37,920		5,628	15
2010	38,463		6,210	16
Total				
2006	404,169		50,055	12
2007	398,052		48,132	12
2008	403,089		46,197	11
2009	399,144		44,916	11
2010	406,776		46,173	11

1. Assignment status indicates that the recipient is receiving social assistance and has assigned their entitlement to receive support payments to the government.
2. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Alberta report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
3. In New Brunswick, cases assigned includes cases with current payment assigned, along with cases that do not have a current assignment, but have arrears and the total amount of arrears is owed to the Crown.
4. In British Columbia, all support payments received are disbursed to the recipients, regardless of the social assistance status of the recipient. However, recipients on social assistance may have their social assistance benefits reduced based on the amount of support received. For the purposes of this report, these cases are considered assigned.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 9
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due, at March 31

	Cases enrolled		Regular monthly payment due (dollars)							
			\$0 ¹	\$1 to \$200	\$201 to \$400	\$401 to \$600	\$601 to \$800	\$801 to \$1,000	\$1,001 to \$2,000	Over \$2,000
	number	percent	percent of cases							
Newfoundland and Labrador ²										
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	5,883	100	8	33	33	13	5	3	3	1
Prince Edward Island ²										
2006	2,571	100	16	31	34	12	4	2	2	0
2007	2,601	100	19	29	32	12	4	2	2	0
2008	2,529	100	19	28	32	12	4	2	2	0
2009	2,475	100	21	27	31	12	4	2	2	1
2010	2,487	100	23	26	29	13	4	2	2	0
Nova Scotia ²										
2006	18,171	100	11	41	28	11	4	2	2	1
2007	17,565	100	12	38	28	12	5	2	2	1
2008	16,962	100	15	35	28	12	5	2	3	1
2009	15,657	100	17	32	28	13	5	2	3	1
2010	15,117	100	19	28	27	13	5	3	3	1
New Brunswick ²										
2006	12,816	100	15	40	29	10	3	1	2	1
2007	12,828	100	16	38	29	10	3	2	2	0
2008	12,702	100	14	39	30	10	3	1	2	1
2009	12,690	100	13	37	30	11	4	2	2	0
2010	12,513	100	14	35	31	11	4	2	2	1
Quebec										
2006	106,227	100	9	20	37	18	8	3	4	1
2007	107,070	100	8	20	37	18	8	3	4	1
2008	106,506	100	7	20	38	19	8	4	4	1
2009	104,502	100	7	19	37	20	8	4	4	1
2010	103,095	100	6	19	38	20	8	4	4	1
Ontario										
2006	175,005	100	23	22	27	14	6	3	4	1
2007	170,835	100	21	22	27	14	7	4	5	1
2008	175,053	100	23	21	26	14	7	4	5	1
2009	174,924	100	23	20	26	14	7	4	5	1
2010	177,888	100	25	20	26	14	7	3	5	1
Saskatchewan ²										
2006	7,635	100	13	29	32	15	6	3	2	0
2007	7,560	100	14	28	32	15	6	2	2	0
2008	7,611	100	15	26	32	15	6	2	3	1
2009	7,416	100	16	24	31	15	6	3	3	1
2010	7,485	100	16	24	31	15	6	3	4	1
Alberta ²										
2006	45,963	100	19	24	30	14	6	3	3	1
2007	44,622	100	20	22	30	15	6	3	3	1
2008	44,160	100	22	20	29	15	6	3	4	1
2009	43,560	100	22	18	28	16	7	4	4	1
2010	43,845	100	23	16	28	15	7	4	5	2
British Columbia										
2006	38,343	100	13	28	33	14	5	3	3	1
2007	37,569	100	14	27	33	14	6	3	3	1
2008	37,545	100	16	24	32	15	6	3	3	1
2009	37,908	100	16	23	32	15	7	3	4	1
2010	38,475	100	17	21	31	16	7	3	4	1
Yukon ²										
2006	414	100	12	22	38	18	4	2	3	0
2007	408	100	13	26	33	16	7	2	2	0
2008	399	100	13	25	36	16	7	3	1	0
2009	387	100	16	22	35	14	7	2	4	0
2010	390	100	15	18	38	12	9	4	3	1
Northwest Territories ²										
2006	636	100	14	11	32	24	9	5	5	0
2007	657	100	15	11	31	21	10	7	5	1
2008	687	100	17	10	29	22	10	7	5	0
2009	717	100	15	9	28	21	10	8	8	0
2010	741	100	15	7	28	21	12	9	8	0

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 9 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due, at March 31

	Cases enrolled		Regular monthly payment due (dollars)							
	number	percent	\$0 ¹	\$1 to \$200	\$201 to \$400	\$401 to \$600	\$601 to \$800	\$801 to \$1,000	\$1,001 to \$2,000	Over \$2,000
			percent of cases							
Total										
2006	407,781	100	17	24	31	15	6	3	4	1
2007	401,715	100	16	23	31	15	7	3	4	1
2008	404,136	100	17	22	30	15	7	3	4	1
2009	400,236	100	17	21	30	16	7	4	4	1
2010	407,919	100	18	20	30	15	7	3	4	1

1. Cases may have a \$0 amount due for several reasons including: they have no regular ongoing obligation, they only have arrears, or they have a different payment schedule, such as quarterly.
2. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 10
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled and regular monthly median payment due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2010

	Total	Type of beneficiary							
		One child	Two children	Three children or more	Spouse only	Spouse with one child	Spouse with two children	Spouse with three children or more	Unknown
number of cases									
Newfoundland and Labrador ^{1, 2, 3}	5,889	3,543	1,167	201	195	51	51	9	672
Prince Edward Island ¹	2,484	1,302	666	276	63	30	33	3	111
Nova Scotia ¹	15,111	8,637	3,825	1,071	759	243	234	108	234
New Brunswick ¹	12,501	7,260	3,105	834	498	120	126	48	510
Saskatchewan ¹	7,491	3,951	1,953	939	168	135	156	93	96
Alberta ^{1, 3}	43,851	20,382	8,169	2,304	1,203	309	381	177	10,926
British Columbia	38,472	23,667	8,745	3,171	909	828	738	309	105
Yukon ¹	378	192	57	18	15	0	0	...	96
Northwest Territories ^{1, 4}	744	420	186	120	18

	Total	Type of beneficiary							
		One child	Two children	Three children or more	Spouse only	Spouse with one child	Spouse with two children	Spouse with three children or more	Other
median regular payment due									
Newfoundland and Labrador ^{1, 2, 3}	250	211	400	499	692	1,000	1,401	1,561	...
Prince Edward Island ¹	206	192	256	345	450	200	354	x	154
Nova Scotia ¹	222	170	313	389	425	451	740	691	...
New Brunswick ¹	205	174	300	373	563	529	850	1,336	...
Saskatchewan ¹	263	220	325	399	500	394	631	859	...
Alberta ^{1, 3}	282	296	508	682	710	1,219	1,654	2,127	...
British Columbia	280	234	396	407	600	574	766	1,000	...
Yukon ¹	300	300	509	726	200	x	x
Northwest Territories ^{1, 4}	400	353	500	700	490

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.

2. In Newfoundland and Labrador, for cases enrolled before 2006, 'spouse with children' cases are categorized as 'children only'.

3. In Newfoundland and Labrador and Alberta, the type of beneficiary is known only if there is an active regular payment obligation for the case.

4. The Northwest Territories cannot distinguish between 'children only' cases and 'spouse and children' cases. Both types of cases are included in the 'children only' categories.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded, as are the small number of cases with a beneficiary other than the spouse or children. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 11
Maintenance enforcement cases administered with a regular amount due, by amount due and received, by fiscal year

	Cases administered with a regular amount due ¹	Regular amount due	Regular amount received	
	number	millions of dollars		percent
Prince Edward Island²				
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	2,313	8.6	5.2	61
2008/2009	2,265	8.4	5.1	61
2009/2010	2,121	7.9	5.0	63
Nova Scotia^{2, 3}				
2005/2006	18,879	62.9	39.3	62
2006/2007	18,582	63.3	39.7	63
2007/2008	17,649	63.3	40.6	64
2008/2009	17,007	61.2	41.6	68
2009/2010	15,327	58.3	41.3	71
New Brunswick²				
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009	12,600	42.6	31.6	74
2009/2010	12,456	43.6	33.1	76
Quebec⁴				
2005/2006	102,915	470.7	421.5	90
2006/2007	104,496	484.7	434.2	90
2007/2008	105,375	493.7	444.3	90
2008/2009	104,160	495.9	452.0	91
2009/2010	103,404	498.4	455.7	91
Saskatchewan²				
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009
2009/2010	7,290	30.5	20.9	68
Alberta²				
2005/2006	44,349	186.0	118.6	64
2006/2007	42,309	184.0	122.5	67
2007/2008	40,746	187.7	127.6	68
2008/2009	39,987	195.7	135.7	69
2009/2010	39,576	206.3	138.8	67
British Columbia³				
2005/2006	37,809	148.9	109.1	73
2006/2007	36,675	149.4	110.1	74
2007/2008	35,928	151.8	113.1	75
2008/2009	36,030	159.7	117.1	73
2009/2010	36,126	165.9	119.0	72
Yukon^{2, 3}				
2005/2006	450	1.7	1.2	70
2006/2007	429	1.7	1.1	68
2007/2008	417	1.7	1.2	69
2008/2009	402	1.7	1.1	68
2009/2010	402	1.7	1.1	65
Northwest Territories²				
2005/2006	645	3.1	1.9	61
2006/2007	669	3.2	1.9	60
2007/2008	678	3.4	1.9	57
2008/2009	714	3.7	2.0	56
2009/2010	717	4.0	2.2	54
Total				
2005/2006	205,047	873.3	691.6	79
2006/2007	203,160	886.4	709.5	80
2007/2008	203,106	910.1	733.8	81
2008/2009	213,165	968.9	786.3	81
2009/2010	217,419	1,016.7	817.1	80

1. Excludes those cases that only have other types of payments due (scheduled arrears, event-driven payments, and fees, costs and penalties).
2. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
4. In certain cases if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, Quebec legislation allows for the Maintenance Enforcement Program to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Cases administered include cases registered for at least part of the year, i.e. cases enrolled and cases terminated. The amount due represents the total regular amount due for the year.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 12
Maintenance enforcement cases administered, by total amount due and received, 2009/2010

	Cases administered ¹	Total amount due ²	Total amount received ^{3, 4}	
	number	millions of dollars		percent
Prince Edward Island				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	2,335	7.2	5.5	77
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	290	0.8	0.4	53
Total	2,625	8.0	5.9	74
Nova Scotia				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	16,785	56.8	49.3	87
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	1,430	3.9	2.9	75
Total	18,215	60.7	52.3	86
New Brunswick				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	13,205	41.7	37.5	90
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	1,125	3.3	2.5	75
Total	14,330	45.0	40.0	89
Saskatchewan				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	6,955	26.3	24.0	91
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	1,670	4.8	4.2	88
Total	8,625	31.1	28.3	91
Alberta				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	41,105	203.3	163.2	80
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	9,585	38.0	29.1	77
Total	50,690	241.4	192.3	80
Yukon				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	285	1.2	1.2	100+
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	190	0.6	0.5	92
Total	475	1.8	1.7	98
Northwest Territories				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	560	3.1	2.4	77
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	275	1.1	1.2	100+
Total	835	4.2	3.5	85
Total				
Non-interjurisdictional support order cases	81,230	339.6	283.1	83
Interjurisdictional support order-in cases	14,565	52.5	40.9	78
Total	95,795	392.1	324.0	83

1. This includes all cases that were enrolled with the Maintenance Enforcement Program at some point during the fiscal year. The interjurisdictional support order status of a case is determined by the status during the last month the case was enrolled in the Maintenance Enforcement Program. Cases administered in this table used a definition developed for Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs data, and results will be slightly higher than the cases administered figure in Table 3, which used a different definition developed for Maintenance Enforcement Survey data.
2. Amounts due at the end of each month are aggregated to arrive at amount due for the fiscal year. Adjustments to the amount due transactions that occur after the reference month are not incorporated.
3. Total payments received include all payments received during the year, as well as any updates to payments received after the reference month (for example, an adjustment for a "non-sufficient funds" cheque or late notification of a direct payment).
4. Some arrears payments received in the fiscal year pay down arrears that accrued before the fiscal year.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded, as are amounts due or received when a case had an interjurisdictional support order-out status. Total may not add up due to rounding.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 13
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due and proportion in compliance, at March 31

	Total	Regular monthly payment due (dollars)						Over \$2,000
		\$1 to \$200	\$201 to \$400	\$401 to \$600	\$601 to \$800	\$801 to \$1,000	\$1,001 to \$2,000	
		percent of cases in compliance						
Newfoundland and Labrador ¹								
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	78	75	76	77	83	70	75	70
Prince Edward Island ¹								
2006	58	44	51	57	61	50	47	...
2007	58	42	51	56	67	41	48	33
2008	59	45	48	52	66	69	50	50
2009	62	47	52	61	54	64	44	20
2010	62	46	50	57	54	50	58	33
Nova Scotia ^{1, 2}								
2006	56	44	54	57	58	53	53	51
2007	56	44	54	57	58	53	58	51
2008	57	44	53	56	56	54	56	50
2009	64	52	58	63	63	57	61	58
2010	69	57	65	65	67	60	63	53
New Brunswick ¹								
2006	62	52	58	59	62	58	55	27
2007	65	54	63	64	65	60	64	61
2008	62	53	58	58	60	57	56	54
2009	68	58	65	68	70	69	73	71
2010	69	59	67	70	72	68	68	71
Quebec ³								
2006	78	68	74	81	84	87	86	83
2007	77	68	72	80	84	85	86	84
2008	77	69	72	80	84	86	86	86
2009	78	70	73	80	84	85	86	84
2010	79	72	75	81	84	86	87	87
Ontario ⁴								
2006	66	47	56	62	64	66	63	54
2007	64	45	54	60	63	65	62	53
2008	62	42	50	56	59	62	60	51
2009	64	44	52	58	61	63	62	52
2010	64	43	50	57	61	62	62	53
Saskatchewan ¹								
2006	69	60	67	67	62	64	64	56
2007	69	59	66	66	63	66	62	60
2008	66	55	62	64	58	71	59	43
2009	70	62	65	65	62	68	60	57
2010	68	63	63	63	58	65	61	45
Alberta ¹								
2006	70	59	66	61	63	66	62	59
2007	64	49	55	59	59	61	61	58
2008	65	49	55	58	60	59	60	55
2009	67	52	57	61	61	62	62	55
2010	67	53	57	60	61	61	62	57
British Columbia ²								
2006	65	55	61	62	61	61	55	55
2007	64	54	60	62	60	61	57	53
2008	65	57	60	60	59	57	60	54
2009	65	58	59	60	61	57	58	53
2010	65	57	59	58	59	58	58	56
Yukon ^{1, 2}								
2006	60	48	55	60	50	67	75	...
2007	62	49	49	68	70	100	67	...
2008	63	58	52	71	56	50	100	...
2009	64	48	60	67	67	33	40	...
2010	65	61	51	69	58	80	75	...
Northwest Territories ¹								
2006	61	54	54	56	47	40	73	...
2007	56	36	48	50	52	60	55	50
2008	55	48	42	48	52	31	50	100
2009	59	41	56	53	50	47	55	...
2010	55	56	51	45	37	48	47	...

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 13 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by regular monthly payment due and proportion in compliance, at March 31

	Total	Regular monthly payment due (dollars)						
		\$1 to \$200	\$201 to \$400	\$401 to \$600	\$601 to \$800	\$801 to \$1,000	\$1,001 to \$2,000	Over \$2,000
		percent of cases in compliance						
Total								
2006	69	54	63	68	70	71	69	62
2007	67	52	61	66	69	70	68	61
2008	66	52	59	65	67	68	67	60
2009	68	54	61	66	68	68	68	60
2010	69	55	61	66	68	68	67	61

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
 3. In certain cases, if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, Quebec legislation allows for the Maintenance Enforcement Program to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor.
 4. Ontario may have some cases that paid beyond month end that are included as having made a payment in the month.
- Note(s):** Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Regular payments are the ongoing amount ordered or agreed to. Compliance in this instance indicates that the regular amount expected in the month was received. The figure for compliance on total cases includes cases where no monthly payment is due. As cases with no payment in a month are coded as 100% compliant, the compliance for total cases may be higher than it would be if based solely on the numbers for the different payment categories shown in this table.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 14
Maintenance enforcement cases in compliance with regular payments due, by type of beneficiary, at March 31, 2010

	Type of beneficiary								
	Children only		Spouse only		Spouse with children				
	Cases enrolled	Cases in compliance	Cases enrolled	Cases in compliance	Cases enrolled	Cases in compliance			
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent			
Newfoundland and Labrador ^{1, 2}	4,920	3,741	76	189	147	78	108	81	75
Prince Edward Island ¹	2,247	1,368	61	66	51	77	63	39	62
Nova Scotia ^{1, 3}	13,533	9,228	68	759	618	81	597	423	71
New Brunswick ¹	11,202	7,653	68	504	393	78	294	204	69
Saskatchewan ¹	6,837	4,608	67	174	141	81	378	279	74
Alberta ¹	30,864	17,892	58	1,200	771	64	855	405	47
British Columbia ³	35,586	23,223	65	903	627	69	1,881	1,095	58
Yukon ^{1, 3}	276	156	57	12	12	100	3	3	100
Northwest Territories ^{1, 4}	726	402	55	15	6	40
Total	106,191	68,271	64	3,822	2,766	72	4,179	2,529	61

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
2. In Newfoundland and Labrador, for cases enrolled before 2006, 'spouse with children' cases are categorized as 'children only'.
3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
4. The Northwest Territories cannot distinguish between 'children only' cases and 'spouse and children' cases. Both types of cases are included in the 'children only' categories.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables. Regular payments are the ongoing amount ordered or agreed to. Compliance indicates that the regular amount expected in a month was received in full by the end of the month. "Other" and "Unknown" type of recipient categories are excluded.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 15
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by compliance on regular monthly payments due, at month end

	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Average ¹
percent of cases in compliance													
Newfoundland and Labrador²													
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009
2009/2010	78	..
Prince Edward Island²													
2005/2006	54	56	53	53	54	53	53	52	53	54	55	58	54
2006/2007	56	56	56	54	56	56	56	55	56	58	55	58	56
2007/2008	59	57	59	57	57	57	58	58	56	57	58	59	58
2008/2009	59	59	59	58	59	58	57	58	58	57	60	62	59
2009/2010	63	63	64	59	62	62	62	61	64	60	63	62	62
Nova Scotia^{2, 3}													
2005/2006	54	56	55	53	54	53	53	55	52	54	53	56	54
2006/2007	54	56	55	54	55	52	56	56	53	56	54	56	55
2007/2008	55	58	57	56	56	56	59	57	54	58	57	57	57
2008/2009	62	59	60	60	58	61	60	60	62	60	61	64	61
2009/2010	64	65	64	63	63	65	63	65	66	62	65	69	64
New Brunswick^{2, 4}													
2005/2006	58	63	58	59	61	59	60	56	58	62	59	62	60
2006/2007	61	61	60	61	59	57	62	57	57	62	56	65	60
2007/2008	63	64	61	62	..
2008/2009	64	62	61	63	60	63	60	59	64	59	60	68	62
2009/2010	63	63	64	63	61	63	63	63	65	60	64	69	64
Quebec⁵													
2005/2006	78	79	80	80	80	80	78	80	79	75	77	78	79
2006/2007	78	79	81	79	80	79	79	80	79	76	78	77	79
2007/2008	77	80	80	79	80	78	79	80	79	76	78	77	79
2008/2009	79	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	76	78	78	79
2009/2010	78	80	81	80	80	80	80	80	80	78	79	79	80
Ontario⁶													
2005/2006	65	65	66	64	65	65	65	66	65	65	64	66	65
2006/2007	64	65	65	62	62	63	63	62	61	63	61	64	63
2007/2008	63	64	63	63	64	62	64	63	61	62	..	62	63
2008/2009	65	64	63	63	62	64	64	62	63	62	61	64	63
2009/2010	63	62	63	63	62	62	63	61	63	61	61	64	62
Saskatchewan²													
2005/2006	68	67	68	61	67	66	66	67	66	63	65	69	66
2006/2007	66	69	66	65	67	66	68	66	68	66	65	69	67
2007/2008	69	70	67	66	68	64	69	67	66	67	65	66	67
2008/2009	69	68	64	69	64	66	69	65	68	64	66	70	67
2009/2010	68	65	67	63	67	65	64	63	67	62	63	68	65
Alberta²													
2005/2006	58	59	59	57	58	58	58	61	59	61	61	70	60
2006/2007	61	63	62	61	63	61	63	62	60	63	62	64	62
2007/2008	64	65	63	64	64	62	66	64	62	65	64	65	64
2008/2009	67	65	65	66	64	64	67	63	66	63	62	67	65
2009/2010	65	63	64	64	62	65	64	63	64	63	62	67	64
British Columbia³													
2005/2006	65	63	64	62	63	63	63	63	62	63	63	65	63
2006/2007	64	65	64	63	64	63	65	64	62	64	63	64	64
2007/2008	65	65	64	65	65	63	66	65	63	65	65	65	65
2008/2009	66	66	65	66	64	67	65	64	65	62	63	65	65
2009/2010	65	63	64	63	62	64	63	62	64	60	61	65	63
Yukon^{2, 3}													
2005/2006	62	64	64	56	63	60	59	59	61	56	57	60	60
2006/2007	54	63	61	58	63	57	59	58	54	59	55	62	59
2007/2008	59	62	56	60	62	57	61	56	55	62	54	63	59
2008/2009	58	60	63	64	58	61	67	56	63	54	61	64	61
2009/2010	57	61	63	59	60	63	59	58	59	58	59	65	60
Northwest Territories²													
2005/2006	56	60	47	51	56	57	52	56	49	57	54	61	55
2006/2007	51	66	55	47	55	53	51	58	45	57	48	56	54
2007/2008	47	61	54	56	54	51	57	55	43	57	45	55	53
2008/2009	58	60	54	56	51	54	54	50	51	52	47	59	54
2009/2010	55	53	53	54	49	53	54	52	47	56	47	55	52

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 15 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by compliance on regular monthly payments due, at month end

	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	Average ¹
	percent of cases in compliance												
Total													
2005/2006	67	67	68	66	67	67	67	68	67	66	66	69	67
2006/2007	67	68	68	66	67	66	67	67	66	66	65	67	67
2007/2008	67	68	67	67	68	66	68	68	66	67	79	66	68
2008/2009	69	68	68	68	67	68	68	67	68	65	66	68	67
2009/2010	67	67	68	67	67	68	68	67	68	65	66	69	67

1. The average monthly compliance rate for the year is calculated by taking the sum of the monthly figures and dividing by 12.
 2. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
 4. New Brunswick converted to a new information system in February 2008 and a new interface to the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs was built for the new system. Data collected the first few months of 2007/2008 was through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey. Data for March 2008 was collected through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.
 5. In certain cases if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, Quebec legislation allows for the Maintenance Enforcement Program to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor.
 6. Ontario may have some cases that paid beyond month end that are included as having made a payment for the month.
- Note(s):** Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Regular payments are the ongoing amount ordered or agreed to. Compliance indicates that the regular amount expected in a month was received in full by the end of the month.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 16
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled for entire fiscal year, by regularity of monthly compliance

	Cases enrolled with a regular payment due ¹		Regularity of monthly compliance				
			In full compliance every month	In full compliance between 6 to 11 months	In full compliance between 1 to 5 months	Never in full compliance, some money received	Never in full compliance, no money received
	number	percent	percent of cases				
Prince Edward Island							
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008	1,815	100	26	29	15	4	26
2008/2009	1,750	100	27	28	15	3	26
2009/2010	1,615	100	29	29	17	3	22
Nova Scotia ^{2, 3}							
2005/2006	14,290	100	27	30	16	3	24
2006/2007	13,690	100	30	29	16	3	22
2007/2008	12,975	100	31	30	16	4	20
2008/2009	11,320	100	34	33	17	4	12
2009/2010	10,550	100	35	34	17	3	11
New Brunswick							
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009	9,325	100	29	41	16	3	12
2009/2010	9,300	100	33	38	16	2	10
Saskatchewan							
2005/2006
2006/2007
2007/2008
2008/2009
2009/2010	5,170	100	30	41	19	3	8
Alberta							
2005/2006	32,415	100	31	29	21	4	15
2006/2007	30,935	100	35	28	18	5	15
2007/2008	29,485	100	37	27	16	5	15
2008/2009	28,790	100	38	26	17	4	14
2009/2010	28,435	100	35	28	17	4	15
Yukon ²							
2005/2006	305	100	27	43	17	2	11
2006/2007	290	100	29	39	18	4	11
2007/2008	275	100	31	40	16	5	7
2008/2009	275	100	33	37	18	5	7
2009/2010	260	100	37	35	17	2	10
Northwest Territories							
2005/2006	450	100	13	45	33	4	6
2006/2007	435	100	13	44	33	2	7
2007/2008	455	100	11	46	31	5	7
2008/2009	480	100	17	38	31	7	8
2009/2010	520	100	13	38	30	11	9
Total							
2005/2006	47,185	100	29	29	19	4	18
2006/2007	45,195	100	33	28	17	4	17
2007/2008	45,005	100	35	28	16	4	17
2008/2009	51,940	100	35	31	17	4	14
2009/2010	55,850	100	34	32	17	4	13

1. Cases enrolled includes all cases enrolled for the entire fiscal year that had a regular payment due each month.
 2. Nova Scotia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
 3. In Nova Scotia, cases in compliance were slightly underestimated in November and December 2005, which may impact the results for 2005/2006.
Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded.
Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 17
Maintenance enforcement cases enrolled, by arrears history and status, at March 31, 2010

	Total	Status at entry							Unknown
		No arrears at entry		Entered with arrears					
		No current arrears	Arrears have increased	Arrears have been paid off	Arrears have decreased	Arrears remained constant	Arrears have increased		
number of cases enrolled									
Prince Edward Island ^{1, 2}	2,481	282	435	408	246		729	351	
Nova Scotia ¹	15,111	3,222	2,808	3,099	2,094	165	3,648	75	
Quebec ^{3, 4}	131,325	43,848	6,534	44,778	15,816	396	18,582	2,061	
Saskatchewan ^{1, 5}	7,494	1,491	1,524	1,266	1,206	36	1,971	0	
Alberta ¹	43,848	8,283	13,494	6,201	4,950	96	10,824	0	
British Columbia	38,469	5,265	4,278	7,557	5,619	528	15,222	0	
Total	238,728	62,391	29,073	63,309	29,931	1,251	50,976	2,487	
percent of cases enrolled									
Prince Edward Island ^{1, 2}	100	11	18	16	10	1	29	14	
Nova Scotia ¹	100	21	19	21	14	1	24	0	
Quebec ^{3, 4}	100	33	5	34	12	0	14	2	
Saskatchewan ^{1, 5}	100	20	20	17	16	0	26	0	
Alberta ¹	100	19	31	14	11	0	25	0	
British Columbia	100	14	11	20	15	1	40	0	
Total	100	26	12	27	13	1	21	1	

1. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and Alberta report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 2. Prince Edward Island has a high number of unknowns because of a change in its information system.
 3. On November 1, 1996, the Ministère du Revenu implemented the information system of the maintenance enforcement program. When that happened, Quebec knew the amount of arrears due at the time, but could not establish the arrears status at entry for the cases registered before that date. These "unknown" cases account for approximately 2% of Quebec's caseload.
 4. In Quebec, cases enrolled in the annual tables include direct payment cases. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient which do not involve the maintenance enforcement program. Furthermore, cases enrolled in the annual tables excludes inactive cases where the payor has no financial means or cannot be found. Other annual tables are Tables 1, 3, and 4.
 5. In Saskatchewan, the number of cases with arrears at entry is undercounted, as some cases with arrears at entry are being classified as 'no arrears at entry'.
- Note(s):** Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. At entry into a maintenance enforcement program, arrears status may be unknown until an accurate balance is produced. Therefore, some payors can actually be in arrears but be recorded as having no arrears.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 18
Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by amount owing, at March 31

	Cases enrolled		Cases with arrears		Arrears due
	number		percent	millions of dollars	
Newfoundland and Labrador 1					
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	5,883	2,148	37	..	11.4
Prince Edward Island 1					
2006	2,571	1,767	69	..	13.4
2007	2,598	1,785	69	..	13.9
2008	2,538	1,707	67	..	15.1
2009	2,463	1,644	67	..	13.2
2010	2,484	1,671	67	..	14.0
Nova Scotia 1, 2					
2006	18,171	11,661	64	..	85.1
2007	17,577	11,148	63	..	82.2
2008	16,965	10,608	63	..	80.2
2009	15,651	9,336	60	..	69.4
2010	15,120	8,721	58	..	66.5
New Brunswick 1					
2006
2007
2008	12,690	8,115	64	..	39.9
2009	12,693	8,052	63	..	41.7
2010	12,498	7,755	62	..	41.8
Quebec					
2006	106,227	47,682	45	..	297.2
2007	107,070	47,280	44	..	307.5
2008	106,512	46,017	43	..	285.1
2009	104,505	43,509	42	..	244.4
2010	103,092	41,442	40	..	227.3
Ontario					
2006	175,005	126,486	72	..	1,190.6
2007	170,826	130,956	77	..	1,233.3
2008	175,062	134,031	77	..	1,299.8
2009	174,927	134,559	77	..	1,376.7
2010	177,891	140,127	79	..	1,470.0
Saskatchewan 1					
2006	7,635	4,512	59	..	38.5
2007	7,548	4,587	61	..	39.8
2008	7,614	4,722	62	..	42.3
2009	7,431	4,482	60	..	45.0
2010	7,500	4,740	63	..	47.7
Alberta 1, 3					
2006	45,963	32,016	70	..	387.3
2007	44,619	29,778	67	..	384.3
2008	44,175	29,163	66	..	395.7
2009	43,554	28,761	66	..	411.1
2010	43,845	29,370	67	..	426.9
British Columbia 2, 3					
2006	38,343	25,077	65	..	284.4
2007	37,572	24,609	65	..	288.3
2008	37,536	24,438	65	..	300.8
2009	37,920	24,600	65	..	320.2
2010	38,463	25,656	67	..	341.7
Yukon 1, 2					
2006	414	258	62	..	3.6
2007	402	246	61	..	3.4
2008	414	222	54	..	3.4
2009	399	219	55	..	3.4
2010	384	219	57	..	3.0
Northwest Territories 1					
2006	636	495	78	..	6.6
2007	654	522	80	..	6.9
2008	684	522	76	..	7.4
2009	726	567	78	..	8.2
2010	747	588	79	..	9.4

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 18 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by amount owing, at March 31

	Cases enrolled	Cases with arrears	Arrears due	
	number	percent	millions of dollars	
Total				
2006	394,965	249,954	63	2,307
2007	388,866	250,911	65	2,360
2008	404,190	259,545	64	2,470
2009	400,269	255,729	64	2,533
2010	407,907	262,437	64	2,660

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
 2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
 3. In Alberta and British Columbia, dollars due and received for interest have not been included.
- Note(s):** Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables. Readers are cautioned against calculating an average per case amount of arrears. Some cases have tens or hundred of thousands of dollars of arrears, while others have a very small amount. The average will be influenced by these cases at either end of the range.
- Source(s):** Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 19
Maintenance enforcement cases, by amount of arrears owing, at March 31

	Total		Amount of arrears owing							
	Cases	Arrears due	No arrears		Greater than \$0 to \$5,000		Greater than \$5,000 to \$20,000		Greater than \$20,000	
			Cases	Arrears due	Cases	Arrears due	Cases	Arrears due	Cases	Arrears due
	number	amount (millions of dollars)	percent of total							
Newfoundland and Labrador										
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	5,885	11.4	63	...	28	14	6	31	2	55
Prince Edward Island										
2006
2007	2,585	13.8	32	...	42	12	20	37	7	51
2008	2,535	15.1	33	...	39	10	20	34	8	56
2009	2,470	13.2	33	...	41	11	19	36	6	52
2010	2,485	14.0	33	...	42	11	19	34	6	55
Nova Scotia 1										
2006	18,170	85.1	36	...	41	12	17	38	6	50
2007	17,565	82.2	37	...	40	12	17	37	6	51
2008	16,960	80.2	37	...	40	12	17	37	6	52
2009	15,655	69.4	40	...	38	12	16	36	6	52
2010	15,110	66.5	42	...	37	11	16	36	6	52
New Brunswick										
2006
2007
2008	12,690	39.9	36	...	47	21	14	43	3	35
2009	12,685	41.7	37	...	45	20	15	43	3	37
2010	12,500	41.8	38	...	44	19	14	43	4	38
Saskatchewan										
2006
2007
2008
2009	7,395	45.5	39	...	34	9	18	31	9	60
2010	7,490	47.7	37	...	35	9	19	32	9	59
Alberta 2										
2006	45,975	387.3	30	...	34	6	23	29	13	65
2007	44,620	384.3	33	...	31	6	23	29	13	65
2008	44,170	395.7	34	...	30	6	22	27	14	67
2009	43,555	411.1	34	...	29	5	23	26	15	68
2010	43,850	426.9	33	...	29	5	23	26	15	69
Yukon 1										
2006	420	3.6	39	...	30	5	19	24	12	71
2007	400	3.4	40	...	30	6	15	20	15	74
2008	405	3.4	46	...	22	4	16	21	16	76
2009	395	3.4	46	...	24	4	16	20	14	76
2010	380	3.0	41	...	26	5	21	28	13	66
Northwest Territories										
2006	630	6.6	21	...	36	7	25	27	17	66
2007	655	6.9	20	...	36	6	27	28	17	66
2008	690	7.4	24	...	30	5	28	29	17	65
2009	725	8.2	21	...	28	5	32	31	18	64
2010	745	9.4	21	...	27	4	30	27	21	68
Total										
2006	65,195	482.6	32	...	36	7	21	31	11	62
2007	65,825	490.6	34	...	34	7	21	30	11	63
2008	77,450	541.7	35	...	35	8	20	30	10	62
2009	82,880	592.6	36	...	34	7	20	29	10	63
2010	88,445	620.7	38	...	33	7	19	29	10	64

1. Nova Scotia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.
2. In Alberta, dollars due and received for interest have not been included.

Note(s): Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables. Readers are cautioned against calculating an average per case amount of arrears. Some cases have tens or hundred of thousands of dollars of arrears, while others have a very small amount. The average will be influenced by these cases at either end of the range.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 20
Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by percentage received of regular monthly payment due, at March 31

	Total cases with arrears		Percentage received of regular monthly payment due					
	number	percent	0	1 to 25	26 to 50	51 to 75	76 to 99	100 and over
			percent of cases with arrears					
Newfoundland and Labrador 1								
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	2,148	100	27	3	5	5	6	55
Prince Edward Island 1								
2006	1,770	100	47	1	3	3	4	42
2007	1,785	100	47	1	2	3	4	43
2008	1,707	100	47	1	2	3	4	44
2009	1,644	100	41	2	3	4	3	48
2010	1,674	100	39	1	4	4	4	47
Nova Scotia 1, 2								
2006	11,670	100	56	1	2	3	3	36
2007	11,148	100	56	0	2	3	3	36
2008	10,605	100	54	1	2	2	3	38
2009	9,336	100	40	2	4	4	4	47
2010	8,724	100	35	2	4	3	4	52
New Brunswick 1								
2006
2007
2008	8,109	100	40	2	3	4	3	49
2009	8,049	100	35	2	3	3	3	54
2010	7,761	100	33	2	3	3	3	56
Quebec								
2006	47,676	100	33	2	6	2	6	50
2007	47,274	100	36	1	6	2	6	48
2008	46,023	100	36	1	6	3	6	47
2009	43,506	100	36	1	7	2	7	47
2010	41,442	100	35	1	6	3	8	47
Ontario								
2006	126,483	100	37	1	2	2	4	53
2007	130,953	100	38	1	2	2	4	53
2008	134,034	100	39	2	2	3	4	51
2009	134,559	100	35	3	3	3	4	53
2010	140,124	100	35	2	3	3	4	54
Saskatchewan 1								
2006	4,512	100	41	1	2	3	2	51
2007	4,575	100	40	1	2	2	3	53
2008	4,713	100	42	1	2	3	2	50
2009	4,479	100	34	2	3	3	3	54
2010	4,734	100	34	2	3	4	3	54
Alberta 1								
2006	32,022	100	34	1	2	2	2	60
2007	29,775	100	44	1	2	2	1	51
2008	29,160	100	42	1	1	2	2	52
2009	28,770	100	36	3	3	2	2	54
2010	29,367	100	35	3	3	2	2	55
British Columbia 2								
2006	25,077	100	42	2	3	3	4	46
2007	24,606	100	43	2	3	3	4	46
2008	24,444	100	38	3	5	3	4	47
2009	24,600	100	37	3	5	4	4	47
2010	25,650	100	35	4	5	4	4	48
Yukon 1, 2								
2006	252	100	49	0	2	2	2	44
2007	243	100	49	0	2	2	1	44
2008	219	100	42	4	5	4	3	41
2009	219	100	38	5	4	3	4	45
2010	222	100	35	3	8	3	1	50
Northwest Territories 1								
2006	498	100	37	2	3	4	2	52
2007	522	100	45	1	2	2	2	48
2008	519	100	38	5	6	3	1	46
2009	573	100	40	4	3	2	2	50
2010	585	100	39	7	4	3	2	46

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 20 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by percentage received of regular monthly payment due, at March 31

	Total cases with arrears		Percentage received of regular monthly payment due						
			0	1 to 25	26 to 50	51 to 75	76 to 99	100 and over	
	number	percent	percent of cases with arrears						
Total									
2006	249,960	100	38	1	3	2	4	50	
2007	250,899	100	40	1	3	2	4	48	
2008	259,533	100	39	2	3	3	4	49	
2009	255,735	100	36	2	4	3	4	51	
2010	262,431	100	35	2	4	3	4	52	

1. Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
2. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 21
Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by elapsed time since last payment, at March 31

	Total cases with arrears		New cases in default	Time since payment received (months)			No payments ever made		Unknown ¹	
	number	percent		Less than or equal to 1 month	Greater than 1 to 3 months	Greater than 3 to 12 months	Greater than 12 months	Cases less than or equal to 12 months old		Cases greater than 12 months old
Prince Edward Island²										
2006
2007
2008	1,707	100	0	42	7	10	1	2	0	37
2009	1,644	100	0	47	7	10	6	2	1	27
2010	1,671	100	1	47	5	10	11	3	2	22
Nova Scotia^{2, 3}										
2006	11,661	100	1	34	11	12	4	4	5	29
2007	11,148	100	1	33	12	13	9	4	6	21
2008	10,608	100	0	34	14	13	13	4	6	15
2009	9,336	100	1	45	8	14	14	4	4	9
2010	8,721	100	1	48	7	11	18	4	4	6
New Brunswick²										
2006
2007
2008
2009	8,052	100	1	52	8	12	2	3	0	22
2010	7,755	100	1	55	9	12	7	2	1	14
Quebec										
2006	47,682	100	1	49	19	14	12	2	4	0
2007	47,280	100	1	47	21	14	12	1	3	0
2008	46,017	100	1	56	16	13	11	2	2	0
2009	43,509	100	1	52	23	14	8	2	1	0
2010	41,442	100	1	53	23	13	8	1	1	0
Saskatchewan²										
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010	4,740	100	2	56	9	13	3	4	1	11
Alberta²										
2006	32,016	100	1	55	7	10	0	3	6	19
2007	29,778	100	1	38	14	17	8	4	6	13
2008	29,163	100	1	39	14	15	13	3	6	10
2009	28,761	100	1	46	8	15	15	3	4	9
2010	29,370	100	1	47	7	13	17	3	4	7
British Columbia³										
2006	25,077	100	1	41	19	16	16	4	4	0
2007	24,609	100	1	40	19	15	17	3	4	0
2008	24,438	100	1	47	13	15	17	4	4	0
2009	24,600	100	1	49	11	14	17	4	4	0
2010	25,656	100	1	49	11	14	17	4	4	0
Yukon^{2, 3}										
2006	258	100	1	37	17	20	10	5	2	7
2007	246	100	2	38	18	17	10	5	4	6
2008	222	100	1	47	12	18	9	4	4	4
2009	219	100	1	48	12	15	15	3	4	1
2010	219	100	1	49	12	12	18	4	3	0
Northwest Territories²										
2006	495	100	2	53	16	16	1	3	0	8
2007	522	100	1	47	20	18	3	5	2	4
2008	522	100	1	52	13	20	5	5	2	3
2009	567	100	2	51	8	21	8	6	2	2
2010	588	100	1	53	12	18	8	4	2	2

See notes at the end of the table.

Table 21 – continued

Maintenance enforcement cases with arrears, by elapsed time since last payment, at March 31

	Total cases with arrears	New cases in default	Time since payment received (months)			No payments ever made		Unknown ¹		
			Less than or equal to 30 days since enrolment	Less than or equal to 1 month	Greater than 1 to 3 months	Greater than 3 to 12 months	Greater than 12 months		Cases less than or equal to 12 months old	Cases greater than 12 months old
	number		percent							
Total										
2006	117,189	100	1	47	15	13	9	3	4	8
2007	113,583	100	1	42	18	15	12	3	4	5
2008	112,677	100	1	47	15	14	13	3	4	5
2009	116,688	100	1	49	14	14	12	3	2	5
2010	120,162	100	1	50	14	13	13	3	2	4

1. The Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs does not collect historical data on cases before the commencement of Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs data collection. Cases existing when the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs collection started are classified as unknown, if there is no record of payment being received for these cases in the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.
2. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.
3. Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Yukon allow direct payments in exceptional circumstances to be made and received by their clientele, however, unauthorized direct payments are not encouraged. Since most of these direct payments are not reported until after the survey data are collected, some payors are reported as not having paid, even though they actually have, which understates compliance and overstates arrears. In Nova Scotia and Yukon, about 1% of cases each month report a payment, or payments, being made in a previous month.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. As a result of the random rounding methodology, some small differences can be expected in the corresponding values between tables.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Table 22
Number and type of reported enforcement actions for maintenance enforcement cases administered, 2009/2010

	Prince Edward Island ¹	Nova Scotia ^{1,2}	New Brunswick ¹	Saskat- chewan ¹	Alberta ¹	British Columbia	Yukon ¹	Northwest Territories ¹	Total
number									
Administrative enforcement action									
Demand for payment	30	2,661	5,148	153	...	28,671	36,663
Demand for information	..	1,068	69	3,609	20,376	309	228	6	25,665
Maintenance enforcement program trace	..	246	..	582	29,715	37,215	27	..	67,785
Jurisdictional garnishment and attachment	414	2,136	3,375	1,944	49,764	56,772	117	498	115,020
Voluntary payment arrangement	0	90	69	0	11,322	3,147	0	..	14,628
Credit Bureau reporting	0	..	108	342	1,791	10,719	21	0	12,981
Land registration	0	0	..	573	381	2,742	3	3	3,702
Personal property lien	6,342	1,635	84	..	8,061
Motor vehicle licence intervention	12	378	420	984	20,673	2,907	36	165	25,575
Writ of execution	0	..	0	12	0	0	6	114	132
Collection calls	1,566	0	1,566
Examination of payor	132	165	0	0	297
Other administrative enforcement actions	2,955	390	0	0	267	15,057	54	39	18,762
Subtotal	3,543	7,134	10,755	8,199	140,631	159,174	576	825	330,837
Administrative action under federal legislation									
Federal trace (FOAEAA ³ -Part I)	51	1,725	8,334	6	21	132	10,269
Interception of federal funds (FOAEAA ³ -Part II)	450	2,295	..	1,461	11,862	9,588	96	204	25,956
Federal licence suspension (FOAEAA ³ -Part III)	0	600	7,044	2,871	12	63	10,590
Federal garnishment (GAPDA ⁴)	3	54	12	6	42	33	0	..	150
Subtotal	504	2,349	12	3,792	27,282	12,498	129	399	46,965
Total administrative actions	4,047	9,483	10,767	11,991	167,913	171,672	705	1,224	377,802
Court enforcement									
Default hearing	282	66	..	471	0	0	819
Committal hearing	183	183
Other court enforcement activities ⁵	54	6	1,047	2,253	0	0	3,360
Total court enforcement actions	336	72	1,047	2,907	0	0	4,362
percent									
Administrative enforcement action									
Demand for payment	1	28	48	1	..	17	17
Demand for information	..	11	1	30	12	0	32	0	0
Maintenance enforcement plan trace	..	3	..	5	18	22	4	..	22
Jurisdictional garnishment and attachment	10	23	31	16	30	33	17	41	33
Voluntary payment arrangement	0	1	1	0	7	2	0	..	2
Credit Bureau reporting	0	..	1	3	1	6	3	0	6
Land registration	0	0	..	5	0	2	0	0	2
Personal property lien	4	1	12	..	1
Motor vehicle licence intervention	0	4	4	8	12	2	5	13	2
Writ of execution	0	..	0	0	0	0	1	9	0
Collection calls	15	0	0
Examination of payor	3	2	0	0	0
Other administrative enforcement actions	73	4	0	0	0	9	8	3	9
Subtotal	88	75	100	68	84	93	82	67	93
Administrative action under federal legislation									
Federal trace (FOAEAA ³ -Part I)	1	14	5	0	3	11	0
Interception of federal funds (FOAEAA ³ -Part II)	11	24	..	12	7	6	14	17	6
Federal licence suspension (FOAEAA ³ -Part III)	0	5	4	2	2	5	2
Federal garnishment (GAPDA ⁴)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	..	0
Subtotal	12	25	0	32	16	7	18	33	7
Total administrative actions	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Court enforcement									
Default hearing	84	92	..	16	0	0	16
Committal hearing	6	6
Other court enforcement activities ⁵	16	8	100	78	0	0	78
Total court enforcement actions	100	100	100	100	0	0	100

1. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories report detailed microdata through the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs. The other jurisdictions in the table report aggregate data through the Maintenance Enforcement Survey.

2. In Nova Scotia, other administrative enforcement actions include personal property liens, federal license suspensions, federal traces and default hearings.

3. *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act*.

4. *Garnishment, Attachment, and Pension Diversion Act*.

5. Other kinds of court enforcement activity include execution orders, registering an order against personal property, appointing a receiver, order to provide information, issuing a warrant for arrest, appointing a trustee in bankruptcy, and issuing writs for seizure and sale.

Note(s): Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Interjurisdictional support order-out cases are excluded. Cases administered includes all cases registered for at least part of the year. More than one action may be associated with the same case.

Source(s): Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Maintenance Enforcement Survey and Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs.

Methodology

Background on the Maintenance Enforcement Survey and the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs

The Maintenance Enforcement Survey (MES) and the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs (SMEP) gather information on maintenance enforcement cases, and on some of the key characteristics associated with those cases. Case flow and changes in the volume of cases can be measured over time. In addition, survey data provide information on financial matters, the processing of payments, and the tracing and enforcement actions taken by maintenance enforcement programs (MEPs).

The MES is an aggregate survey, meaning that there is no information on individual cases, and data are collected and reported for pre-defined categories. As a result, opportunities for further analysis of the data to produce or derive new measures are quite limited. The data collection tables used by the survey were constructed during the identification of information needs and survey specifications in 1995.

The SMEP is currently being implemented by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) at Statistics Canada. It is a microdata survey that collects case-level data, and summary data tables are produced at the CCJS. Eventually all 13 provincial/territorial MEPs will report to the SMEP. The switch from aggregate to microdata collection allows for more extensive and dynamic analysis of maintenance enforcement information. The SMEP can produce all statistics presently available through the MES, as well as numerous additional types of analyses and views of maintenance enforcement data.

Data collection

The MES and the SMEP are administrative surveys that collect data from the case management information systems maintained by provincial and territorial MEPs. Data are extracted from each MEP's automated information system according to the survey specifications. Computer interfaces map survey concepts to local system information and the data are then electronically extracted from the system and transmitted to the CCJS.

Survey coverage

The current report presents data for fiscal years 2005/2006 through 2009/2010. For 2009/2010, there are 11 reporting jurisdictions: Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia, which report to the MES survey, and Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories which provide data to the SMEP survey. Together, these 11 jurisdictions account for about 96% of Canada's population.

Because the survey was implemented in different jurisdictions at different points in time, data coverage over the five-year period varies by jurisdiction. Additionally, some publication tables do not include all 11 survey respondents because the data are not available from some jurisdictions.

The jurisdictions currently reporting data to the survey are not representative of the non-reporting provinces and territories. Moreover, the MES and the SMEP data are not representative of the estimated 66% of support arrangements that exist outside the provincial/territorial MEPs (General Social Survey 2006).

Reporting timeframes

As support payments are often paid monthly, much of the MES data and all of the SMEP data are collected from the MEPs on a monthly basis. The MES also collects some annual data. In the SMEP, this information is tabulated from the monthly results. For example, information such as median age of payors and recipients and median child support obligation is not prone to large monthly fluctuations and is collected for the fiscal year ending March 31st.

Data for the MES are collected in a “snapshot” manner, meaning they provide a view of the various statistics at the end of the month or the end of the fiscal year. The survey will not reflect new information coming to light after month-end or year-end data collection, such as the payor having made a direct payment¹ to the recipient or a cheque-based payment being returned for non-sufficient funds. Data from the SMEP are also collected in a “snapshot” manner, so they too provide a view of the various statistics at month-end. However, unlike the MES, the survey captures any adjustments to payments or other information that are made in subsequent months.

Data limitations

The section “A description of maintenance enforcement services” described the operational differences that exist among maintenance enforcement programs, from how cases are enrolled and closed, to how they are enforced, that may have an impact on the interpretation of survey data. In addition, because the survey data are obtained from operational information systems designed to assist the MEPs in monitoring and enforcing their caseload, there will be some deviations from survey specifications. The following paragraphs outline where these effects are known.

Newfoundland and Labrador

In Newfoundland and Labrador, cases that enrolled before 2006 that had both a spouse and child beneficiaries are categorized as having ‘Children only’ beneficiaries, due to reporting limitations in the Newfoundland and Labrador system.

Prince Edward Island

In Prince Edward Island, no data are available for order authority, reason for case termination or withdrawal, and only partial data are available for payment history. Total payment amounts due exclude scheduled arrears.

In tables 1 and 3, data from all active and inactive cases enrolled in the MEP are reported. In all other tables, only data from active cases are included.

Nova Scotia

In Nova Scotia, one practice that affects the survey data is the acceptance of direct payments of support to the recipient. When a payor pays the recipient directly, the MEP does not record the payment until it receives notification, and, as such, the case will be categorized as “in default” because the MEP has no record of payment. Each month, approximately 1% of cases report a payment, or payments, made in a previous month. As a result, the compliance rate will appear to be lower than it actually is.

In 2008/2009, Nova Scotia’s Maintenance Enforcement Program undertook a full file review retroactive to 1996, the year the program was implemented. This review resulted in the closure of a number of files which has contributed to the decrease in cases enrolled and administered and may have contributed to increased compliance and decreased arrears.

Nova Scotia data do not distinguish between provincial support orders and support agreements registered under provincial legislation.

1. Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient that do not involve the Maintenance Enforcement Program.

New Brunswick

In 2007/2008, New Brunswick migrated to a new information system. During this time, data were not collected from New Brunswick for a number of months. As part of the development project for the new system, a new data collection interface to the SMEP was built. On February 11, 2008, New Brunswick converted to the new system, and SMEP data collection began March 2008. Because of the conversion to the new system, data on arrears on enrolment for cases existing at the time of conversion are not available, and the number of cases with arrears on enrolment will not be published for a period of time following the conversion date (as most cases will have an arrears on enrolment status of unknown).

Quebec

Quebec's program requires that the payor set up a payment method at the outset, either through payroll deductions or a payment order. If by payment order, payors must remit support payments directly to the MEP and provide a security sufficient to guarantee one month of support payments. In some cases, if the program is certain to recover the sum from the payor, the legislation allows for the MEP to provide an advance to the recipient to help ensure regularity of payments. Advances are considered to be support payments and must be repaid by the payor. As well, the legislation requires that payments go to the recipients on the 1st and 16th of every month.

Quebec's program does not distinguish between types of beneficiaries, and therefore cannot report this information to the survey. As well, direct payment cases are included in the annual tables (Tables 1, 3, 4, and 17), but not the monthly tables. Therefore, case counts for the annual tables will be greater.

Alberta

Alberta began charging interest on a monthly basis on all outstanding arrears in October 2008. The dollars due and received from interest are not reported in this publication. This practice could influence payment compliance.

British Columbia

In British Columbia, as in Nova Scotia and Yukon, the legislation permits the acceptance of direct payments of support. Until the MEP receives notification that the payment has been made, the case is considered to be "in default" and the compliance rate will appear to be lower than it actually is.

British Columbia legislation requires that interest be charged on late and unpaid maintenance. This interest is payable to the recipient. Although the dollars due and received for interest are not collected by the MES, this practice could influence payment compliance.

As described in the Enforcement section, British Columbia has a default fee. Each year the payor is charged the equivalent of one month's maintenance, to a maximum of \$400, upon the second default of the year. This penalty, which is payable to the MEP, has resulted in an increase in caseload, but information on these cases is not collected by the MES.

Northwest Territories

In the Northwest Territories, no data are available for the authority of the order (*Divorce Act*, Provincial order, etc.). The assignment status of a case is also not available. Moreover, the Northwest Territories' program cannot distinguish between "children only" cases and "spouse and children" beneficiary cases. Both types of cases are captured as "children only" in the SMEP.

Yukon

In Yukon, one practice that affects the survey data is the acceptance of direct payments of support to the recipient. When a payor pays the recipient directly, the MEP does not record the payment until it receives notification, and, as such, the case will be categorized as “in default” because the MEP has no record of payment. Each month, approximately 0.5% of cases report a payment, or payments, made in a previous month. As a result, the compliance rate will appear to be lower than it actually is.

To summarize, the national survey definitions do enable some comparisons between jurisdictions but always within the context of operational differences of the MEPs, differences in case profiles and differences in how data are reported to the survey. Nevertheless, with an increasing number of MEPs supplying data, a more complete picture of the national context is emerging and ongoing data collection is beginning to provide an opportunity to examine trends over time.

Confidentiality/random rounding

Maintenance Enforcement Survey data have been subjected to a confidentiality procedure known as “random rounding” to reduce the likelihood of associating the data with any identifiable individual. The technique of random rounding provides protection against disclosure, but does not add significant distortion to the data. In this report, all MES and SMEP data involving counts of individuals or cases are randomly rounded either up or down to the nearest multiple of 3. Thus, a case count of 32 would become either 30 or 33 when rounded. Data in Tables 12 and 16 from the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs also employed the random rounding procedure, except counts were rounded to the nearest multiple of 5.

It should be noted that totals are calculated from their randomly rounded components, rather than being rounded independently. Thus some small differences can be expected in corresponding values among various MES tables.

Appendix I

Glossary of terms

Administrative survey

An administrative survey uses data that were collected by another agency or group for its own purposes. While the data collected were designed to assist decision-making or monitoring by the original agency, data can be extracted for research purposes providing a source for this information without having to mount a separate survey.

Aggregate survey

This refers to a survey where information on individual cases is not collected, but where data are summarized, collected and reported for pre-defined categories. More specifically for the MES, computer interfaces map survey concepts to local system information and the data are then electronically extracted from the system in aggregate form.

Arrears

Arrears refer to money owing from earlier missed payments. As a result of either a court order or voluntary payment arrangement, an amount of arrears may end up being subject to a schedule. As long as the payment schedule is being adhered to, it is likely no additional enforcement action will be taken. Any non-scheduled arrears are those arrears which are owed from an earlier time, and for which there is no payment schedule established. The full amount is due and enforceable.

It is possible for a case to have arrears and be in compliance with total expected payments at the same time. This would be the situation if the payor were making all the current payments due, including the scheduled arrears payment.

Assignment status

This identifies whether the recipient is receiving social assistance and has had his or her case formally assigned to the Crown, or it may signify that arrears exist and that when collected, should be used to recover Social Assistance payments previously paid. Monies that are collected on behalf of the recipient on social assistance are either paid directly back to the provincial/territorial government or are reported and then deducted from the next assistance cheque.

Authority for the order

Support obligations enforced by the MEPs are the product of a court order or an agreement between the recipient and the payor. Orders for support may be the result of consent between the parties or a contested court hearing, and may be granted either under the federal divorce legislation, or the applicable provincial/territorial maintenance legislation.

Beneficiary

The beneficiary is the person(s) entitled to the benefit of the support payment, and is named in the support order. The beneficiary may be children only, spouse only, or both. In a very small number of cases in some jurisdictions, the beneficiary may also be a parent of the payor.

Cases administered

This includes all cases that were enrolled with the MEP at some point during a period of time, for example a year. It is a measure of all the cases for which the MEP had responsibility to monitor and enforce. Thus it includes both enrolled and terminated cases, but excludes ISO-out cases.

Cases enrolled

This includes all cases that are enrolled with the MEP at a particular point in time or over a period of time (i.e. all cases enrolled for the entire fiscal year). It can include cases for which the MEP is responsible to monitor (ISO-out cases) as well as those for which it is responsible to monitor and enforce (non-ISO and ISO-in cases).

Collection calls

This refers to an enforcement activity that involves the phoning of payors to demand payment.

Collection rate

Total amounts received by the MEP over the fiscal year are divided by total amounts due over the same time period. A rate of 100% would mean the amount received equalled the amount due.

Committal hearing

This refers to the hearing held when a payor defaults on an order where the penalty is jail.

Compliance/default

For purposes of the survey, compliance means that at least the amount expected in a month is received. Cases where there is nothing due in a month are counted as being in compliance. Excess payments or early payments are not considered separately. Cases not in compliance are in default.

Cases in compliance may also have arrears, either non-scheduled or scheduled. The determination of compliance is only made against the current amount due in a month.

Credit Bureau reporting

Credit Bureau reporting occurs when a MEP advises the Credit Bureau of payors who are in arrears. This lets other potential credit granters know of the debt so they will take this into consideration before allowing the payor to take on a new obligation that might be affected by the support obligation.

Default hearing

This refers to a hearing before a master/court administrator or judge to determine what action may be appropriate in the face of a failure to make support payments.

Demand for information

This includes all demands (usually letters) sent where the maintenance enforcement program is asking for information. Letters can be sent to the recipient, the payor, or some other party, such as an employer.

Demand for payment

This includes all demands (usually letters) sent where the maintenance enforcement program is asking for payment. The letter could be to the payor or some other party, such as an employer who has not sent in the money from a garnishment order, for example.

Direct payments

Direct payments are defined as payments made by the payor to the recipient, as stipulated by order/agreement that do not involve the maintenance enforcement program other than for adjustments to arrears, or for notification of failure to continue direct payment.

Enforcement activity

Various methods can be employed by a MEP to enforce an outstanding payment. Activities taken on a case can be categorized into three main types according to who conducts the procedure:

- Administrative activities are those mechanisms employed by the MEP itself, and would include demands for information, jurisdictional garnishment and attachment and Credit Bureau reporting as examples.
- Quasi-judicial enforcement comprise activities undertaken by a master or court administrator, and may involve conducting a default hearing.
- Court-based enforcement involves court and judge time and is generally employed as a last resort. These tend to be more serious enforcement actions, involving default hearings, issuing of warrants, and default orders, and may culminate in fines or jail.

Event-driven payments

This refers to monies that are due because of some situation that has arisen if provided for in the order or agreement. For instance, an event-driven payment could be for tuition, dental work or lessons.

Examination of payor

This refers to any and all activity taken by the maintenance enforcement program to examine a payor with respect to assets and liabilities. In some jurisdictions, this action can be undertaken by administrative staff, or court administrators.

Execution order

This refers to the order made by a judge to liquidate assets.

Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (FOAEAA)

Under the three parts of the federal *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (FOAEAA)*, MEPs can access different services provided by the Family Law Assistance Service (FLAS) of the federal Department of Justice. Part I allows for requests to search various federal databanks to determine the location of the payor. Part II allows for the interception of federal money owing to a payor. This most frequently takes the form of intercepting an income tax refund. Part III allows the MEP to apply through FLAS to the applicable federal department to have federally-administered licenses suspended or denied. This encompasses passports and certain transport (aviation and marine) licenses.

Federal garnishment

This refers to garnishments and orders made pursuant to the Queen's Regulations, and the *Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act (GAPDA)*.

Federal licence suspension

This refers to the *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (Part III)* which allows the denial of passports, aviation licences, and marine certificates.

Federal trace

This refers to the request for a federal trace under the *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (Part I)*.

Garnishment, Attachment, and Pension Diversion Act (GAPDA)

Under the *Garnishment Attachment and Pension Diversion Act (GAPDA)*, federal employee salaries and pensions are subject to garnishment.

Garnishment and attachment

This refers to the legal redirection of money owed to a support payor by another person or a corporation. A garnishment is referred to as a wage attachment in some jurisdictions. Most MEPs are able to issue their own garnishments and attachments, without court involvement.

Inherited arrears

These are the arrears that accrue before the case was enrolled in a MEP. MEPs are responsible to enforce on inherited arrears if repayment is not made after enrolment.

Interception of federal funds

Under the *Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act (Part II)*, the maintenance enforcement program can intercept federal funds, such as income tax refunds, employment insurance benefits, old age security, Canada Pension Plan benefits, interest on regular Canada Savings Bonds.

ISO status

Formerly referred to as REMO (reciprocal enforcement maintenance orders) or RESO (reciprocal enforcement support orders) status, ISO (interjurisdictional support order) status indicates whether cases cross jurisdictional boundaries, usually because the payor and recipient live in different provinces, territories or countries. Cases are classified according to three categories:

- **Non-ISO cases**

These are typically cases where both parties live within the jurisdiction where the case is registered. Additionally, where parties conduct business, bank, or have assets in a jurisdiction, they may be registered there without residing there.

- **ISO-in cases**

These are cases that the jurisdiction has been asked to enforce by another jurisdiction because the payor is known to reside and/or have assets in its jurisdiction.

- **ISO-out cases**

These are cases that have been sent to another jurisdiction, and are registered there for enforcement purposes because the payor lives and/or has assets there.

For cases that cross jurisdictional boundaries, all provinces and territories, except Quebec, have introduced new legislation, the *ISO Act*. The purpose of this legislation is to allow one or both of the parties to obtain or vary a support order, or to have an existing order recognized and enforced when the parties are in different jurisdictions.

Jurisdiction

This describes the province or territory.

Jurisdictional garnishment

This refers to the formal process whereby an amount is deducted from a payor's salary or wages, or other source of income on a regular basis.

Land registration

This refers to actions taken to encumber the sale of specific real estate. A support order may be registered in the Land Registry Office in the jurisdiction against the payor's land. Upon registration, both the ongoing support obligation and any arrears owing become a charge on the property. The charge may be enforced by sale of the land.

Maintenance enforcement plan trace

This refers to all attempts to find the payor using jurisdictional information banks.

Microdata survey

This refers to a survey where information is extracted for each individual case. Summary data (mostly aggregations of the values for each case record) are produced at the CCJS.

Motor vehicle license intervention

A motor vehicle license intervention may be placed in order to prevent the renewal of licenses (and in some jurisdictions, motor vehicle-related services) and/or suspension of driving privileges prior to satisfying the support obligation.

Opt-in registration

In an “opt-in” registration system, enrolment with a MEP is at the option of either the recipient or payor. The only exception is cases where the recipient is entitled to social assistance, in which case enrolment is mandatory.

Opt-out registration

In an automatic or “opt-out” registration system, maintenance orders are automatically enrolled with a maintenance enforcement program at the time of the order. To be removed from the caseload of a MEP, a recipient must ask to be withdrawn from the program. In many jurisdictions, the payor has to agree to the withdrawal. This request can be denied if the recipient is collecting social assistance.

Order forfeiture of security

This refers to action taken by a master or court administrator where final authority is given to seize a security.

Order to provide information

This refers to a court order to provide information, including the payor’s financial affairs.

Pay-through system

The “pay-through” approach refers to a system where payors forward their payment to the MEP; the MEP records the payment and forwards it to the recipient.

Pay-to system

In a “pay-to” system, the payor makes his/her payment payable to the MEP, which functions as a clearinghouse for the payment before disbursing it to the recipient.

Payor

The payor is the person named in the order/agreement who provides the support payments. Some MEPs refer to the payor as the “debtor” or “respondent”.

Personal property lien

Support payments in arrears can be registered as a lien or charge against any personal property (e.g. motor vehicle) owned or held by the support payor in the jurisdiction. Registration affects the ability of the payor to sell or finance the encumbered personal property.

Provincial agreement

Domestic contracts, such as paternity agreements or separation agreements, between the payor and recipient can be filed in court and enforced by a MEP under provincial/territorial legislation, provided the agreement meets jurisdictional requirements for enforcement.

Provincial order

This refers to a court order for support made under provincial/territorial legislation.

Reason for termination

Cases will terminate or cease to be enrolled in a MEP for a variety of reasons. For example, orders expire as children age, the payor or recipient may die, or the recipient or payor may choose to withdraw from the program. In some instances the program may close the case depending upon its policy. For example, a MEP might close a case if the recipient cannot be located or if the recipient is accepting direct payments contrary to the program's policy.

Recipient

The recipient is the person named in the order/agreement to receive the support and is generally the parent who has parental responsibility for the children. Sometimes the recipient is a grandparent or another person responsible for the children. The money the recipient receives could be for the benefit of the recipient, for dependent child(ren), or for both. Some MEPs refer to the recipient as the "creditor" or "claimant".

Register order against personal property

This refers to the registration of the maintenance order against property of the payor.

Regular payments

This refers to the amount ordered or agreed to, expressed as a monthly payment due and includes the regular ongoing amount due in one month. Scheduled arrears are not included.

Total payments

This refers to all monies for support, expressed as a monthly payment. This amount includes the regular amount expected for a given month plus scheduled arrears, event-driven payments, and fees, costs and penalties due.

Voluntary payment arrangement

This refers to an arrangement made by the maintenance enforcement program and agreed to by the payor where a voluntary payment schedule is established. The voluntary assignment of wages is included.

Writ of execution

This refers to the actions taken by the maintenance enforcement program that result in payment, for example the seizure and sale of a payor's assets.

Writ of seizure and sale

A legal document by which a sheriff in a jurisdiction where the writ is filed can be authorized to seize either personal property (e.g. motor vehicle) or real property (e.g. land) of a support payor in default and to sell the property to satisfy the support debt. A writ of seizure and sale can also affect the ability of a payor to finance or sell the encumbered property.

Appendix II

References

Statistics Canada. 2002. *Maintenance Enforcement Programs in Canada: Description of Operations, 1999/2000*. Catalogue no. 85-552-XIE. Ottawa.